

Daniel 8:14,
The Day Of Atonement,
And The Investigative Judgment

By

Desmond Ford

DEDICATED

*To those who, believing that God raised up
the Advent movement to proclaim the truth
for earth's last hour, value truth more than
position, comfort, or reputation.*

*For such,
"New occasions teach new duties,
Time makes ancient good uncouth,
They must upward still and onward
Who would keep abreast of truth."*

(513, Church Hymnal)

INTRODUCTORY SUMMARY OF THIS MANUSCRIPT

CHAPTER ONE

Because the sanctuary truth is such a prominent part of our doctrinal platform, it is vital that our exposition of it be such as will recommend it to the best minds of non-Adventists, as well as our own people, and be able to survive the most searching scrutiny. The issue is not just theoretical, for as R.A. Anderson has said, "A misconception of the great sanctuary truth has robbed many of the very assurance they need when we will have to stand without a Mediator just prior to our Lord's return" (*Review and Herald*, Aug. 3, 1962, p. 9).

Our history shows that loyal leaders in our ranks have undergone agony of soul as they contemplated our traditional teaching on the investigative judgment and tried to reconcile it with Scripture. Some of these men ultimately left us for this reason, including A.F. Ballenger, E.S. Ballenger, L.H. Crisler, I. Kech, W.W. Fletcher, L.R. Conradi, R.A. Grieve, etc, while others, such as W.W. Prescott and L.E. Froom and many contemporaries chose to remain with us, though deeply troubled and perplexed.

Our twentieth century scholars have called into question many pillars of our usual sanctuary presentation. Study of recent documents on the sanctuary by our scholars shows a great departure from the nineteenth century positions. For example, it is now admitted that blood from the offerings of the common people never went into the sanctuary, and that sacrificial blood never defiles. The sanctuary was defiled by the act of sin, not by the transfer of it through blood. Neither is there any Scripture which teaches an investigative judgment of the saints beginning long before the Advent. Doctrine cannot be established by types or prophetic interpretation - these may only be used to illustrate and confirm what is clearly taught elsewhere, and in non-symbolic language. Key texts originally used by us to teach a judgment of the saints have now been recognized by many as pointing rather to a judgment of the wicked. For example, the context of Dan. 7 makes it clear that the little horn, not believers, is being investigated. The same is true of Rev. 14:7,8.

In the 1960's a special Daniel committee met for five years to deal with such problems but reached no unanimity. A previous questionnaire sent to our leading scholars brought the reply that it is impossible to so exegete Dan. 8:14 as to derive the investigative judgment. Dr. Raymond Cottrell, former associate editor of the *SDA Bible Commentary* and the *Review*, has often told that story, and recently published it in the April issue of *Spectrum*. He affirms that the traditional sanctuary interpretation cannot be derived from Scripture, and that most of our scholars know that to be the case.

While no teacher amongst us holds to the Ballenger schema of years ago, which taught a pre-cross sanctuary ministry of 4000 years, yet many acknowledge that Ballenger was at least correct on Christ's entrance within the veil at His ascension. (Contemporary SDA New Testament scholars interpret Heb. 6:19,20 and 10:19,20 quite differently to 19th century Adventist writers.)

E.G. White agreed with Ballenger on this aspect also, as is made clear by *Desire of Ages* 757 and *Signs of the Times*, April 19, 1905, though simultaneously holding to a first apartment ministry culminating in 1844. The words of veteran scholar, W.E. Read, summarize her Day of Atonement emphasis:

"The Day of Atonement in days of old foreshadowed not only the work of Christ on Calvary but also the final events in the great controversy, which envisioned the cleansing of the

universe by the removal and destruction of all iniquity. “When this takes place, and all that relates to sin is finally eradicated from the universe of God, then we shall see “new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.” (*Review and Herald*, Nov. 8, 1962, p. 4)

CHAPTER TWO

The only book of the New Testament which discusses the meaning of the Day of Atonement, the significance of the first apartment ministry, and the fulfilment of the cleansing of the sanctuary is Hebrews. Chapter 9 deals with all three topics, but in no place gives the traditional Adventist position on these points.

Hebrews 6:19; 10:19,20; 9:8,12, 24-25 teach Christ went into the equivalent of the Most Holy Place at His ascension. Today our New Testament scholars admit that “within the veil” means within the second veil, and Greek scholars acknowledge that *ta hagia* in 9:8,12,24; 10:19 means the second apartment only. Even the English translation makes this clear, for *ta hagia* is only reached through that veil which the High Priest penetrated solely on the Day of Atonement. Heb. 9:7,8,12,24.

According to the writer of Hebrews, the significance of the first apartment was to underline the inadequacy of the Jewish typical sacrificial service, and to show that only the coming of the true Sacrifice could bring forgiveness of sins, and entrance into the presence of God. See 9:7-12; 10:1-12. This New Testament book, far from saying that the heavenly sanctuary is just like the earthly, only larger, often contrasts it with the earthly. The same is true of the heavenly ministry. Christ is not a Levitical priest, but one after the order of Melchizedek — a king-priest who has completed His sacrificial work and sat down on his heavenly throne. Nowhere in Hebrews do we find the early Christians waiting for Christ to go into the second apartment. On the contrary, it teaches that at that time He was already there, and they were waiting for Him to come out. See 9:28. The Day of Atonement is applied throughout Hebrews to what Christ had already done by the Cross and His ascension to heaven. Hebrews does not teach that the Day of Atonement points to some event eighteen centuries then future. It teaches the opposite. Scholars such as F.D. Nichol, and our contemporary New Testament exegetes, admit that our sanctuary teaching cannot be found in the only book of the New Testament which discusses the significance of the sanctuary services. This has been acknowledged by well-known Adventist writers around the world.

The cleansing of the sanctuary is mentioned in Heb. 9:23, but it is applied to what Christ has already done by His death, not to some future judgment work. Nowhere does Hebrews draw on Dan. 8:14 and project its fulfilment to a later Day of Atonement towards the end of the world. The cleansing of the sanctuary is identical with His making “purification for sins” on the Cross prior to His ascension to “the right hand of the Majesty on high.” See Heb. 1:3 and compare Rom. 5:9-11,18 with Heb. 9:22-26.

CHAPTER THREE

Our Daniel scholars this century have for the most part concluded that, as with Hebrews, in this book also, there is neither contextual nor linguistic evidence to support our traditional interpretation of Dan. 8:14. This has been admitted repeatedly by such men as Don Neufeld, Raymond Cottrell, E. Heppenstall, and many others.

There is no Biblical basis for assuming that the year-day be applied to Dan. 8 and 9. Dan. 9 nowhere mentions days that could be turned into years. It speaks of “seventy sevens,” not seventy weeks of days.

Neither is it possible to be dogmatic on any of the dates focused on by our by our prophetic exegesis of these Daniel chapters. No man knows the year of our Lord's death, nor the exact time of His birth or baptism. Neither is it possible to prove that "the going forth of the commandment to restore and rebuild Jerusalem" can only mean Autumn of 457 B.C. There is nothing in Ezra 7 that speaks of rebuilding Jerusalem's walls. Neither can we establish that Stephen was stoned in A.D. 34, or that the Day of Atonement in 1844 fell on Oct. 22. Scholars say rather that the Day of Atonement in 1844 fell a month earlier, and was so observed even by most Karaite Jews.

The evidence of the New Testament is that Christ could have returned in the first century had the church taken the gospel to the whole, world. See Matt. 24:14,34 (the expression "this generation" which occurs over a dozen times in the gospels always means the generation of Christ's contemporaries); Heb. 1:1; 9:26; 1 John 2:17; Rom. 13:13; Acts 3:19,20. The *SDA Bible Commentary* clearly teaches this in several places. See 4:26-33; 7:29. And the *Review* similarly has thus affirmed. Thus all the Daniel prophecies are conditional, and their primary meaning was not to affirm a two thousand year gap between the advents.

In the New Testament we find the Daniel prophecies re-interpreted, but again not in such a way as to indicate that many centuries must necessarily transpire before the end of the world. Revelation, which draws on Daniel, speaks seven times of the imminence of Christ's return in John's day.

In Dan. 9:24-27 we have an eschatological prophecy which is explanatory both of Dan. 7:9-13 and 8:14. Five terms occur in verse 24 which are only found together in one other chapter of Scripture — Leviticus. 16. Here we read of the fulfilment and consummation of the Day of Atonement type. But the New Testament applies this not only to the Cross of Christ, but also to the end of the world. Christ's Second Advent sermon is a commentary on Dan. 9:24-27 and uses its key motifs for the last things but in such a manner as to show that He is projecting the latter-day consummation for the world of what was to overtake Him at His passion. This shows conclusively that Leviticus. 16 finds its legal fulfilment in Christ's sacrificial atonement, but its empirical consummation in the final cleansing of the universe from sin and sinners. See *Patriarch and Prophets* 358.

In recent years, non-Adventist scholars have shown an unparalleled interest in apocalyptic, and many have seen that Dan. 7:9-13; 8:14; 9:24-27 apply to the last judgment and the end of the world.

CHAPTER FOUR

Not only Hebrews, but Revelation, contains references to the Day of Atonement. In this book the type is applied eschatologically rather than soteriologically. It is connected with the last judgment, and God's wrath prior to the setting up of the kingdom of glory. Non-Adventist scholars for centuries have pointed out the prominence of *Yom Kippur* imagery in the Apocalypse.

In the seventh seal, the seventh trumpet, the seven last plagues, the climactic chapters of 13, 14, 17 and 20 we have allusions to the Day of Atonement as the final wiping away of sin is contemplated.

Thus in the Bible's last book we find strong evidence for the Adventist eschatological use of the Day of Atonement, though not for a protracted investigative judgment.

CHAPTER FIVE

Twentieth century scholars, our own and others, point out that the New Testament views the “end of the world” as launched by the Christ event. Thus all great eschatological themes such as the kingdom, judgment, the gift of the Spirit, eternal life, resurrection, the destruction of Satan, the abolition of death, are applied to the Cross and its fruits. See Heb. 2:13; 2 Tim. 1:10; John 5:24; 12:31; Matt. 12:28; Acts 2:16; Eph. 2:1; Col. 1:13; 3:1; Heb. 1:1; 9:26; 1 John 2:17, etc. But these same motifs figure again in the prophetic promises of the times associated with the return of Christ. Thus the Passover is not only applied to the first advent, but to the second. The same is true of Tabernacles, the Jubilee, **and the Day of Atonement. Thus Leviticus 16 has an application to the Cross, but also to the last judgment. While the rest of the religious world has seen the soteriological application of the Day of Atonement but not, as a rule, the eschatological, Seventh-day Adventists have done the reverse — with the exception of Ellen G. White, who saw and taught both applications.** When this is linked with the fact that many Old Testament scholars in recent years have admitted that Dan. 8:14 was not exhausted by the Maccabean era, but applies to judgment at the end of time, Adventists find that they do have foundations for their basic prophetic postulate — that Dan. 8:14 and Leviticus. 16 point to “the last things” and contain important truths for modern Christians. This, however, does not guarantee the accuracy of subsidiary positions such as the investigative judgment.

CHAPTER SIX

A misunderstanding of the issues of authority, inspiration, and inerrancy have been responsible for the majority of doctrinal controversies the Seventh-day Adventist church has experienced.

The scriptural doctrine of authority has to do with the primacy of the Word as interpreted to loyal believers through the Holy Spirit. Inspiration’s primary purpose is to lead men to Christ. See John 20:31. It is perfect for God’s purpose and may, like the Living Word, challenge and upset our prior prejudices. Inerrancy is never claimed for prophets, and E.G. White specifically denied any claim to it.

Not one doctrine came to this church through E.G. White. First, truth was established through the Word and only then confirmed through the Lord’s messenger. Ellen G. White, according to W.C. White, had an imperfect grasp of truth as shown particularly by some of her early expressions. She changed several doctrinal positions, including systematic benevolence versus tithing, the law in Galatians, the covenants, time to keep the Sabbath, the eating of pork, etc. Furthermore, W.C. White tells us that it was quite possible for his mother to sometimes misunderstand and misinterpret her own visions. She told the brethren that they should understand the significance of the revelations from heaven made to her better than herself. She erred regarding the meaning of her first vision, thinking it confirmed the shut door doctrine.

Our major error has been to make the writings of E.G. White have veto power over Scripture. But in matters of scriptural debate where good men were ranged on both sides, it was not Ellen White’s practice to decide doctrinal issues. When tithing was first introduced in the 1880’s, many opposed it because E.G. White had advocated a different system for many years — systematic benevolence. When the new view of the daily came (actually the old view of the Reformers) extreme conservatives opposed it on the basis of a single statement from *Early Writings*. At Minneapolis in 1888 U. Smith opposed Waggoner and Jones on the grounds that

in *Sketches from the Life of Paul Ellen White* had set forth the law in Galatians as the ceremonial law.

Repeatedly, her writings have been misused to prevent progress in understanding Bible truth. Against this she vigorously protested. See *Selected Messages* 1:164.

To understand the *Great Controversy* exposition of the sanctuary doctrines we should study how other prophecies are applied in this same book. . It comes as a surprise to many to learn that prophecies such as Rev. 6:12; 2 Thess. 2:3,4; Matt. 25:1-13; and Dan. 8:14, etc. which in *Great Controversy* are applied to 1844 or times earlier, are also applied by E.G. White to events yet future at the end of the world.

Ellen G. White used the apotelesmatic principle whereby prophecy is interpreted as applying to more than one time and one event. She applied such passages as Joel 2:28; Mal. 4:5,6; Matt. 24; Rev. 6:14; Matt. 25:1-13; Rev. 14:8; and Dan. 8:14 to separate eras. Particularly do we find her applying eschatological motifs such as the shut door, the marriage, the mid-night cry, the shaking, the sealing, the signs in the heavens, to events associated with 1844 — but also she applies the same themes to the end of the world yet future. For example, she used Matt. 24:1-13 as a prophetic parable of the Miller movement (*GC* 428) but in *Christ's Object Lessons* applied the same passage to the worldwide church at the end of the world. Here she makes no reference whatever to the Miller movement. The midnight cry becomes the Loud Cry of Rev. 18:1-4, and the marriage is the union of the church with Christ at His coming (instead of His entrance into the Most Holy Place to be married to the New Jerusalem as taught in *Great Controversy*).

The *Great Controversy* application of Matt. 25:1-13 and Dan. 8:14 had some appropriateness for an age that could have witnessed the return of the Lord had all who professed the name of Christ been true to duty. As it is, it is no longer valid to interpret the eschatological prophecies in the identical way that our Millerite pioneers did. Thus Ellen White can declare in letters about the turn of the century that the bride is the church (though in *Great Controversy* the opposite is declared). She made plain in her first pronouncements on the topic, that the heavenly signs are yet future. See *Early Writings* 41. **If the marriage, the shut door, heavenly signs, the sealing, the shaking, the seventh trumpet (all of which were applied to the times surrounding 1844 by our pioneers) are all yet future, it is quite consistent to say that the full application of Dan. 8:14 likewise so applies.** *Patriarchs and Prophets* 358 and the last pages of *Great Controversy* (where such terms as “vindicate,” “purify,” “clean,” or cognates are common) indicate that this was Ellen White’s position also.

Similarly, most of the later statements by E.G. White about the Day of Atonement apply it to both advents, with Christ entering the Most Holy at His ascension. Nowhere does E.G. White equate the cleansing of the sanctuary with the Investigative judgment. (D. Neufeld also in the *Review* of Feb. 14, 1980, warned against such an identification.) The former is one of the landmarks being clearly established before the end of the 1840’s, whereas the doctrine of the investigative judgment was not held by us as a people till near the end of the 1850’s. The doctrine of the investigative judgment is not one of the landmarks, and there is no vision from Ellen White that teaches it. Neither is there any Biblical basis for a judgment that began over a hundred years ago. Scripture does teach pre-advent judgment — namely Christ’s sealing as His own through His imputed merits all whose names are still in the book of life on the eve of probation’s close. This is no attenuated affair. See Dan. 12:1. The judgment of Dan. 7:9-13 and 8:14, like that of Rev. 14:7, is a judgment upon the wicked which simultaneously vindicates the righteous.

It is essential to have a better view of inspiration than most Seventh-day Adventists have at present. Only the picture given in *Selected Messages* 1:15-39 will suffice, where inspiration is pointed out as perfect for practical purposes, but involving a union of the human with the divine whereby the inspired writers become God's penmen but not His pen, subject to error, and certainly not representing God in rhetoric or logic.

Ellen White never claimed infallibility, and demonstrable error is present in her writings. There is neither historical nor exegetical evidence for the *Great Controversy* application of the fate of the two witnesses to the events of the French Revolution. Neither is there any evidence for Aug. 11, 1840, as a fulfilment of prophecy. Our scholars have known about both of these errors for nearly a hundred years. Ellen White's conceptual expression of the investigative judgment is as surely drawn from Uriah Smith and J.N. Andrews as her other prophetic expositions were drawn from such men. But none of these interpreters was infallible. According to E.G. White, her writings are not to be used as the basis of doctrine or to solve doctrinal issues. She refused over the decades of the "daily" controversy to decide the issue, and forbade men to use her writings to that end. The same applies to present-day controversy over sanctuary interpretation. On the Bible and the Bible only our doctrinal beliefs must rest. When fierce doctrinal controversy was waging over the identity of the law in Galatians, she affirmed that it was God's will that the issue be solved from Scripture and not from her writings. The same principle applies today.

Nevertheless, those who wish to reject Ellen White as a special messenger with the gift of prophecy should remember that Adventism could never have become what it has but for God's providential leading through Ellen G. White. In crisis after crisis she proved a worthy prophetess, and a guide and protector to the tiny church. This includes the 1844 disappointment, the Minneapolis conference, the Holy Flesh movement, the Kellogg crisis, etc. Neither her use of multiple sources, or her errors of exposition disqualify her from her place as a worthy servant of God, His providential agency to aid His people in the last days. But we honour her best if we see her writings as she herself declared them to be — but a "lesser light" when compared with Holy Scripture, "the greater light." To use her own words:

"The Spirit was not given — nor can it ever be bestowed — to supersede the Bible; for the Scriptures explicitly state that the word of God is the standard by which all teaching and experience must be tested. ... God will have a people upon the earth to maintain the Bible, and the Bible only, as the standard of all doctrines and the basis of all reforms." (GC 11, 595).

See our summary of the conclusion of this manuscript including our comments on the unique nature of the message God has given this church for the world, and see chapter 2, for the essence of what the New Testament teaches regarding the two apartments of the sanctuary.

CONTENTS

	Page
Chapter 1: History of Sanctuary Problems in Seventh-day Adventist Church and Recognition of these Problems by Adventist Writers	17
Chapter 2: The New Testament Exposition of the Sanctuary and the Day of Atonement, as found in Hebrews	107
Chapter 3: Daniel and the Day of Atonement.....	177
Chapter 4: The Book of Revelation and the Day of Atonement.....	283
Chapter 5: Rehearsal and Resolution of the Problem	303
Chapter 6: Ellen G. White, 1844, and the Day of Atonement	347
Some Important Questions	431

Appendices

For Chapter 1:

1. Waggoner on the Investigative Judgment
2. The Problem of Dan. 8:14 and Its Context
3. The Chequered History of the Phrase “Within the Veil”
4. CUC Course Outline on the Sanctuary and 1844

For Chapter 2:

5. Quotations on the D. A. in Hebrews
6. Quotations Regarding Hebrews 9:6-9
7. Quotations Regarding Hebrews 10:20
8. Quotations Regarding the Significance of the First Apartment
9. Quotations Regarding the Antithetical Nature of the Sanctuary Type
10. Reference in the New Testament to the Day of Atonement Apart From Those in Hebrews and Revelation
11. The Gospels and the Day of Atonement

For Chapter 3:

12. Studies in the Book of Daniel (R. Cottrell)
13. Parallels Between Daniel 8 and Daniel 9
14. Should a Question be Answered?
15. The Importance of Antiochus Epiphanes
16. The Connection Between Daniel 8:14 and Daniel 12:13
17. Summary on Daniel 8:14 and 1844
18. The Daniel Committee of 1938-1952, and the Chronological Problems of the 2300 Days
19. Extracts from Dr. R. Cottrell’s Presentation, Loma Linda, February, 1980

- 20. The Conditional Nature of the Time of the Advent
- 21. The Year-Day Principle
- 22. Daniel 8 Its Relationship to the Kingdom of God
- 23. Daniel 9:24-27 Recognized as Containing Jubilee and Day of Atonement Allusions
- 24. The Historical Development of the Doctrine of the Investigative Judgment

For Chapter 4:

- 25. A. Farrer on the D. A. and Dan. 8:14 in Revelation
- 26. Dan. 9:24-27 and the Olivet Discourse
- 27. The Apocalypse, the Day of Atonement, and the Latter Days

For Chapter 5:

- 28. Quotations on Inaugurated Eschatology
- 29. The Practical Implications of the New Testament Gospel
- 30. The Biblical Doctrine of Judgment
- 31. The Relationship Between Inaugurated Eschatology (First Advent) and Consummated Eschatology (Second Advent) (See also Ap. 37)

For Chapter 6:

- 32. Quotations from Church Leaders Relevant to the Topics of the Authority, Inspiration, and Errancy of Ellen G. White
- 33. The Major Sources of the Great Controversy Sanctuary Chapters
- 34. Ellen G. White and Exegesis
- 35. An Analysis of "Prophetic Tension" in the Eschatology, of Ellen G. White
- 36. Ellen G. White and the Charge of Plagiarism
- 37. Dr. K. Strand ... and the Apotelesmatic Principle

ABBREVIATIONS

AG	Arndt, W.F., and Gingrich, F.W., ed., <i>A Greek English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> (E. T., Cambridge-Chicago, 1957)
Ap	Appendix
BDB	Brown, Driver, Briggs, <i>Hebrew Lexicon</i>
CT	<i>Christianity Today</i>
ed.	editor
EB	<i>The Expositor's Bible</i>
HERE	<i>Hastings Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics</i>
ICC	<i>The International Critical Commentary</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JThCh	<i>Journal for Theology and Church</i>
K-B	Koehler-Baumgartner, <i>Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros</i>
LXX	The Septuagint
nd.	no date
N.T.	New Testament
O.T.	Old Testament
RSV	Revised Standard Version of the Bible
SDABC	<i>The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary</i>
TDNT	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> , ed. G. Kittel, and G. Friedrich, F. T. by G. W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids, 1964-74)



Copyright laws should be remembered by the readers of this manuscript, and it should not be quoted or reproduced without permission.

CHAPTER ONE

History of Sanctuary Problems in
the Seventh-Day Adventist Church
and Recognition of these Problems
by Adventist Writers.

OUTLINE OF CHAPTER ONE

I. INTRODUCTION	19
Validation of the Project.....	19
Limitations.....	27
Objectives	28
Assumptions	29
Sources and Acknowledgments	30
II. HISTORY OF SANCTUARY PROBLEMS IN THE SDA CHURCH AND RECOGNITION OF THESE PROBLEMS BY ADVENTIST WRITERS	31
O.R.L. Crosier.....	35
James White.....	35
D.M. Canright.....	36
E.J. Waggoner.....	39
A.F. Ballenger.....	41
E. Ballenger	51
W.W. Fletcher.....	51
L.R. Conradi	53
W.W. Prescott.....	55
L.E. Froom.....	57
Harold Snide	59
R.A. Grieve.....	60
R.D. Brinsmead.....	65
R.A. Cottrell	66
C.G. Tuland	68
E. Hilgert	71
D. Sibley, D. Ford.....	71
III. NEW SANCTUARY POSITIONS ASSUMED BY ADVENTIST SCHOLARS ..	79
The Atonement	79
Literal Apartments in Heavenly Sanctuary	79
Was Moses Shown the Actual Heavenly Sanctuary?	82
Did Blood From The Offerings Of The Common People Go Daily Into The First Apartment?.....	82
Does Blood Defile?	82
What Sins Were Recorded By The Blood?	82
Within the Veil Heb. 6:19	83
Nature of the Judgment	85
Daniel 7:9.13.....	85
Revelation 14:7	86
Daniel 8:14	86

Terminus for Dan. 8:14	91
Little Horn of Daniel 8	91
Hebrews 9	91
“Holies” in Hebrews 9.....	91
Texts Such as Acts 3:19; I Peter 4:17, I Timothy 5:23, Prove the Investigative Judgment	92
The Year-Day Principle is a Biblical Datum.....	92
The Prophecies of Daniel, Christ, and John are Conditional	93
Justification of the Human Race	94
Second Advent Could Not Come Till After 1844.	94
Prophecies of the End.....	95
ENDNOTES FOR CHAPTER ONE	103

Appendices particularly relevant to this chapter:

1. Waggoner on the Investigative Judgment
2. The Problem of Dan. 8:14 and Its Context
3. The Chequered History of the Phrase “Within the Veil”
4. CUC Course Outline on the Sanctuary and 1844

I. INTRODUCTION

Validation of the Project

The present writer has as his intent the defence of the church. For thirty-five years he has contended for its doctrines in public halls, private homes, churches, and the classroom. He has debated with opponents of the church publicly and privately, orally and in writing. Only in one area of our fundamentals has he felt embarrassment: the traditional mode of setting forth the sanctuary truth. Since 1955 he has found he is not alone in this. Innumerable discussions with fellow scholars, theologians, and administrators of the church have demonstrated that the embarrassment is widespread amongst us.

Despite the contemporary discussions on righteousness by faith, this writer has spent more time over the years in studying how to better present Dan. 8:14 and the judgment than he has spent on the issue of justification and sanctification. This study commenced in 1945, and has continued unabated to the present. Both an M.A. and a Ph.D. program were dedicated to the task.¹ Over a period of years he has personally known several key figures connected with our sanctuary apologetic, particularly most of the members of the committee on *Problems in Daniel*, as well as prominent opponents of our position. Discussion and correspondence with such men as R.A. Anderson, R. Cottrell, H. Lowe, L.F. Froom, F.D. Nichol, W.E. Read, D. Neufeld, E. Hilgert, D. Sibley, W.G. Murdoch, S. Horn, E. Heppenstall, and many others have only underlined the need of the present study. (This is not meant to imply that those named agree or disagree with the writer's tentative conclusions.)

Not all of our administrators are aware of the many indications that our traditional mode of presenting the sanctuary truth has in recent years become almost passé. It is a long time since our leading theological institution has taught a course wholly dedicated to the sanctuary doctrine. (One has been recently planned for the Seminary.) For years it has been possible for young men to become Seventh-day Adventist ministers without studying the topic, or even taking a course in the prophecies of Daniel and Revelation. Almost unanimously our scholars neglect the theme: the only publication in any depth of recent times has been Heppenstall's *Our High Priest* [1972], noteworthy both for its emphasis on the gospel and its departure from the traditional exposition.

In evangelism around the world some prefer not to present the sanctuary doctrine publicly, or if so presented, many experience great relief when what they consider a "ticklish" issue is in the past. Some speak of the increasing embarrassment the growing stretch of time since 1844 has brought upon us. The contrast with our pioneers who expected Christ's ministry in the Most Holy to last only a few months is stark.

Our doctrinal Maginot line in this area has increasingly crumbled since the time of the publication of Uriah Smith's *Sanctuary* [1887] and E.G. White's *Great Controversy* [1889]. To illustrate (but documentation is left till later):

19th Century Positions (held by most)	20th Century Positions (held by some)
Christ moved from one apartment to another in the heavenly sanctuary.	The apartments are only symbolic of phases of ministry in heaven.

19th Century Positions (held by most)	20th Century Positions (held by some)
The judgment work inside the second apartment would be brief. "Its whole duration is to be spanned by one generation." Matt. 24:34. <i>Looking Unto Jesus</i> , 269.	The work has been going on for 136 years — a far cry from the single DAY of the atonement, and embarrassingly or incomprehensibly long.
The atonement was not made at the cross.	The atonement was made at the cross.
The blood from the daily offerings of the common people was taken into the sanctuary.	The blood from the daily offerings of the common people was NOT taken into the sanctuary.
Blood defiles.	Blood cleanses.
"Within the veil" can only mean within the first veil.	It can and must mean within the second veil.
The Bible teaches the year-day principle for symbolic prophecy.	The year-day principle is not a Biblical datum, but a providential disclosure in church history.
Since 1844, God has been examining the books of record to find who should be saved.	"God is not poring over books." "The Lord knoweth them that are his."
Dan. 7:9-13 pictures the judgment of the saints.	Dan. 7:9-13 pictures the judgment on the wicked little horn.
Rev. 14:7 speaks of a judgment of believers only.	Rev. 14:7 speaks of judgment on the wicked, not the saints.
Christ was not a priest at Calvary.	Christ was priest at Calvary.
The offering was one of sinful human nature.	The offering was of sinless human nature of infinite value because of the divine Person.
Christ will become King when His priestly work is completed.	Christ is already King as well as priest.
God the Father does the judging.	God the Son does the judging.
Dan. 8 and 9 are separated by only a few months.	Dan. 8 and 9 are separated by about 12 years.
Dan. 8:14 reads: "Then shall the sanctuary be cleansed."	Dan. 8:14 reads: "Then shall the sanctuary be restored to its rightful state" or "justified."
Dan. 8:14 is linguistically linked with Lev. 16.	Dan. 8:14 is not linguistically linked with Lev. 16.
Dan. 8:14 is contextually an island, not related to the issues of the question in verse 13.	Dan. 8:14 is not an island, but is related to the issue of the question in verse 13.
Dan. 8:14 applies to events in heaven, unlike verse 13.	Dan. 8:14 must include events on earth, like verse 13.
In Dan. 8:13, the "daily" is pagan Rome.	In Dan. 8:13, the "daily" is Christ's gospel ministry.
In Dan. 11:31 the sanctuary is Rome.	In Dan. 11:31 the sanctuary is the sanctuary of God.

19th Century Positions (held by most)	20th Century Positions (held by some)
The little horn has nothing to do with Antiochus Epiphanes.	The little horn, like Matt. 24, has more than one application, and has its first fulfillment in Antiochus Epiphanes.
Dan. 11, which expands Dan. 8, ends with Turkey.	Dan. 11, which expands Dan. 8, ends with Antichrist.
Acts 3:19 applies only to the blotting out of sins in the investigative judgment.	Acts 3:19 parallels 2:38, and refers to the forgiveness accompanying the gift of the Spirit.
I Peter 4:17 applies to the investigative judgment.	I Peter 4:17 does not so apply.
I Timothy 5:23 applies to the investigative judgment.	I Timothy 5:23 does not so apply.
The cleansing of the sanctuary points specifically to the investigative judgment which closes before Christ comes.	The cleansing of the sanctuary points to the purification of the universe from sin and sinners and extends to the new earth, or it means . . . ?
The doctrine of the investigative judgment was discovered just after the great disappointment in 1844 by Edson and others.	The doctrine of the investigative judgment was not part of the general beliefs of the SDA church until about fifteen years after the 1844 crisis.
The doctrine of the investigative judgment was one of the doctrines hammered out in the Sabbath conferences, and was there confirmed by the leading of the Spirit of Prophecy.	The doctrine of the investigative judgment was not one of the doctrines decided upon at the Sabbath conferences and confirmed by the Spirit of Prophecy.
The doctrine of the investigative judgment is one of the "landmarks" of the pioneers.	It is not one of the "landmarks" of the pioneers — was not taught by Edson Crosier, or James or Ellen White in the 1840's.
The visions from the beginning, by their reference to Christ's special work in the Most Holy Place, clearly alluded to the investigative judgment.	The visions do not so allude.
The heavenly sanctuary is a building, though, of course, much more vast than the typical tabernacle.	The heavenly sanctuary, being "heaven itself" and "not made with hands" is not a building. "Real" and "literal" should never be equated. A building suggests limitations, but to reject a building does not mean to reject the reality of the heavenly sanctuary. Buildings are what they are because of the imperfect conditions which characterize sin-cursed existence. We have walls and doors and a roof to keep out inclement weather, fierce animals, and untrustworthy people. Heaven is not threatened by any of these. EGW refers to the original home

19th Century Positions (held by most)	20th Century Positions (held by some)
	of our first parents as a "sanctuary," though it contained no buildings, and was an extension of heaven (Paradise) on earth. The fact that EGW speaks of the heavenly sanctuary as the abode of the great God and all His angels makes this matter plain. As with other prophets, EGW frequently used the language of the type, leaving it to the reader to make the transition. Compare John 1:29 and the whole book of Revelation.
The human race was not justified at the cross.	The human race was justified at the cross, but that justification only becomes effective for an individual when he surrenders to Christ.
The Second Advent could not come until after the 1260 and 2300 year periods.	The Second Advent could have come in the first century.
That is, a judgment period after 1844 was essential before the world could end.	A judgment period after 1844 was not essential before the world could end.
Dan. 9:24-27 uses the year-day principle.	Dan. 9:24-27 does not necessarily use the year-day principle.
Rev. 11 points to the French Revolution and climaxes with the beginning of "the time of the end" in 1798 and gave impetus to the Second Advent movement.	There is no way of proving that Rev. 11 applies to the French Revolution.
Matt. 25:1-13 applies to Christ's coming to the Most Holy Place in 1844 as the Bridegroom to be married to the New Jerusalem.	Matt. 25:1-13 applies to the Second Advent, when He will be married to His church.
The sixth trumpet ended Aug. 11, 1840, just as the cleansing of the sanctuary was about to commence	The sixth trumpet has nothing to do with Aug. 11, 1840.
Mal. 3:1-2 applies to Christ's coming to the Most Holy Place in 1844.	Mal. 3:1-2 points to the two visible comings of Christ.
The High Priest wore his glorious garments on the Day of Atonement, according to some such as Haskell. .	The High Priest wore the linen garment of a common priest for his distinctive work on the Day of Atonement.
The scapegoat bears the sins of the saints	The scapegoat bears his part in the sins of the saints.
Heb. 9 teaches the SDA sanctuary doctrine.	Heb. 9 says nothing on the distinctive Adventist doctrine of the two-apartment ministry.
"Holies" in Heb. 9 points to a plurality of apartments in the heavenly sanctuary.	"Holies" in Heb. 9 does not necessarily point to a plurality of apartments in the heavenly sanctuary.

19th Century Positions (held by most)	20th Century Positions (held by some)
Heb. 9:12 speaks of the first apartment.	Heb. 9:12 is speaking of the second apartment, as verses 8, 24-25.
SDAs never taught that the shut door of the sanctuary pointed to the close of probation for the world.	SDAs did teach probation closed in 1844.
EGW never so believed (above).	EGW did so believe.
EGW's commentary on her visions of the shut door meant by that term something different to her contemporaries.	EGW's commentary on her visions of the shut door meant by that term something similar to her contemporaries.
The early visions were reproduced in full by later editions.	The early visions were not reproduced in full by later editions.
All of that which we now have in such volumes as <i>GC</i> is EGW's own original or miraculously given insights into doctrinal truth — the only outside interference being a correcting of grammar.	That which we have in <i>GC</i> and some other volumes includes a vast amount of matter which is not original, nor miraculously given. Furthermore, it was not unknown for secretarial help to omit some of EGW's own pages and substitute whole blocks of material from other sources — material often, but not always, historical in nature. The Don McAdams study indicates this. The sanctuary chapters draw largely from the writings of J.N. Andrews and Uriah Smith. EGW indicated this type of procedure in her introduction to <i>GC</i> .
Histories of early Adventism by men such as Loughborough are reliable.	Histories of early Adventism by men such as Loughborough are not reliable, (e.g. His account of EGW and the family Bible.)
The prophecy of 1856 re "some food for worms, some for the seven last plagues, and some for translation" was not conditional.	The prophecy of 1856 was conditional.
Those who saw the falling of the stars in 1833 would also see Jesus come after the investigative judgment. Matt. 24:34 so applies.	Those who saw the falling of the stars are dead. Matt. 24:34 does not so apply.
The heavenly sanctuary was shown Moses in vision as a pattern.	What Moses saw was not the actual heavenly sanctuary.
Dan. 8:14 clearly teaches the investigative judgment.	Dan. 8:14 does not clearly teach the investigative judgment.

It must not be assumed that the present writer hereby affirms all those positions on the right and denies those on the left. The significance of some of these points will become apparent later. Several have bearing on the nature of inspiration and the issue of inerrancy.

When one considers this list on the right, one wonders how much is left of traditional Adventist sanctuary teaching, and the inevitable inquiry arises: “What should be preached in explaining Dan. 8:14?” The practical intent of the present document is to attempt an answer to this question which will be intellectually responsible, Biblically defensible, and yet sustain our eschatological understanding of the Day of Atonement as a work of pre-Advent judgment. Obviously, this cannot be accomplished without some divergence from our usual apologetic, so readers are invited to shun the hope for a square circle, or a living corpse.

To further motivate the conviction that this project is vital, some straws waving in the wind of recent Seventh-day Adventist history will be plucked.

For approximately twenty years, some leading Seventh-day Adventist scholars have contended that it is impossible to Biblically prove our doctrine of the investigative judgment. (For example, Raymond Cottrell and Don Neufeld. These have so affirmed in the presence of others, but many others have so believed without making public statements. See the articles on the sanctuary and on inspiration in the most recent issue of *Spectrum* [April, 1980]. This whole edition should be read most carefully by all who are concerned regarding the current sanctuary discussion. Previous numbers of the same journal have also relevant articles.) In 1958, a questionnaire on Dan. 8:14 was sent to twenty-seven of our top men in language and exegesis. All twenty-seven replied that it was impossible to make a linguistic connection between Dan. 8:14 and Leviticus. 16. They pointed out that “cleansed” was a faulty translation, and that “justified” or “restored” was more accurate, though quite unlinked with the Day of Atonement.

On the basis of this questionnaire, F.D. Nichol asked Elder Figuhr for a committee on problems in Daniel - a confidential committee which would not keep minutes. For five years the committee met and studied together, but without reaching agreement on the basic problems. Finally, Elder Figuhr declared it was not necessary to make a written report of the findings. To this day, the problems canvassed and postures taken by individual members remain confidential except where those members have publicly expressed themselves.

Few are aware that today most Adventist New Testament scholars admit that Hebrews 9 teaches Christ’s entrance into “the Most Holy Place” at His ascension. These scholars recognize that “within the veil” of Heb. 6:19 refers to the second apartment ministry which, according to Hebrews, Christ had already commenced. They further see that 10:19-20 clearly teaches that identical truth, and likewise 9:8, 12, 24-25.²

Both Old and New Testament scholars amongst us frequently confess that it is scripturally impossible to prove the year-day principle, and it is well-known that Dan. 8 and 9 constitute a nest of unsolved exegetical problems. For example, there is no way of demonstrating that Christ died in AD 31, and it is well known amongst scholars that there is no way of proving that the decree of 457 BC is the one referred to in Dan. 9:25. There is nothing in Ezra 7 giving permission to rebuild the city, and Ezra 6:14 and context show that the decree by Artaxerxes concerned the temple and not the city.

One thing is sure, unless the church works in this area with promptness and efficiency, the sanctuary doctrine as traditionally taught will become an increasing source of embarrassment, and a cause of loss of membership among both ministry and laity. With our increasing number of graduate students proficient in the original languages of Scripture and the tools of grammatico-historical exegesis, awareness of the problems under consideration is inevitably going to spread and multiply.

W.E. Read in *Doctrinal Discussions* noted, “The Seventh-day Adventist view of the investigative judgment has come in for a good deal of criticism during the years,” (p. 43). And Edward Heppenstall speaks even more strongly:

Among the friends and critics of Seventh-day Adventists nothing has aroused more discussion and opposition than the teaching of an investigative judgment in heaven reserved for the people of God prior to Christ’s return. For many this doctrine seems to shatter all possibility of assurance here and now and leaves uncertain one’s standing with God. How can a Christian in this life be sure of his destiny and future with God until the pro-Advent judgment has laid bare the facts of each person, and judgment is pronounced? [p. 202]

How shall we understand the “investigative judgment” of God’s people? Such a judgment can hardly mean that God needs to make such an investigation on the presumption that He is ignorant of the facts about His people.

Nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are his (2 Tim. 2:19). I am the good shepherd, and know my sheep, and am known of mine (John 10:14).

Obviously, there can be no doubt or question in the mind of God concerning those who have kept the faith. Through all the years the saints cannot stand in jeopardy until the judgment hour. What about Enoch, Moses, and Elijah in heaven, and the multitude of captives resurrected when Christ had completed His work on earth, and taken to heaven? Do they have to wait until the pre-Advent judgment begins to learn whether their position in heaven is secure? Do they anticipate the possibility of a reversal of the divine verdict that led God to resurrect and translate them to heaven? Obviously not.

If God needs no investigation, then why have one? If God has known all along who are saved and who are lost, why bring the saints to judgment? If a person is a forgiven, redeemed child of God to the end of his life, why bring up the past for consideration? [pp. 207-208]

Why is an investigative judgment of the saints necessary? Did not Jesus teach - “in very truth, anyone who gives heed to what I say and puts his trust in him who sent me has hold of eternal life, and does not come up for judgment, but has already passed from death to life”? (John 5:24 NEB) If Christ promised immunity from judgment to His followers, how can God hold such a judgment without breaking His promise?

Second, we must also take into account that “the Lord knoweth them that are his” (2 Tim. 2:19). “I... know my sheep, and am known of mine” (John 10:14). According to this, God does not need to postpone His verdict of acquittal concerning His people until the last-day judgment. One can hardly affirm that God is not certain who the saved are until a final formal judgment takes place. For if this were true, how could there be any experience of security for the saints while on earth? Does not their very security here and now rest on the clear assurance that “there is... no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus” (Rom. 8:1)? Are we not commanded here and now to make our calling and election sure (see 2 Peter 1:10)? If even God does not make the final decision until after 1844, how could Paul confidently affirm: “Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing” (2 Tim. 4:8)? How could Paul have been so sure at that time? [p.108]³

Not one non-Adventist scholar has ever been favourably impressed by our traditional sanctuary presentation. (So claimed Dr. Raymond Cottrell in his Loma Linda address on the sanctuary, Feb. 20, 1980.) It has been declared “stale, flat, and unprofitable” and a mere “face-saving device.” For example, a leading theological journal has published the following:

Is not the doctrine that Christ entered the heavenly sanctuary in Oct., 1844 a pure assumption? It was suggested by Hiram Edson’s vision in the corn field. It was also endorsed by a vision of Mrs. White. Of course, if one holds that those visions were inspired, nothing more is needed. But we wonder if a real biblical justification for the doctrine can be given?

Dan. 8:14 states, “then shall the sanctuary be cleansed,” but the text does not say who shall cleanse it or where the sanctuary is located. The Epistle to the Hebrews speaks of a heavenly tabernacle and of Christ entering it. But in Hebrews is not His entrance and atoning work always spoken of as a past fact? Was not His High Priestly intercession continuous from the time of His exaltation? He had already “entered within the veil” at the time when the Epistle was written (Heb. 6:19-20). He was available as a High Priest for the readers of the Epistle (Heb. 4:14-16). “Through his own blood he entered once for all” (not will enter) “into the holy place” (Heb. 9:12). His atoning work is all connected with His death on the cross (Heb. 9:26-28). Note statements like the following:

“Christ entered not into the holy place made with hands, but into heaven itself, now to appear before the face of God for us” (Heb. 9:24). “He, when he had offered one sacrifice for sin forever, sat down at the right hand of God” (Heb. 10:12). “We have such a High Priest, who sat down on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens, a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle” (Heb. 8:1-2).

But Mrs. White would seem to put Christ’s entrance into the sanctuary in the year 1844.

Now we ask: Why does He delay His coming so long when He started the final judgment in 1844? We feel sure the early Seventh-day Adventists felt that the time till the Advent would be short, but it has been more than 100 years since the judgment started. Why has it not been completed? We do not wish to seem facetious, but we may well ask: Does it take the omniscient Judge more than 100 years to examine the books? Or do we say, man’s probation is still continuing, and He is waiting for more generations to be born and die before the judgment is finished? If so, why did He start the judgment in 1844? Of course, if we had clear biblical teaching that He did start investigation in 1844, we might be content not to know the reason. But since such clear evidence is lacking, we wonder if this problem of the hundred odd years investigation does not call for a new appraisal of the validity of the whole doctrine?⁴

Such criticisms have in recent years moved from the outside of the church to the inside. Years ago, this writer warned the GC that a storm was coming over this topic and that we should begin to prepare. That storm broke at Riverside, California, early in 1979, when R.D. Brinsmead began to circulate his *1844 Re-Examined* and to lecture upon its contents. The winds reached Angwin, California, where the *Forum of Adventist Scholars* requested a public meeting on the topic of the investigative judgment. The October 27 meeting was an attempt to indicate the dimensions of our denominational problems in this area, and to suggest a solution. Some, traumatized by the former, failed to listen to the latter. Thus the present document hopes to remedy that situation, but it is written in tentative spirit, and is accompanied by the request for all available help from its readers.

Limitations

Many of the topics listed in the 19th and 20th century series above would be sufficient challenge on their own for a six-month research project. Indeed, we have not settled a number of them after 130 years of study. Of necessity, strict limitation is needed in this initial presentation. Time alone imposes severe limitations in topics discussed, and in less important themes particularly, the amount of attention given, is of necessity, minimal. We would be happy to study any significant area, but not all of them at the same time, and with the vain hope of one tiny mouth sucking the ocean dry at a single intake.

This document is limited chiefly by the key positions taken at the Oct. 27 Forum presentation, where the problem of Heb. 9 was stressed and a solution offered. On that occasion, it was stated that Dan. 8:14 does not have any linguistic connection with the Day of Atonement chapter in Leviticus, and neither does Hebrews in its exposition of the sanctuary refer us back to Dan. 8:14. It was suggested that the well-known theological concepts of inaugurated and consummated eschatology, whereby events to be materially fulfilled in connection with the end of the world had a prior legal application at the cross, offer us a key to our chief problem.

The chapter outline on page 17 indicates the areas treated. Even these limited themes are actually too many to fully canvass, for any one of them fully developed would require the equivalent of a Ph.D. dissertation. But this writer hopes to say enough to make clear his general direction for purposes of review and evaluation. It is hoped that these pages will pave the way for more thorough subsequent work by other writers and committees.

Particularly, it should be pointed out that chapter six does not propose to cover the ground essayed by F.D. Nichol in *Ellen G. White and Her Critics*. This writer believes in the divine inspiration of Ellen G. White and her special mission, but he does not here intend to solve all the problems raised by such a faith. Instead, he proposes to chiefly set forth the support he finds in Ellen G. White for the thesis proposed, and to attempt a tentative answer to some urgent problems.

Another aspect of limitation should be emphasized: the first five chapters deal with the topics from scripture only. This is done in deference to the counsel found in *Evangelism* 356 and many other places.

The testimonies of Sister White should not be carried to the front. God's Word is the unerring standard. The Testimonies are not to take the place of the Word ... - Let all prove their positions from the Scriptures and substantiate every point they claim as truth from the revealed Word of God.⁵

Our statement of Fundamental Beliefs in the *Church Manual* assures us that our doctrines are based on Scripture only. It is not the writer's intention to neglect any of the special guidance given this people, but to keep it in its right place — subordinate to Holy Writ, ~~the~~ only unerring rule of faith and practice" (*Fundamental Beliefs, Article I*); ~~the~~ one unerring guide" (*ST* 389); ~~the~~ only infallible authority" (*GC* 177); the ~~only~~ sufficient, infallible rule" (*GC* 173). ~~The~~ Bible, and the Bible alone, is to be our creed, the sole bond of union" (*ISM* 416).

Organization

Every theological issue is raised in a historical context and our first chapter offers such orientation. Explanation may be needed for the place of chapter two. The only place in Scripture where the significance of the ministry in the first apartment of the sanctuary is commented upon is Hebrews 9. Similarly, the only place in Scripture where the ministry of

the second apartment is didactically expressed is Hebrews 9. Thirdly, the only place in the New Testament where the meaning of the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary is set forth in Hebrews 9.⁶ Yet Adventism has never written a book, or offered a scholarly document, exegeting Heb. 9 with special reference to our sanctuary doctrine. (*The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* deliberately separates the one from the other, i.e. the Bible chapter from our sanctuary teaching.)

We hope the reader will not pass by these three points on Heb. 9 without giving them due weight. As Christians, to ignore the only New Testament chapter which actually discusses the themes central to our basic teaching is, to say the least, strange.⁷ Hebrews 9 is the divine Word on the meaning of the sanctuary ritual, and anything that conflicts with that explanation cannot be urged upon others as a doctrine to be believed and taught. We must not make the mistake of trying to prove doctrine from types or parables. These have a legitimate place in illustrating and enforcing only that which elsewhere is didactically presented in literal terms. Even prophecy must never be so interpreted as to clash with clear apostolic proclamation. Either our basic sanctuary doctrine is found in the New Testament chapter which alone deals with that theme, or it is not found in Scripture at all. This is the rock which has brought untold numbers of thoughtful Seventh-day Adventist ministers to a hard place, including such men as W.W. Prescott, and L.E. Froom.⁸

The reason for chapter three is obvious — our prophetic and doctrinal conclusions drawn from Dan. 8:14 must be the fruit of the rules of grammatico-historical interpretation or they are invalid. This chapter suggests that Dan. 9 indeed explains 8:14, and that in Dan. 9 the Day of Atonement in anti-type is clearly predicted.

Chapter four is concerned with the relationship between inaugurated (or proleptic) and consummated eschatology, and shows that themes already set forth in the gospels and epistles as fulfilled by Christ at His first advent yet have a final application to the end-time including the kingdom, the judgment, and the Day of Atonement. Revelation is the book of the New Testament on eschatology, and our positions on the end-time must be supported by it or be surrendered.

The titles of chapters five and six are self-explanatory. The chief burden of the final chapter is to show that Ellen G. White is Biblical in applying the Day of Atonement soteriologically to the first advent in her books on that theme, and eschatologically in that book which deals specifically with latter-day events and the end of the world.

Objectives

The first objective of this work is to make clear the doctrinal problem confronting our church. It is one which has troubled earnest believers over our whole history, and it has never been officially considered in adequate depth. As Christian growth depends upon overcoming all revealed sin, so church growth depends upon adequate resolutions of those problems revealed to the body corporate. We cannot have an effective apologetic for the non-Adventist world, nor successful soul-winning on a large scale, until this matter is resolved. The writer, as with many of his readers, has urged people to risk their employment and even their marriage and family relationships on the basis that Dan. 8:14 points to this movement as one of divine origin and should be joined at any personal cost. We have had many workers who have come to the place where they could no longer so urge others because of their personal problem with Hebrews 9. Furthermore, fears concerning personal standing in the investigative judgment have cut the nerve of joyous witness for many church members. Legalism is one result, and

lack of assurance another, when the judgment is traditionally presented, for the primacy of grace and imputed righteousness is usually forgotten.

The second objective is to suggest a solution to the problem the writer has found effective and satisfying throughout his ministry.

Assumptions

Attempted demonstration of all beliefs would lead to an infinite regress of argumentation. No axiom can be proved, and complete proof regarding anything in the real world is impossible to mortals, requiring as it would an infinite number of observations, perfect measuring instruments, and complete objectivity — none of which is available to us. All research begins with assumptions that can only be supported, not by demonstration, but by a weight of evidence. This includes the assumption that the project is worthwhile.

In this instance the assumptions include the following:

There is a personal God who has by special revelation made Himself and His truth known through His divine Son and by the Inspired writings we call the Bible.

Seventh-day Adventists are indeed Protestants, and therefore believe in Sola Scripture, without denying that the Bible speaks of spiritual gifts and the special leading of the Spirit through prophets in times subsequent to the closing of the canon. But ~~the~~ Spirit was not given — nor can it be bestowed — to supersede the Bible; for the Scriptures explicitly state that the Word of God is the standard by which all teaching and experience must be tested” (GC vii).

The hermeneutical system of grammatico-historical interpretation is here assumed as the only valid means of doing full justice to the meaning of Scripture. The well-known five principles of exegesis — lexical, grammatical, contextual, historical, and the analogy of faith — are considered as basic for all serious work in Biblical research. This stands in sharp contrast to the proof-text method which sufficed in the days when the conclusions of the 19th century series above were formulated. Particularly should it be kept in mind that Seventh-day Adventist scholars today do not believe that types or prophetic interpretation should be used as the basis of doctrine.

The sixth century dating of Daniel is an assumption in this project — not because it is without serious challenge, but because the answering of that challenge is outside the proposed scope of this work.

That Ellen G. White had the gift of prophecy is assumed, but common understandings of inspiration are not. This writer wholeheartedly embraces the view of inspiration found in *Selected Messages* 1:15-39, a passage which he feels has never been closely studied by most Seventh-day Adventists, and consequently leaves the vast majority of church members open to error and bewilderment.

While acknowledging this assumption of the inspiration of Ellen G. White, it seems to this writer that the warning found in the *Teachers Helps* of the Jan-Mar. 1980 *Adult Sabbath School Lessons*, “*Redemption in Romans*,” page 12, expresses aptly the caveat offered in chapter six of this document. We quote:

Among the complaints brought against Seventh-day Adventist teachings today is one that insists that we are not really biblical in our positions, that we do much talking about

the Bible but do not really study the Bible itself. We are seen by some as particularly likely to take Ellen White's comments on the Scriptures as reason to close off any further study or consideration. For many "Ellen White says" is the end of further (or even any) investigation.

Such an approach to Bible study seems particularly unfortunate when it flies in the face of the persistent appeal of Ellen White for church members, pastors, and teachers to study the Word, even to make the Bible the test of the special work of Ellen White.

What is not assumed in this document is that "all our arguments are without a flaw," that our exegesis of Dan. 8 and 9, Heb. 6-10 is adequate, that we fully understand the Day of Atonement, or God's intention in raising up this church in 1844.

Finally, the Golden Rule is assumed to apply not only to the writer, but to the reader — i.e. the latter should require no more of the former in this project than if he were the former. The present work, to quote the reference last given (*ISM* 20), is "for practical purposes" and is not an inquire-within upon everything.

Sources and Acknowledgments

The writer gratefully acknowledges the generous help of the White Estate and the GC Archives, and R.A. Olson, D. Yost, and B. Haloviak in particular, in the matter of researching some aspects of our denominational history which have bearing on the sanctuary doctrine. Other sources than historical documents are but the usual ones of Biblical scholarship, except for my own writings in earlier years from which I have freely drawn.

A special "thank you" is due to Mrs. Gwen Brown, who so ably typed this manuscript.

II. HISTORY OF SANCTUARY PROBLEMS IN THE SDA CHURCH AND RECOGNITION OF THESE PROBLEMS BY ADVENTIST WRITERS

Not the recurrence of problems within the church over our sanctuary teaching, but the failure to deal adequately with these problems is the strangest feature of any historical review of the subject. While we have works which are exhaustive in treating objections regarding our views on the Sabbath and the nature of man, there is no parallel in the issue of the sanctuary. Instead, a silence confronts us.

According to many of our contemporary Adventist scholars, all our sanctuary apologetic works of this century are both inadequate and inaccurate. This charge will be substantiated in chapter two. F.D. Nichol told the present writer that “a definitive work on the sanctuary is our greatest need.” His own classic, *Answers to Objections*, has next to nothing on the problems which threaten “the foundation of our faith.” His section on the sanctuary touches on the atonement, and Azazel, but the many other major challenges are ignored. Having corresponded with Elder Nichol on the sanctuary doctrine, such silence is no surprise to this inquirer. F.D. Nichol accepted our official position, but practically by faith alone.

As one surveys the boxes and boxes of files in the Archives from the libraries of such deceased scholars as L.E. Froom, W.E. Read, M.L. Andreasen, etc., one is impressed with the evidence there that such men were acquainted with the problems concerning our traditional exposition on Dan. 8:14. One finds folder after folder with factual data on Heb. 9 and kindred passages, but rarely does one find a statement of conclusions reached.

While L.E. Froom was prodigious in research, as is well-known, and while we find him inquiring on problems concerning Heb. 9 from the beginning of the 1930's, he wrote nothing in any detail upon those problems. When Harold Snide, thirty years in the work and Bible teacher at Southern Junior College, went to him for help, according to Snide's letters he was not offered anything of value. If we had published materials from Froom confronting the issues and answering them, or even attempting to answer them, we could disregard Snide's accounts. But we have none such.

As for Nichol, who could tackle such thorny problems as the shut door in the Ellen G. White writings, and the charges of plagiarism, etc., he likewise was as silent as the tomb on the problems which concern us most. Consider the fact that the man who did the painstaking research to disprove the ascension robe and insanity stories regarding the Millerites, left us nothing of value on such more important issues as the Day of Atonement in Heb. 9.

F. C. Gilbert wrote the well-known *Messiah in His Sanctuary*, and a large volume on the same topic years earlier. In his Archival files we have evidence of research into issues concerning 1844, but in his published materials there is hardly a jot or tittle to indicate that he had the needed answers.

When C.B. Price (brother of George McCready Price) wrote C.H. Watson some queries on his *Atoning Work of Christ*, Brother Watson excused himself from the task of answering. Twenty-five years ago a young worker by the name of Ford sent off a series of letters to our top scholars asking for solutions, and while he met with kindness, only one respondent, E. Heppenstall, had anything significant to offer.

The second aspect which becomes apparent when the history is reviewed is our latter-day reversal of many former sanctuary positions, and our rejection of former arguments. This was touched upon in our introductory chapter where nineteenth and twentieth century teachings were summarized.

The change in our apologetic stance can be illustrated by two letters: an interchange over the initial writing on Hebrews for the Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary. These letters illustrate the old and the new, though the second letter, in face of criticism, bends over backwards to be accommodating. Note the contrast between the attitude taken in distant Australia to the more recent understandings of Hebrews, and the complacent acceptance of the same positions by our better informed American scholars.

Dear Brother Nichol:

I am not very happy over the way the references to the heavenly sanctuary are handled. In fact I am disturbed, and feel that unless some of the vagueness can be cleared up **the material will do more harm than good** when it reaches the field.

You mention that ~~the~~ general conclusion we have reached with regard to the evidence in Hebrews concerning the apartments in heaven is found in the comment on Heb. 10:20.” My reading of the comment in question leads me to say that it **practically destroys any idea of a sanctuary in heaven**.

In the comments on chapter 6:19 the sanctuary is mentioned, but so many divergent views are given concerning the expression ~~“within the veil”~~ that **the reader is left wondering if this is a Seventh-day Adventist Commentary** or merely one written to show the variety of views held by Seventh-day Adventists and Bible students in general without any expression of opinion as to what the Seventh-day Adventist church teaches. Again, in the comments on chapter 8:2 the sanctuary in heaven is affirmed, but at the same time the comment **casts doubt on the matter of apartments**. Again reference is made to the heavenly sanctuary in comment on chapter 9:8, with the summing up of Adventist belief, **evading the question of two apartments**.

In chapter 9:11 there is a brief positive statement affirming the existence of a heavenly sanctuary with a cross reference not yet complete, but **the evidence in this text for the existence of the heavenly sanctuary is treated with much more feebleness than it deserves**.

In chapter 9:12 the heavenly sanctuary is affirmed.

While the above references affirm a belief in a heavenly sanctuary, **the general treatment of the subject would enable the reader, in my opinion, to question whether the Seventh-day Adventist church firmly believed in a sanctuary in heaven as an appointed place where a definite work of vital importance is being carried forward**.

Then I would refer to the general teaching on the heavenly sanctuary, including two apartments, as taught in our books, both those generally circulated among our workers and people and those sold to the public by subscription. In the first group I would mention the *Book of Hebrews*, by M.L. Andreasen, pp. 325-331, 336-341, 356-357; the *Atoning Work of Christ*, C.H. Watson, pp. 154, 160-163, 186. By the way, Brother Watson is a most respected figure in Australasia, and the brethren do not consider his opinions lightly, since he wrote his book largely to rebut the sanctuary-destroying

teaching of Brother W.W. Fletcher, the influence of which, some of our brethren feel, was responsible for our latest apostasies among the ministry.

Next I would mention *Our Firm Foundation*, vol. I, pp. 322, 334, 336, 358, 9; vol. 2, pp. 29, 32, 33, 40-42.

In some of the above works argument is put forth to establish two apartments. In most places it is taken for granted as something that is most surely believed among us.

Chapter 9:9 –“Time then present.” It speaks of the apartments with their services being a parable of the then existing age. Should this not read in both instances parable **for** the then existing age. There is considerable difference in theology between the use of the words *of* and *for* in this case.

Chapter 9:23 –“As a result of this the sinner’s conscience is purged,” etc. This teaches that the purifying of things in the heavens is really the purging of the sinner’s conscience. This seems foreign to the teaching of the denomination and the Spirit of Prophecy. I understand the purifying of heavenly things to be the cleansing from the heavenly sanctuary the record of confessed sin. *Great Controversy*, pp. 418-421.

Yours sincerely,

F. G. Clifford⁹



Dear Brethren:

The indictment you brethren bring against the Commentary on Hebrews is a heavy one. None of the replies I received from our North American College Bible Departments, and from certain General Conference brethren, and others, on the Hebrews galleys, support your indictment. On the contrary, they were very commendatory.

The Commentary editors are not in the business of inventing theology for the denomination. Instead, we seek to ascertain precisely what the Bible writers have actually said, and then to discover the consensus of sound theological thought among Seventh-day Adventist leaders.

I am well aware of the long-standing problems in relation to the book of Hebrews. For years I lived in California where Ballenger fumed and stormed against us. I had hardly more than gotten to Washington, about thirty years ago, when **I was placed on the committee that dealt with W.W. Fletcher.** My task was to go through his bulky document and summarize his argument. Elder Spicer was in the chair. **As a result of our meetings with Fletcher I drew certain conclusions regarding the book of Hebrews, as follows:**

1. That some of the things Paul wrote that are hard to understand and that unstable souls wrest to their destruction, are found in the book of Hebrews.
2. **That the construction of the argument and the construction of the Greek do not permit us to reach the dogmatic conclusions some of us have sought to reach on certain of the passages in Hebrews. This fact is clearly revealed in the variant**

interpretations that have been given to certain key passages in well-recognized Adventist works.

3. That our opponents can produce a plausible, though invalid, argument in support of their view by giving a certain value to some of the Greek terms used to describe the sanctuary and its apartments.
4. That if we take too literalistic a view of the heavenly sanctuary we aid our opponents. For example, Christ ascended to go into the presence of God for us; indeed His position since His ascension is in the presence of God where He is seated at God's right hand. Various of our opponents argue that the presence of God is where the Shekinah glory is found, namely, in the second apartment. Therefore, since the ascension Christ has been ministering in the second apartment! **I remember what Brother Spicer said to me at the time of the Fletcher hearings as we walked home one day. It was, in substance, this: "We must not press the figure too far and think of two tight compartments in a building in heaven."** He felt, of course, that the two compartments in the earthly sanctuary were intended to teach the great truth of the ~~two~~ great divisions," as Mrs. White expressed it, of Christ's heavenly ministry in our behalf. We shall always have some honest differences of opinion as to how literally a symbol is to be understood, but so long as we keep clear the prime truth of ~~two~~ great divisions" in Christ's heavenly ministry, we have met our opponents squarely and have preserved our 1844 date, which is ever the focal point of attack. **A symbol must always stand for something beyond itself, or else it is not a symbol but simply a literal statement. John saw, as he looked heavenward in vision, a Lamb as it had been slain, but we know that in heaven above there is found no slain lamb.** However, we have no difficulty in understanding the import of the symbol. You will observe from what I say in the Additional Note on Chapter 10 that I consider it very proper to use the Biblical symbolism of two apartments because those symbols convey an important truth. But I don't want to press the symbol so literally as to play into the hands of our opponents in their argument about Christ's going into the presence of God, and also some other arguments they can build upon ultra-literalism.
5. That because of the fact that some passages in Hebrews are difficult to understand, **we ought never to allow our opponents to manoeuvre us into fighting the decisive battle as to the sanctuary doctrine on the battlefield of Hebrews.** I believe we ought always to take our strong stand on the sanctuary doctrine, including its two apartments, on other and clearer scriptures. Having done that, I think we are well protected against the plausible, but invalid, conclusions that our opponents seek to reach by their attempts to make Paul's passages in Hebrews support them. After all, this is the standard exegetical method we follow on many difficult matters of Scripture, as you brethren will agree. I have followed this procedure in my Additional Note for Chapter 10. Taking this procedure, we may willingly grant that it cannot be established with certainty as to what Paul may mean in a few places in Hebrews, but we can affirm with certainty that he does not mean what our opponents allege that he means. In other words, though **we no longer attempt to find dogmatic proof for certain aspects of our sanctuary doctrine in Hebrews,** we deprive our opponents of finding there any valid proof against that doctrine. To borrow again the figure of battle, we thus prevent them from bringing us into confusion on the field of Hebrews and make them fight their unholy warfare against us in the great areas of Scripture where we can win easily and completely.

6. **That Paul is not seeking, in Hebrews, to focus upon the definite divisions of Christ's work in heaven above**, that instead he makes reference to this or that aspect of Christ's heavenly ministry as a part of a grand argument to prove that the Jewish Christians could now avail themselves of ~~a~~ "more excellent ministry" than that of the earthly sanctuary. We have sought to make this great Pauline thesis stand out clearly in the rewritten section on ~~Theme~~ "Theme" in the Introduction.

These conclusions that I reached about 30 years ago, I see no reason to change today.

Now, my dear brethren, my letter is very long, but I am trying to share with you my thinking, and I believe it is essentially the thinking of my brethren who have sent approving reports on the galleys. It is a line of reasoning that weakens in no way our sanctuary doctrine. Rather, I think, it greatly protects it. The fact that **we do not attempt to prove a certain aspect of our sanctuary doctrine specifically in the book of Hebrews** does not mean that we are letting that great doctrine ravel out. **You contrast our treatment of the sanctuary with the strong support we have given to the Sabbath doctrine throughout the Commentary.** If you will look again at the galleys you will note that we declare at some length that we do not believe that Hebrews 4:9 presents a valid argument for the Sabbath; I am sure some folks will grieve over this and perhaps even argue that we have weakened the Sabbath doctrine. We do not believe so. We simply believe that **Hebrews is not the place to try to establish the Sabbath doctrine.** I think **the analogy is evident.**

Sincerely your brother in Christ,

F. D. Nichol¹⁰

The moral is clear. When our best scholarship worked on Hebrews, it came up with this conclusion: Do not use in support of our sanctuary doctrine the only New Testament passage which discusses the meaning of the tabernacle and its services. Especially ignore its references to the Day of Atonement.

Let us now take a rapid survey of the history of the sanctuary issues amongst us. No attempt is made to be exhaustive as that would yield a massive volume, at least partly irrelevant for our purposes. Instead we touch upon high points, and refer chiefly to well-known names of people who after study felt our traditional exposition of the sanctuary truth to be inadequate.

O.R.L. CROSIER

The first to find fault with the Adventist sanctuary teaching was its creator — O.R.L. Crosier. Damsteegt tells us concerning him, ~~In~~ 1846 he accepted the Sabbath but soon repudiated it together with his sanctuary teaching."¹¹

JAMES WHITE

The second prominent figure with difficulties in this area was James White. Not until 1857 did he accept the doctrine of the investigative judgment, and prior to that time he wrote against any such concept. For example, in the *Advent Review* of September, 1850, he declared:

Some have contended that the day of judgment was prior to the second advent. This view is certainly without foundation in the word of God.

Daniel, ~~in~~ the night visions” saw that ~~judgment~~ was given to the Saints of the Most High,” but not to mortal saints: not ~~until~~ the Ancient of days came,” and the ~~little~~ horn” ceased prevailing, which will not be until he is destroyed by the brightness of Christ’s coming. ~~Charge~~ thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ who shall judge the quick and the dead at (not before) his appearing and his kingdom” 2 Tim. 4:1.

The advent angel (Rev. 14:6, 7) saying with a loud voice, *Fear God and give glory to him: for the hour of his judgment is come* does not prove that the day of judgment came in 1840, or in 1844, nor that it will come prior to the Second Advent.

Prior to that he had declared in his *Word to the Little Flock*, p. 24,

~~The~~ event which will introduce the judgment day, will be the coming of the Son of Man, to raise the sleeping saints, and to change those that are alive at that time.

It is not necessary that the final sentence should be given before the first resurrection, as some have taught; for the names of the saints are written in heaven, and Jesus, and the angels will certainly know who to raise, and gather to the New Jerusalem.”

There is no evidence that at this time Ellen G. White differed with her husband on this point. Her 1849 statement in *Early Writings* 36 about the judgment is only a general statement and seems to place it after the seven last plagues.

I saw that the anger of the nations, the wrath of God, and the time to judge the dead, were separate and distinct, one following the other.

Damsteegt’s comment about James White probably also applies to Ellen G. White: ~~The~~ view of a pre-Advent judgment was only gradually adopted by J. White.”¹²

It took Joseph Bates, J.N. Andrews, J.N. Loughborough, and Uriah Smith to fully formulate the judgment doctrine over a period of years, and by the end of the fifties, more than a decade after the great disappointment, the doctrine became prevalent in the small community of Sabbath-keeping Adventists. In 1857 James White uses the expression ~~the~~ investigative judgment” (R&H, Jan. 29, 1857). It should be kept in mind that this doctrine was not formulated by the historic Sabbath conferences, the sixth of which took place in 1848. It is not one of the landmarks, though the final atonement in the heavenly sanctuary is. Rather, it seemed to emerge to fill the gap made by the collapse of the first interpretation of the shut door. Believers everywhere wanted to know ~~Well~~, if probation for the world did not close in 1844, just what did happen?”

D.M. CANRIGHT

Foremost among those who polemicized against the church’s position on the sanctuary in the 19th century was Dudley M. Canright, who vacillated in and out of the Adventist community for years. In his bitter *Seventh-day Adventism Renounced* he wrote:

Seventh-day Adventists make everything turn upon their view of the sanctuary. It is vital with them. If they are wrong on this, their whole theory breaks down. The reader should, therefore, study this subject carefully. They dwell upon it constantly, and affirm that they are the only ones in all Christendom who have the light on the subject.

1. Do the Adventists **know** that they are right about this question? No.

2. If this subject is as plain and as important as they say it is, it is strange that nobody ever found it out before.
3. After being perfectly familiar with their view of it, and knowing all their arguments, I feel sure they are mistaken about it. [p. 117]
1. God sent the Adventists with a last solemn message to earth upon which the destiny of the church and the world depended. The very first thing they did was to get the wrong year, 43 instead of 44. Then, when they got that fixed up, instead of announcing the real event to take place, the change in Christ's work in the sanctuary in heaven, they said He was to come to earth, raise the dead, and burn the world, when nothing of the kind was to occur!
2. Not one in fifty of the original Adventists ever found out the real mistake they had made. Not even one of the leading Adventists, like Miller, Himes, Litch, etc., ever accepted this sanctuary explanation. Only a mere handful out of the great mass of 1844 Adventists found out the truth about the sanctuary, and these were men of no note in Miller's work.
3. Miller himself opposed the Seventh-day Adventists' move, rejecting the idea of the sanctuary, the Sabbath, and the third angel's message. What a hopeless tangle that Advent work was! No wonder people rejected it. What if Moses had opposed Joshua, and John the Baptist had opposed Christ? Miller was sent to do a work, got it wrong, and then opposed those who did finally get it right!
4. Instead of receiving the "light" on the sanctuary question from Mrs. White's visions, or from heaven, they got it from O.R.L. Crosier. But he soon gave it all up as an error, and has opposed the Seventh-day Adventists for many years. It looks badly for a theory when its very authors renounce it.
5. Seventh-day Adventists at first adopted the sanctuary theory to prove that the door of mercy was shut in 1844, a theory which Mrs. White and all of them held at that time. Here is my proof on this point:

Ann Arbor, Mich., Dec. 1, 1887

Elder D.M. Canright: "I kept the seventh day nearly a year, about 1848. In 1846, I explained the idea of the sanctuary in an article in an extra double number of the *Day Star*, Cincinnati, O. The object of that article was to support the theory that the door of mercy was shut, a theory which I and nearly all Adventists who had adopted William Miller's views, held from 1844 to 1848. Yes, I know that Ellen G. Harmon — now Mrs. White — held the shut door theory at that time."

Truly yours, O.R.L. Crosier

Now listen to Mrs. White: "Fopsham, Me., April 21, 1847.

* * * The Lord showed me in vision more than one year ago, that Brother Crosier had the true light on the cleansing of the sanctuary, etc., and that it was His will that Bro C. should write out the view which he gave us in the *Day Star* (extra), Feb. 7, 1846. I feel fully authorized by the Lord to recommend that extra to every saint.

* * * E.G. White in *—A Word to the Little Flock*,” pages 11, 12. Here you have the origin and object of that sanctuary theory. Before me lies *—The Present Truth*,” Vol. I, No. 5, Dec. 1849, by James White. *—The Shut Door Explained*,” is the leading article, in which it is argued from the type Lev. 16:17, that when the high priest entered the Most Holy there could be no more pardon for sin. *—On this day of atonement He is a high priest for those only whose names are inscribed on the breast plate of judgment*,” p. 44. No more salvation for sinners, is what their sanctuary theory was then used to prove. The whole volume is full of this idea.

6. Their argument from the type on this point was right; in the type no sin could be confessed and conveyed into the sanctuary after the high priest entered the Most Holy. Lev. 4:1-7; 16:17, 23, 24. So if this was a type of the entrance of Christ into the Most Holy in heaven in 1844, then truly the door of mercy did close there, and all sinners are lost.
7. No work whatever was to be done on the Day of Atonement, or day when the sanctuary was cleansed. Lev. 23:27-32. The law was very strict. If the Advent argument on the sanctuary is correct and the Day of Atonement began in 1844, then they ought not to have worked a day since. Hence, many Adventists after 1844 held that it was a sin to work; but time starved them out, and they had to go at it again.
8. Finally, being compelled to abandon the position that the door of mercy was entirely shut against sinners in 1844, they next taught that only those could be saved who knew of the change which Christ made in the sanctuary in Heaven in 1844. [pp. 118-120]

After thoroughly investigating the whole subject of the sanctuary, I feel sure that they are in a great error on that point.

1. God's throne was always in the Most Holy place of the sanctuary, between the cherubim, over the ark, never once in the Holy place. For proof on this point see Lev. 16:2; Num. 7:89; I Sam. 4:4; 2 Kings 19:15. Smith argues that God's throne was sometimes in the holy place, and refers to Ex. 33:9. But here the Lord appeared outside the tabernacle, and not in the Holy place at all. So his text fails him.
2. When Jesus ascended to Heaven, eighteen hundred years ago, He went directly to the right hand of God and sat down on His throne. Heb. 8:1. Hence, He must have entered the most Holy then, instead of in 1844.
3. *—Within the veil*” is in the most Holy place. *—And thou shalt hang up the veil under the taches, that thou mayest bring in thither within the veil the ark of the testimony: and the veil shall divide unto you between the Holy **place** and the most Holy.*” Ex. 26:33. Also see Lev. 16:2, 12, 13.

None can fail to see that *—within the veil*” is in the most Holy place where the ark was. This is just where Jesus went eighteen hundred years ago. Proof: *—Which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that within the veil; whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus made a high priest for ever.*” Heb. 6:19, 20. As the high priest went *—within the veil*,” so Jesus, our high priest, went *—within the veil*,” into the most Holy place, to the right hand of God and sat down on His throne. Nothing could be more plainly stated. This upsets the whole Advent theory of 1844. For further proof see Ex. 27:21; 30:6; 40:22-26; Lev. 4:16, 17; 16:15; 24:3; Num. 18:7; Matt. 27:51.

4. ~~Before the throne,~~ Rev. 8:3. Elder Smith asserts that ~~the throne of God was in the first apartment of the sanctuary,~~ because it is said that the seven lamps and the golden altar were ~~before the throne,~~ Rev. 4:5; 8:3. It is a desperate cause which seizes upon such proof. The same argument would prove that the ark and God's throne were always in the first apartment of the earthly sanctuary, which we know to be false. As there was only a veil which divided the holy from the most holy, where God's throne was, things in the holy place were said to be ~~before the Lord,~~ as they were so near to the throne, which was just behind the curtain. Proof: Ex. 27:20, 21; 30:6-8; 40:23-25; Lev. 4:6, 15-18. Even outside of the tabernacle entirely, where the beasts were killed, was ~~before the Lord,~~ as Leviticus. 4:15 shows. Abraham walked ~~before the Lord,~~ Gen. 24:40, yet he was on earth, and the Lord was in heaven.
5. Not a single text can be found in all the Bible where the ark and cherubim and throne were in the holy place of the earthly sanctuary, the type; yet in the antitype they have the throne of God in the holy place, not on some special occasion, but all the time for 1800 years, just contrary to the type! [pp. 121-123]¹³

In his later *Life of Mrs. E. G. White*, Canright's chief protest against the Adventist position was the charge that ~~in~~ this theory the atonement did not take place until over eighteen hundred years after Jesus died on the cross!" (p. 101) He then led into the shut door thus:

In Crosier's theory it was held that the work in the first apartment of the earthly sanctuary was for ~~forgiveness of sins~~ only; hence, when the work in the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary closed (Oct. 22, 1844), there ended forgiveness of sins for all the world! Probation for sinners ended there! So, after 1844, Christ's work of atonement in the Most Holy Place was for saints only!

Mr. Crosier states that the object of this article on the sanctuary was to prove that probation ended in 1844, and Mrs. White endorsed it for that reason.¹⁴ It should be pointed out that while Crosier in the 19th century affirmed that his historic article was written to support the shut door concept, he later denied that it supported that idea. James White agreed with the latter claim.¹⁵

E.J. WAGGONER

As we consider the next figure, it is with a measure of shock.

E. J. Waggoner, ~~the Lord's messenger~~ in 1888, had become heretical by the early 1890s. In 1916 Waggoner died, and his last writing is known as his *Confession of Faith*. There he states his long-silent position on the sanctuary — a position which reflects his growing departure from objective justification.

We quote him at length because of his influence upon Adventism, and because he ably sets forth views which were rapidly growing amongst us. The statement is most interesting, although it contains as many things open to criticism as the views he was examining. There were references by Waggoner to 1844 in later years, but they were not presented with much conviction. We wish to stress that here and in other places where we quote critics of our sanctuary doctrine, such quotation does not necessarily affirm the present writer's agreement with the contentions made.

Neither at the cross, nor before or since, has there been any new feature introduced — any change in the way for sinners to approach the Throne of Grace. Christ has from the foundation of the world been the Lamb slain; His life has always been the one perfect

sacrifice for sin; and His royal priesthood has been unchangeable. He is from first to last the ~~one~~ mediator between God and men.” He has borne the sins of the world from the beginning of sin; and He has ~~taken away~~” the sin from as many of the world as have been willing to have it blotted out of their lives.

Also, twenty-five years ago, these truths, coupled with the self-evident truth that sin is not an entity but a condition that can exist only in a person, made it clear to me that it is impossible that there could be any such thing as the transferring of sins to the sanctuary in heaven, thus defiling that place; and that there could, consequently be no such thing, either in 1844 AD, or at any other time, as the ~~cleansing~~ of the heavenly sanctuary.”

~~Then~~ what took place in 1844?”

That question puzzled me for many years; for I had been so thoroughly indoctrinated with the idea of a 2300-year period ending in 1844, that it never occurred to me to doubt it. Indeed, I never did doubt it for a moment; but one day the light dawned upon me, and I saw that that period had no foundation whatever, and then of course I simply dropped it.

How did I learn this? you ask. Well, I suppose I should never have seen it if I had not been for so many years fully convinced that the thing which I, from my boyhood, had been taught took place in 1844 did not occur, then nor at any other time.

But what about the 2300 days? Are we to throw away the prophetic rule of ~~a~~ day for a year”? By no means; that rule holds, but it has no application in this case, for the simple reason that the eighth chapter of Daniel makes no mention whatever of 2300 days. Not the ~~King James~~” version, nor any other version, but the Hebrew text, must settle the question, and that says ~~two thousand and three hundred evenings and mornings~~” (literally ~~evening-mornings~~”), as correctly rendered in the revised version.

~~But,~~” it is asked, ~~doesn’t~~ an evening and a morning make a day?” Yes; but what reason have we for gratuitously assuming that the term is here used as a periphrasis for ~~day~~”? In that case we should have a figure of a figure! We are placed under the necessity of interpreting a figure of speech, and then taking that interpretation as a prophetic figure. When a prophetic symbol is used, the symbol itself ought to be absolutely clear, needing no explanation. But here we are told to believe that we have for the figurative day a term that is never elsewhere used in the Bible for the word ~~day~~.” Why should we assume an exception here? There is a Hebrew word that is everywhere rendered ~~day~~,” and it is the only word for ~~day~~” in the Hebrew Scriptures. Has it never occurred to you to wonder why an exception should be made here? It certainly rests with those who claim an exception here to show the most clear and convincing proof of the alleged fact, and to give a plain and conclusive reason therefore.

If the translators of the 1611 version had translated the Hebrew words *ereb boker* (evenings mornings), instead of substituting ~~day~~” for the proper rendering, I doubt if even the maintaining of a theory would have led anyone to light upon so farfetched an interpretation. I ask again, what reason can be given for the introduction by inspiration of a new, absolutely unknown, and clumsy expression, instead of the simple and well-known word for ~~day~~,” if the reader were intended to understand ~~day~~”? I say ~~clumsy~~ expression,” meaning only, of course, as a circumlocution for ~~day~~.” In reality there is nothing clumsy about it when taken in its obvious sense. It seems so obvious as to need

no argument, that the term “evening-mornings,” when used in connection with the sanctuary, must refer only to evening and morning sacrifices.

Incidentally there comes in here, of course, a consideration of the application of the “little horn.” Consistency demands that the horn of a goat should be of the nature of a goat — a process, a continuation of the animal in question. But this would preclude the application of a Grecian horn to Rome, since Greece and Rome were two distinct, independent powers. Why is there any more ground for saying that Rome came out of Greece, than there is for saying that Greece came out of Medo-Persia, or that Medo-Persia came out of Babylon? It is true that a victory over a Macedonian king gave Rome great prestige, but not so great as the victory over Darius gave Alexander, or the conquest of Babylon gave Cyrus. Rome, like its predecessors in universal dominion, originated in territory to the westward of the kingdom immediately preceding it, and had an origin as distinct from Greece as Greece had from Medo-Persia, or Medo-Persia from Babylon. The facts do not fit the interpretation which Seventh-day Adventists have given the prophecy. Strangely enough, the chart that has always been used by the denomination, and the supposed picture of the goat, which still appears in all the books and articles devoted to this prophecy, plainly show the inconsistency of the interpretation. Look it up, if you do not have the picture in mind, and you will see that the “little horn,” marked “Rome,” is represented as coming from behind the goat, and that the goat horn marked “Syria” is represented as uniting with that previously-existing little horn, instead of the latter coming out of the Syrian horn. The awkward picture contradicts the words of the prophecy; but if it had been made true to nature and to the text, the little horn could not have been labelled “Rome.”

I had thought to devote a little space to a positive consideration of the application of the little horn, but I will not cumber the argument with it. I did not really need to refer to the horn at all, it being sufficient for my purpose, in dealing with the atonement, to show that the eighth chapter of Daniel does not contain any long prophetic period, at the end of which sins are to be blotted out. My only burden in this writing is that sin is not an entity, a commodity, that can be taken away from a person and deposited intact somewhere else, awaiting its final destruction. Since no earthly sinners have ever been in the sanctuary in heaven, their sins can never have defiled that place, necessitating its cleansing. But the sanctuary at Jerusalem in Judea, which alone was the subject of Daniel’s anxiety, had been most horribly defiled by Antiochus, and did need cleansing.

“But what about the Investigative Judgment?” Yes, indeed, what about it? In truth, there is no responsibility resting on me to say anything about it, because in the entire Bible, from Genesis. 1:1 to Rev. 22:21, inclusive, **there is never once any mention of such a thing.**¹⁶

A.F. BALLENGER

Here is a name that is almost as emotion-creating as that of D.M. Canright, though belonging to a very different type of character and personality.

Albion Ballenger, of ministerial ancestry, lived between 1861 and 1921. In his late twenties, he was appointed the secretary of the National Religious Liberty Association. For a period, he was assistant editor of the *American Sentinel*. In these capacities he attended camp meetings and other important gatherings in nearly all the conferences in North America. Transferring to the British Isles, he preached in several of the large cities of England, Wales, and Ireland. He became the superintendent of the Ireland Mission. After he was defrocked,

some other workers joined him, including one of the officers of the British work, Win. Hutchinson, and L.H. Crisler, a former conference president in the US. Ballenger never developed an organized offshoot movement, though from 1914 he edited *“The Gathering Call”* paper. Renowned as a preacher while still with the church, he spoke and wrote much on the theme of the Holy Spirit, and authored the well-known *Power for Witnessing*. We suspect from some of his own statements, and some words of Ellen G. White, that strong mystical inclinations were the seed of later problems for Ballenger. It is certain that Ellen G. White viewed Ballenger as part of the growing sector of workers influenced by Kellogg’s views which made both God and His dwelling-place unreal.

Clearly condemned by Ellen G. White, Ballenger’s views, particularly on the sanctuary, need to be understood by us. **So far as we know, there is nobody in today’s Adventism who holds this man’s sanctuary schema.** He believed that Christ operated as priest for 4000 years before coming to earth, and that the sphere of His operations was the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary. Separating the two apartments was a cordon of angels through which Christ passed at His ascension into the Most Holy Place. In view of the plain statements in Hebrews that a priest had to be taken from among men, and that of necessity He must have a sacrifice to offer, it is not strange that Ellen G. White accused Ballenger of denying ~~mighty~~ truths held for ages.”

We list the nine propositions submitted by Ballenger at the 5:30 a.m. meeting, May 21, 1905, General Conference Session.¹⁷ The meeting was a secluded one with only some of the leaders present.

I want to read to you now some of the misfits that I find in my attempt to place the first apartment work of the earthly sanctuary this side of the cross:

1. The earthly sanctuary, which was a shadow of the heavenly, located the ark, or throne of God, in the holy of holies, or second apartment, while the priest was ministering in the first apartment. The denominational view of the heavenly sanctuary places the ark or throne of God in the first apartment while the priest ministers in that apartment, in violation of the type.
2. The shadow placed a veil between the priest and the ark or throne of God while the priest ministered in the first apartment. The denominational view has the priest ministering in the heavenly sanctuary in the first apartment, with no veil separating him from the ark or throne of God, but with a veil behind both priest and throne, in violation of the type.
3. The type represents the priest as performing a long ministry in the first apartment of the sanctuary before the blood is shed that pays the penalty of sin. The denominational view teaches that the blood was shed which pays the penalty of sin long before the ministry began in the heavenly sanctuary, thus contradicting the type.
4. The type taught that the priest ministered for a long period in the first apartment, during which time there was accumulated upon him the sins of the people before the blood was shed which met the penalty of those sins which the priest was carrying. The denominational view locates the death of Christ before any ministry has been performed in the heavenly sanctuary whereby the sins of the world are transferred to him.

(We teach that no sins are pardoned except those that go into the sanctuary by the priestly work, and yet we have the sanctuary closed to the patriarchs for four thousand years, and that Christ began the work of carrying sins into the heavenly sanctuary at His ascension. This leaves four thousand years without any priest by which the sin was carried into the sanctuary.)

5. The shadow placed the death of the Lord's goat, whose blood met the penalty of the law in type, on the great day of atonement. The denominational view places the death of Christ, whose blood meets the penalty of the law, more than eighteen hundred years before the great day of atonement is supposed to begin.
6. The shadow represents the high priest going from his ministry in the court where he obtained the blood, directly into the holy of holies on the day of atonement. (He did not stop in that first apartment; he obtained his blood, and then carried it straight through into the holy of holies.) The denominational view teaches that Christ went from His ministry in the first apartment, and not from the court, into the holy of holies, in 1844.
7. The type represents the priest as unloading forever, through the blood of the Lord's goat, the sins which had been accumulating upon him during the year by his ministry before the veil. (All the sins that had gone into the sanctuary during that one year, and were charged to the priest, that penalty was met on the day of atonement in the holy of holies.) The denominational view represents Christ as loading Himself up again in the first apartment with the same sins which He had before borne at the cross and unloaded in His death.
8. The shadow sends the high priest directly through the first apartment into the holy of holies as soon as he has in his hands the blood of the Lord's goat, or the blood which pays the penalty of sin. The denominational view stops our great High Priest in the first apartment when He has in his hands His own blood which pays the penalty of sin.
9. The shadow represents the high priest as going immediately with the blood, the warm blood, of the Lord's goat, into the holy of holies, and sprinkling that blood upon the mercy seat before the veil. The denominational view teaches that our great High Priest did not sprinkle His blood on the mercy seat before the veil for more than eighteen hundred years after it was shed.

Note that the chief emphases of these theses is the tenet that Christ had ministered in the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary for millenniums before the cross. It should be observed that even years later when Ballenger wrote his *Cast Out for the Cross of Christ*, he was still a believer in the judgment beginning in 1844 in fulfilment of Dan. 8:14.¹⁸ But he did not believe that this judgment had anything to do with the saints, and here Ellen G. White strenuously disagreed.¹⁹

Let us now notice Ballenger's letter to Ellen G. White, one which did not receive a personal reply. The letter sums up what were his dominant objections to the church's position ever after.

Dear Sr. White: For some time I have been constrained to write to you regarding my convictions on the sanctuary. Many of my friends have urged me to do this, while others have thought it useless inasmuch as, in their opinions, the letter would never reach you.

Nevertheless I have decided to write and state my difficulty frankly.

My first difficulty is with the interpretation which you give to the following scripture found in Heb. 6:19, 20, ~~Which~~ hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that **within the veil**, whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus made an high priest forever after the order of Melchisedec."

I cannot help believing that this term ~~within the veil~~" refers to the holy of holies of the heavenly sanctuary and the scriptures which convinced me, are given below.

On one side I have placed the interpretation given this scripture by the Word of God and on the other side the interpretation which you have given it. You will note that you merely assert that this term applies to the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary, but you do not refer to any scripture which uses the term and applies it to the first apartment. What I am pleading for in this letter, is, that if there be a ~~thus~~ saith the Lord" to support your statement, that, out of compassion for my soul you furnish it.

<p align="center">"Within the Veil" As the Bible Interprets it.</p>	<p align="center">"Within the Veil" As You Interpret it.</p>
<p>"And thou shalt hang up the veil under the taches, that thou mayest bring in thither within the veil the ark of the testimony: and the veil shall divide unto you between the holy place and the most holy" Ex. 26:33.</p> <p>"And the Lord said unto Moses, Speak unto Aaron thy brother that he come not at all times into the holy place <i>within the veil</i> before the mercy seat, which is upon the ark, that he die not: for I will appear in the cloud upon the mercy seat." Lev. 16:2.</p> <p>"And he shall take a censer full of burning coals of fire from off the altar before the Lord, and his hands full of sweet incense beaten small, and bring it <i>within the veil</i>." Lev. 16:12.</p>	<p>"The ministration of the priest throughout the year in the first apartment of the sanctuary, <u>within the veil</u> which formed the door and separated the holy place from the outer court, represents the work of ministration upon which Christ entered at His ascension. It was the work of the priest in the daily ministration to present before God the blood of the sin offering, also the incense which ascended with the prayers of Israel. So did Christ plead His blood before the Father in behalf of sinners and present before Him also, with the fragrance of His own righteousness, the prayers of penitent believers. Such was the work of ministration in the first apartment of the sanctuary in heaven."</p>
<p>"And he shall kill the goat of the sin offering that is for the people, and bring his blood <i>within the veil</i>, and do with his blood as he did with the blood of the bullock, and sprinkle it upon the mercy seat, and before the mercy seat." Lev. 16:15.</p> <p>"Therefore thou and thy sons with thee shall keep your priest's office for everything of the altar, and <i>within the veil</i>." Num. 18:7.</p>	<p>"Thither the faith of Christ's disciples followed Him as He ascended from their sight. Here (in the first apartment) their hopes centered, <u>which hope we have,</u> said Paul, <u>as an anchor of the soul both sure and steadfast, and which en-tereth into that within the veil; whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus, made an high priest forever.</u>" GC 420, 421.</p>

Sr. White, you refer the terms ~~within the veil~~" to the *first* apartment, while the Lord applies the terms "*without the veil*" and "*before the veil*" to the first apartment, as appears from the following Scriptures.

—And thou shall set the table (of shewbread) *without the veil.*” Ex. 26:35.

—And thou shalt command the children of Israel that they bring thee pure olive oil beaten for the light, to cause the lamp to burn always in *the tabernacle of the congregation, without the veil*, which is before the testimony.” Ex. 27:20,21.

—And he put the table in the tent of the congregation, upon the side of the tabernacle northward *without the veil.*” Ex. 40:22.

—And he put the golden altar in the tent of the congregation *before the veil.*” Ex. 40:26.

—And the priest that is anointed shall take of the bullock’s blood, and bring it to the tabernacle of the congregation: and the priest shall dip his finger in the blood and sprinkle of the blood seven times before the Lord, *before the veil of the Sanctuary.*” Lev. 4:5, 6.

—And the priest that is anointed shall bring of the bullock’s blood to the tabernacle of the congregation, and the priest shall dip his finger in some of the blood, and sprinkle it seven times before the Lord, even *before the veil.*” Lev. 4:17.

—And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Command the children of Israel that they bring thee pure olive oil beaten for light, to cause the lamps to burn continually *without the veil* of the testimony, in *the tabernacle of the congregation.*” Lev. 24:1-3.

Five times the Lord uses the term *within the veil*” and in every case it is applied to the second apartment of the sanctuary, and not to the first.

Seven times the Lord uses the terms *without the veil*” and *before the veil*,” and in every instance He applies it to the **first** apartment or tabernacle of the congregation, and never to the court outside of the door of the tabernacle. But if *within the veil*” applies to the **first** apartment as you teach in your interpretation of Heb. 6:19, 20, then the term **without the veil**” must apply to the space in the court outside the tabernacle door. Every one of these seven scriptures which plainly state that *without the veil*” and *before the veil*” is in the first apartment, is a divine witness to the truth that *within the veil*” in Heb. 6:19, 20, **must** apply to the second apartment.

There are therefore twelve witnesses, a twelve-fold *thus saith the Lord*” testifying that the term *within the veil*” refers to the holy of holies, and not to the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary as you assert.

At my secret trial four years ago, three leading brethren were chosen to answer me. (It is interesting to note in passing that two out of the three were **then** and are still under your condemnation inasmuch as they both teach that the *daily*” of Dan. 8:13 refers to the heavenly service instead of paganism as taught by you in *Early Writings*.) In private conversation with me one took the position that *within the veil*” meant within the sanctuary, but did not refer to either apartment. Another asserted at the trial that the term applied to the first apartment as you have interpreted it. The third, compelled by the witnesses quoted above admitted in his answer that the term *within the veil*” does apply to the holy of holies, but that it is spoken **prophetically**, and although the scripture says Christ is entered **within** the veil” we are to understand it to mean that He WILL enter in 1844. This babel of voices did not help me to see my error, if error it be.

Before publishing my MS I sent it to several ministers holding official positions, whose loyalty to the denomination is unquestioned, and asked them out of love for the truth and my soul, to show me from the Scriptures, where I was in error. I promised that should they do this I would never publish the MS. Not one of these brethren attempted to show me my error from the Word. One wrote thus:

—Candour compels me to say that I can find no fault with it from a Bible standpoint. The argument seems to be unassailable.”

Another said:

—I have always felt that it was safer to take the interpretation placed upon the scriptures by the Spirit of Prophecy as manifested through Sister E.G. White rather than to rely upon my own judgment or interpretation.”

This last quotation expresses the attitude of all those who have admitted that my position seemed to be supported by the Scriptures, but hesitated to accept it.

Honestly, Sister White, I am afraid to act upon this suggestion; because it will place the thousands upon thousands of pages of your writings in books and periodicals between the child of God and God’s Book. If this position be true, no noble Berean dare believe any truth, however clearly it may seem to be taught in the Scriptures, until he first consults your writings to see whether it harmonizes with your interpretation. This is the principle always advocated by the Roman church and voiced in the following quotation:

—Like two sacred rivers flowing from Paradise, the Bible and divine Tradition contain the Word of God. Though these two divine streams are in themselves, on account of their divine origin, of equal sacredness, and are both full of revealed truths, still of the two, TRADITION is to us more clear and safe.” *Catholic Belief*, p. 54.

It was against this putting of an infallible interpreter between the man and his Bible that the Reformation waged its uncompromising war.

The Romanists robbed the individual of his Bible, denouncing the right of “private interpretation”; while the Reformation handed the Bible back to the individual while denouncing the papal dogma that demands an infallible interpreter between the child of God and his Bible.

The brethren urge me to accept your interpretation of the Scriptures as clearer and safer than what they call my interpretation. But I have not interpreted this Scripture, I have allowed the Lord to do this and have accepted His interpretation. Let me illustrate:

The first mention of the Sabbath in the New Testament is found in Matt. 12:1. It does not there tell us which day is the Sabbath, assuming that the reader knows which day is referred to, or if not, he will be able to learn from the Old Testament, which day it is. When one turns to Ex. 20:8-12 and reads, —The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord,” is not that God’s interpretation? Has any one the right to reply, —That is your interpretation.” Surely not.

In like manner, the first and only instance where the term, —within the veil,” is used in the New Testament, is found in Heb. 6:19. It is taken for granted that the reader will know to which apartment the Holy Spirit refers; but if not, the searcher can learn from

the Old Testament which place is meant. Now, when I turn to the Old Testament and find that in every instance this term is applied to the holy of holies, can it honestly be charged that this is my interpretation? I have not interpreted it, but have given that honour to the Holy Oracles themselves. And now Sister White, what can I do? If I accept the testimony of the Scriptures, if I follow my conscientious convictions, I find myself under your condemnation; and you call me a wolf in sheep's clothing, and warn my brethren and the members of my family against me. But when I turn in my sorrow to the Word of the Lord, that Word reads the same, and I fear to reject God's interpretation and accept yours. Oh that I might accept both. But if I must accept but one, hadn't I better accept the Lord's? If I reject His word and accept yours, can you save me in the judgment? When side by side we stand before the great white throne; if the Master should ask me why I taught that ~~within the veil~~ "was in the first apartment of the sanctuary, what shall I answer? Shall I say, ~~Because~~ Sister White, who claimed to be commissioned to interpret the Scriptures for me, told me that this was the true interpretation, and that if I did not accept it and teach it I would rest under your condemnation?"

Oh, Sister White, that this answer might be pleasing unto the Lord. Then would I surrender to your testimony. Then would you speak words of encouragement to me again. Then would my brethren, with whom I have held sweet counsel, no longer shun me as a leper. Then would I appear again in the great congregation, and we would weep and pray and praise together as before.

But on the other hand should the great and terrible God say to me on that day, ~~But~~ disobedient servant, WHAT DID I SAY?" Oh what could I answer?

If I surrender my convictions to escape thy testimonies of condemnation which you heap upon my head; if I yield the Word of God that I might again enjoy the love and fellowship of my brethren, how can I again look into the face of Him who died for me? How could I again lay my Bible open upon my bed, and kneeling, plead for light upon His word? No, no, I cannot do that. I must go on my pilgrimage alone. And while I would not put myself in the company of Him who was despised and rejected of men, the Man of sorrows, the Man of the lonely life, yet I am comforted in the thought that He knoweth my sorrow and is acquainted with my grief.

Your younger brother in Christ,

A.F. Ballenger.²⁰

After a silence of four years following his ejection from the ministry, Ballenger published his *Cast Out for the Cross of Christ*. The following year, the denomination published a reply by E.E. Andross entitled *A More Excellent Ministry*. In rebuttal, Ballenger wrote *An Examination of Forty Fatal Errors Regarding the Atonement*, a title which clearly indicates his view that the cross fulfilled **Yom Kippur**. His first pages are significant for our study.

It is gratifying to note that this new book, ~~Which~~ fully explains the sanctuary question as understood by the denomination," takes the position that ~~within the veil~~ of Heb. 6:19, 20, does refer to the holy of holies of the heavenly sanctuary, and does teach that Christ entered there at His ascension.

This will doubtless astonish many in the denomination, ministers and people, who have believed the old position as taught by the pioneers for sixty years, and published in the

books of the denomination, and supported by Sister White. And none will be more astonished than those ministers and people who have been cast out of the churches for believing what the denomination now publishes as its position on this scripture.

What astonishes the writer most is that this new position is published without a hint that the author, Elder E.E. Andross, or the denomination ever published or taught any other position. This new book says:

Much stress is laid, by the author of *“Cast Out,”* upon the expression, *“within the veil,”* as found in Heb. 6:19, 20, fifteen pages of the pamphlet being devoted exclusively to an effort to prove that this means within the second veil or most holy apartment of the heavenly sanctuary.

A More Excellent Ministry, p. 52.

By this it is intimated that this fifteen-page effort was entirely unnecessary. The author then proceeds to take the same position, just as if he and the denomination for whom he speaks, had always held and taught that same position. However the facts are that they have always taught the contrary position, and, during the last eight years, condemned and cast out scores of those who believe this new position.

It is impossible to believe that there was not some one in the many councils held to consider the manuscript of this new pamphlet during its year of rejections and revisions, who had honesty of heart and courage of conviction sufficient to raise some of the following questions. I shall presume that there was, and that his questions were somewhat as follows:

Question: Why are we making this change in the denomination’s position? For sixty years we have believed and taught that *“within the veil”* of Heb. 6:19, 20, refers to the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary.

Answer: Because we cannot maintain the position from the Scriptures. The Scriptures are positively against it.

Question: And has the denomination only just found this out? And how did the denomination happen to find it out just now?

Answer: No doubt Bro Ballenger and his friends would say that it was the result of their agitation of the question.

Question: Would it not be the truth?

Answer: Possibly.

Question: I remember how Bro. Ballenger, for one solid hour, stood before us, when he was brought to trial over this matter, and read scripture after scripture to prove that *“within the veil”* of Heb. 6:19, 20, pointed to the second apartment of the heavenly sanctuary. I remember that we then opposed this position and regarded him and Elder Win. Hutchinson, who was on trial with him, as sadly in the dark and as having turned them out with scores of their brethren, for believing what they taught, are we now going to adopt their position and publish it to the world as our position?

Answer: But we are not adopting all of Bro Ballenger's conclusions from this Scripture.

Question: But you are adopting the two principal positions that he advocated and based on this scripture. First, that the scripture refers to the holy of holies of the heavenly sanctuary, and second, that it teaches that Christ went there at His ascension. Is this not true?

Answer: Yes. But we do not believe that Christ remained in that apartment, but that He and the Father immediately moved into the first apartment where they remained until 1844.

Question: But on the two points mentioned, you now agree with Bro. Ballenger and his brethren.

Answer: Yes.

Question: And you now believe that in publishing these new positions you are publishing the truth?

Answer: Yes.

Question: Then you now believe that in publishing the old position for sixty years, the denomination has been publishing error?

Answer: Yes.

Question: And you believe that when Elder Daniells and other of the leading brethren went from camp meeting to camp meeting teaching the people that ~~within~~ "the veil" of this scripture referred to the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary, and taught that Christ entered there at His ascension, they were teaching error, were they not?

Answer: Yes, we presume they were.

Question: When Bro. Ballenger was standing before us on trial for his life as a minister, when he taught with all earnestness of his soul that ~~within~~ "the veil" of Heb. 6:19, 20, referred to the holy of holies of the heavenly sanctuary, and taught that Christ went there at His ascension, he was teaching the truth, was he not?

Answer: Yes, it appears so now.²¹

Ellen White's warnings against Ballenger are found in the White Estate release, (MS760) *The Ballenger Letters*. She sees him as threatening the very foundations of Adventism, indeed, of Christianity itself. Some of her admonitions seem to place Ballenger into a camp very similar to Kellogg, as ~~mystical~~, "unable to ~~be~~ substantiated by the word of God," possibly even ~~departing~~ from the living God in spiritualistic satanic experiences," ~~led~~ by satanic agencies," undermining ~~the~~ pillars of our faith." Ballenger was spending his time in presenting as truth that which, if received, would undermine **the mighty truths that have been established for ages**." Ballenger's theories, if received, ~~would~~ lead many to depart from the faith." ~~The~~ Lord has not given him the message that he is bearing regarding the sanctuary service." Heavenly messengers have pronounced that Brother Ballenger was

—substituting human interpretation for the interpretation that God has given.” The new views would mean —the uprooting of faith in God, and the making of infidels.”

Specifically the theories of Ballenger are contrasted with those that emerged —since 1844. —. we who passed through the disappointment of 1844 can testify to the light that was then given on the sanctuary question.” Ellen White distinctly alludes to the Sabbath conferences which established a line of truth leading right to the time when we shall enter the city of God. Repeatedly the pioneers of 1844 are appealed to, and Brother Ballenger’s —proofs” are warned against as unreliable, and certain to —destroy the faith of God’s people in the truth that has made us what we are.” Very specifically Ellen G. White puts her finger on that which concerns her most about Ballenger’s teachings. —... **the points that he is trying to prove by scripture are not sound. They do not prove that the past experience of God’s people was a fallacy.**” —When efforts are made to unsettle our faith in our past experience, and to send us adrift, let us hold fast to the truth that we have received.” —The warning is given, hold fast to the past experience.” —The truths given us after the passing of the time in 1844 are just as certain and unchangeable as when the Lord gave them to us in answer to our urgent prayers.” Denial of the sanctuary truth is linked to the danger of denying the existence of a personal God — an obvious allusion to the teachings of Dr. J.H. Kellogg.

Viewed together, the warnings of the Spirit of Prophecy seem to be directed against mystical pantheistic sentiments which would result in denying the reality of the heavenly sanctuary and the present ministry of Christ our High Priest. Such false teachings would fail to connect the sanctuary service with —present truth” for the people God raised up in 1844. Ballenger did believe in a judgment beginning in 1844, but it had chief reference, not to the disposal of the sins of believers, but those of unbelievers. Strictly speaking, he did not believe in atonement for the saints as part of Christ’s final ministry in heaven.

Ellen White’s repeated references to the passing of the time in 1844 and to the Sabbath conference show clearly her thrust and emphasis. To rightly understand her, we should keep in mind that while the teaching on the investigative judgment was not accepted by this church till about a decade after the last of the Sabbath conferences, stress on Christ’s closing ministry for the saints in the holy of holies was present from the date of 1844 itself. Ballenger, by applying the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary to Christ’s priestly work before the cross, and the second apartment to his subsequent work, was denying not only the plain teachings of Hebrews about Christ’s priesthood being subsequent to His incarnation, but also ignoring the Biblical evidence that the second apartment ministry had a special application to the last days. Crosier had taught the eschatological application of the Day of Atonement, but not the investigative judgment. This was true of all those pioneers to whom Ellen G. White refers when mentioning the Great Disappointment and the Sabbath conferences.

One other caveat should be offered. It was customary for Ellen G. White to commend and endorse whatever contained a preponderance of truth — regardless of existing errors in the same package. She commended Crosier’s article to every saint despite several positions in it which she repudiated.

Similarly, Ellen G. White endorsed Uriah Smith’s commentary on *Daniel and Revelation*, despite its Arian sentiments, and a multitude of inaccuracies. Thus her stress on the sanctuary truth which came to the disappointed saints in 1844 does not necessarily endorse every detail subsequently added. It would certainly be wrong to apply Ellen G. White’s warnings as a denial of ALL that Ballenger was saying, particularly as she herself in several places echoes some of the same sentiments expressed by him.²²

E. BALLENGER

Edward Ballenger was even more vocal than his brother. At first an opponent of Albion, he became his most staunch defender among the administrators, pastors, and laity who espoused the heretical cause. It is chiefly Edward Ballenger's name that is remembered with the *Gathering Call* publications which were a denominational gadfly for decades. An acquaintance of Ellen G. White's, Edward Ballenger headed up the work of education for the church in California until his defection. After that event he issued a spate of materials until the beginning of the fifties.

W.W. FLETCHER

When we move to the late 1920s, we have a case even more poignant than Albion Ballenger's. The latter has never been successfully accused of unchristian behaviour, and the situation is identical with the former. Daniells seemed close to tears when he wrote of this man whom he described as ~~a~~ gentleman, a very devout, praying man. I have greatly enjoyed working with him." Everyone believes in Brother Fletcher."²³

Even today, those who are vocal opponents of Fletcher's theology speak with almost reverence of the man. Letters from Elder L. Jones to Drs. Olson and Ford so testify. (L.L. Jones is a retired minister in Victoria, Australia.)

Fletcher spanned the years between 1879 and 1947. After colporteur, he became a public evangelist, and then entered foreign mission work. Returning from Singapore, he held city missions and then became the president of the South Australian Conference. He was Young People's, Home Missions, and Education secretary for the Australian Union Conference in 1914, and vice president of the union in 1915. During the following three years he was the president of the India Union Mission. Next he became field secretary, and then chairman of the Southern Asian Division, 1920-22. He returned to evangelism in Australia, then pursued further work as an administrative officer of the union prior to joining the faculty at Avondale College to teach Bible. We have never, never found a word breathing suspicion on his integrity and fidelity to the church over these twenty-five years of service.

Fletcher's theological stance should not be equated with Ballenger's. He never accepted the ~~way-out~~ features of the Ballenger position, but its emphasis on Heb. 6:19-20 and Heb. 9 was appropriated by him with a sad fervour. He did not wish to believe it, but found himself compelled to do so, even as L.R. Conradi, W.W. Prescott, L.E. Froom, R.A. Anderson, E. Heppenstall, R. Cottrell, D. Neufeld, E. Hilgert, and a host of others in later years. (Certainly, the majority of our New Testament scholars assent to the essential accuracy of Ballenger's exegesis of ~~within~~ the veil." Several studies by students of Andrews University in the last few years, including essays by denominational college Bible teachers, take the same position.)

Fletcher's *apologia sua vita* is *Reasons for My Faith*. There he sets forth his fundamental positions, the answers of the brethren, and his answers to their answers. We quote the first:

The Propositions

1. That it was the immediate unveiled presence of God as manifested in the Holy Shekinah that constituted the inner apartment of the earthly sanctuary the most holy place, and that consequently when at the time of His ascension the Lord Jesus Christ sat down at the right hand of God, thus ~~a~~ appearing in the presence of God for us," He entered the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary. There can be no place in heaven more holy than the place of the unveiled presence of Almighty God.

2. That in the typical service of the earthly sanctuary the sprinkling of blood upon the altar and before the veil represented the expiation of sin, and not its transfer into the sanctuary.
3. That it is necessary to modify our view that the *Testimonies* are to be regarded as having the authority of a direct revelation from God.²⁴

Scores, including ministers, were disfellowshipped from the Australian churches over the sanctuary issues in Fletcher's time. Entire groups left the church and fellowshipped together away from its borders.

Some paragraphs from Fletcher's *Open Letter* of Nov. 20, 1930, may be of interest:

The truths of the Advent message are very dear to me. The knowledge of these truths stirred my heart in my youth, and the belief of them has moulded my life ever since. I thank God for the day when one of the Lord's messengers came to our home town in Northwest Tasmania preaching these things.

Thirty years have gone by since then. During all this time the great essential truths of the Advent message have been a constant inspiration and comfort to me. In tendering to the brethren my resignation as a worker employed by the Australasian Union Conference, I have done so with much regret, having feelings of the warmest affection for the Advent cause and people.

After all these discussions my convictions remain practically unchanged. I do not myself regard the divergence as sufficient to warrant the separation of a worker from the Advent ministry; but my conversations with the brethren here and in America have shown that many of our responsible men are not prepared to take that view.

While my change of conviction with regard to the sanctuary teaching will cause pain and perplexity to some of my dearest friends, **I see a reformation of doctrine in that connection to be essential for the good of the church.** Although the first recognition of this may cause perplexity, a fuller and truer knowledge of the nature of the Saviour's ministry in the heavenly sanctuary, and the relation of that ministry to the work accomplished on Calvary's cross, cannot but bring great joy and peace to all who truly believe.

I have felt it to be my duty to bring my convictions before my fellow-ministers, and still feel that it is our workers particularly that should give thought to these things. There are matters of interpretation of type and prophecy that are not essential to salvation. This does not mean, however, that they are unimportant. While these things should not be made a test of fellowship, we have rightly attached great importance to them.

I feel bound to the people among whom I have learned the ways of the Lord by ties of love that can never be broken. I would exhort one and all, both young and old, not to be unduly disturbed over some divergence of viewpoint in prophetic interpretation. Whatever may be the interpretation of particular passages, undoubtedly the second advent of Christ is near, even at the doors. We have not followed cunningly-devised fables in making known the power and coming of the Lord. We must remember, however, that while the lamp of prophecy will shine more and more brightly until the day dawn, we are to look to Christ, and depend more upon Him than upon our own understanding of the times and the seasons. It is still true that the Father keeps these things more or less —within His own authority." Let us keep our eyes fixed upon —Him

that loveth us, and loosed us from our sins by His blood.” —To Him be the glory and the dominion for ever and ever. Amen.”

L.R. CONRADI

L.R. Conradi lived between 1856 and 1936. After studying for the Roman Catholic priesthood, he migrated to America at the age of seventeen and was there led to this message in 1878. In one-third of the normal four years he completed the ministerial course at Battle Creek, though working at typesetting over the same period. James White, noticing his poverty, bought for him a graduation coat. In 1882 he was ordained, and 1888 found him at the historic Minneapolis Conference. Not long afterwards he was back in his native Germany as a very active church leader, and according to the GC president, much appreciated.

Now Brother Conradi is not a speculative man at all, in his temperament. He is a well grounded man. He is a scholar, and a man of very keen foresight, of much insight; and he is building up a work in Europe that is simply marvellous; and he is building it on the old solid foundation of this cause. He is not wandering about.²⁵

L.R. Conradi's problems began very early. At the time of his defection he had laboured for the cause over half a century, having been a student of Uriah Smith's. Conradi was well read, eloquent by tongue and pen, and had captured the hearts of a large number of our people throughout Europe. But his sanctuary problems came to the fore in the last decade of the nineteenth century, though he never separated from our people till the 1930s when he was seventy-six years of age.

Particularly the relationship between the question and answer to Dan. 8:13-14 worried our German leader. After all, verse 14 was an answer to a specific question, and that question said much about the sins of antichrist, but nothing about the sins of true believers, and apparently nothing about the Day of Atonement. From Conradi we obtained, through this mental tumult, our present denominational teaching on the ~~daily~~ which spread from him to A.T. Jones, A.G. Daniells, W.C. White, W.W. Prescott and other leaders. Conradi revived the teaching of the reformers that Dan. 8:13 pointed to the papal counterfeits of Christ's gospel and mediatorial work. (Before going in print as the first Seventh-Day Adventist writer to set forth the ~~new~~ view of the ~~daily~~, Conradi wrote Ellen G. White inquiring whether she had any light on that topic. He received no answer. Ellen G. White usually refused to settle doctrinal issues.)

Therefore, deduced Conradi, in company with the reformers, **8:14 pointed to a restoration of the long obscured gospel**. (He also believed in another aspect of fulfilment to do with Mohammedanism's attacks on Christians. This he picked up from scholars of other faiths who preceded him, or were contemporary with him, such as H.G. Guinness.)

Conradi also came to believe with Ballenger that Christ at His ascension fulfilled the ministry symbolized by the High Priest on the Day of Atonement — he went ~~within~~ the veil.” Not until June 12, 1931, however, did Conradi publicly set forth his views. After he was rebuked for a statement on Dan. 7 in the journal he edited (*Herold der Wahrheit*) he wrote Elder H.F. Schubert, chairman of the division committee and requested a hearing.

The discussion appointed for July 19, 1931, was duly held in good spirit on both sides, and a sub-committee appointed to prepare a report for the Division Committee. This report was considered and adopted July 22, 1931. In this report appears the following summary of the discussion:

~~Brother~~ Brother Conradi made these two questions prominent for discussion:

- a) the sanctuary question,
- b) the question of the Spirit of Prophecy.

The discussion took place in the following manner. Brother Conradi was granted an opportunity to present his ideas to the full committee in a series of three Bible studies. Brother F.C. Gilbert replied to his presentation in two Bible studies which were later supplemented by Brethren C.C. Crisler, G.W. Schubert, and W. Muller. These presentations took place alternatively.

At Brother Conradi's request the discussion was broken off, as he desired time in which to study further that he might become clear. He then made the accompanying statement on Wednesday, July 22.

~~In~~ answer to this presentation of Bro. Conradi we declare definitely that **we hold unconditionally to the Holy Scriptures and their teachings as the only authority in questions of faith (and doctrine)**. For this reason we hold to the teachings of the sanctuary in all their details as heretofore. Furthermore, we continue to appreciate spiritual gifts, among which is the Spirit of Prophecy, as taught in Holy Scriptures."²⁶

Three months later Conradi was heard in Omaha, Nebraska, by a committee of twenty-seven appointed by the General Conference, including all the officers at Washington, and four division presidents from abroad. After the hearing, Brother Conradi wrote C.H. Watson, assuring him that by accepting his resignation as field secretary of the General Conference the brethren would do him a favour. This was done.

The official Statement of the Conradi Case offers as a typical reaction the following:

A lay business man in one church who entertained Brother Conradi, and who had received some of his documents, says:

~~When~~ I asked him [Conradi] concerning his position regarding the sanctuary and Sister White he gave me his opinion on these two points."

~~Quite~~ a number of brethren and sisters share the view of Brother Conradi, but one needs time to read it all."

Letter from H. Fenner to E. Kotz, May 4, 1932.)

Later the same brother wrote:

~~Since~~ there seems to be a preparation for a fight against Brother Conradi, I consider it my duty to warn you against participating in it. ... Anyone who wants to fight against Brother Conradi must be well able to prove that his views are wrong (although he does not want to persuade anyone to share these views with him) else the people would be against those who oppose Brother Conradi. This I believe is not only my own private judgment, but it is the view of about ninety percent of the brethren and sisters."

(Quoted In a letter from H. Fenner to E. Kotz, May 4, 1932.)²⁷

Still later he wrote:

~~A~~ man like L. R. Conradi lives in the hearts of all. However, if his views are wrong, yet I would see my way clear to bear with this old pioneer. I agree with you and so do

the churches in Bremen. Let us wait and see. If it is from God, ye cannot overthrow it, but if it be of men it will come to naught.”

(Quoted in letter from H. Fenner to E. Kotz, May 4, 1932.) (27)

A different reaction also is recorded from a former field secretary:

—Now we have been greatly distressed. Brother Conradi has not only belittled the gift of prophecy, but has also repudiated all his own books that he has written. All the work that he has done during 55 years is now declared untrue. He says he avoids pork only on account of health principles. The threefold message has been proclaimed during the Reformation. The deadly wound in Rev. 13:3, the beast with the two horns of Rev. 13:11 — all these things have already found their fulfilment in the fifth century.

—As to the effects of these presentations of Brother Conradi in the church, we shall have to wait and see. Personally, I did not receive a good impression. I would not have believed that Brother Conradi was thinking along that line.”

(Letter from Aug. Kollosser to H. Fenner, May 16, 1932)²⁸

We quote the last lines of the same Statement:

The following cablegram was received at the General Conference headquarters from the Central European Division office in Berlin, under date of August 13:

—Division recommends withdraw Conradi's credentials.”²⁹

On August 14, another cablegram came from the same division office, as follows:

—Conradi arriving New York August 19 boat (Deutschland).”³⁰

W.W. PRESCOTT

Present at the trials of Ballenger and Conradi was our veteran educator and administrator, W.W. Prescott (1844-1944). He was president of Union, Walla Walla, and Avondale, and head of the theology department of EMC. He served as field secretary of the GC, and editor of the *Review* (for seven years). He was the author of *The Spade and the Bible*, published by Revell. Hundreds of preachers and officers of the denomination received their Bible training from Prescott. The *Doctrine of Christ*, written by him in the twenties, summarizes his doctrinal presentations in the classroom.

In the Officer's Minutes of March 2, 1934, we find allusion to the need to save the denomination from “drifting into theories like Ballenger's.” In the *Review* of 1909 (Oct. 28 ff.) Prescott had replied to the heresies of Ballenger.

The Officer's Minutes of Jan. 22, 1934, record that:

W.W. Prescott, who is teaching Bible at Emmanuel Missionary College had certain questions concerning our theology. When these had been considered by a small group it had been agreed that W.W. Prescott continue at EMC for the rest of this school year, and that he not teach in the classroom any of these matters upon which he differs with the denomination. It had also been agreed that at the end of the school year he would not be continued longer at EMC. A letter had been received by W.H. Branson from K.H. Holden asking that the General Conference call W.W. Prescott back to Washington to relieve them of the necessity of asking him to discontinue work.

Considerable time was spent discussing just what would be the best procedure to follow in dealing with Elder Prescott. It was finally

Voted, That I.H. Evans and W.H. Branson draw up a statement to W.W. Prescott explaining to him that on the basis of conversations which have been had with him by members of the official staff, that we understand he is not in full harmony with the denominational beliefs, and that we believe that he cannot go on teaching in a Bible Department while his views are not in harmony with the denomination, and suggest to him that he cooperate with the Officers and with the Emmanuel Missionary College Board by withdrawing at the end of the school year; that we further suggest to him in the statement that if he wishes, he may have a hearing on his religious views with the Officers of the General Conference.³¹

February 2, 1934, W.W. Prescott wrote to Elders Branson and Evans. We quote the first two paragraphs.

Dear Brethren:

In your letter of Jan. 29, received yesterday, you advise me to withdraw voluntarily from my place as a worker in this movement on the ground that I am ~~—~~somewhat out of harmony with the established faith of the denomination on certain vital points, especially the doctrine of the sanctuary.” You do this without having had any conference with me over the serious question involved, and without expressing any regret that I have taken such a course as to forfeit your confidence in me as a proper representative of this work after having devoted about fifty years of my life to its advancement. Not only so, but you plainly imply that if I do not thus withdraw, the matter will be taken up with the Board of Trustees of this college with the purpose, of course, of preventing me from being invited by them to continue my work here.

Now it is an axiom in any court of justice that an accused person should have the opportunity of facing his accusers in court and be given a fair chance of disproving the charges against him, but it seems as if you had already decided the case against me, and were now advising me to avoid a public condemnation by quietly accepting your decision. It is true that you offer me the opportunity of coming to Washington to confer with you, but are the accusers the proper jury to consider the case? Is it not a fair procedure that the charge which you make against me should be considered by those who have not made the charge? It seems that way to me.³²

In the archives is an interesting note in the handwriting of A.W. Spicer. Note that the first sentence is giving the words of Prescott, but the rest the words of Spicer.

1. ~~—~~I have waited all these years for someone to make an adequate answer to Ballenger, Fletcher and others on their positions re the sanctuary but I have not yet seen or heard it.”
2. After a long discussion of the sanctuary, the Trinity and other questions you ask whether I felt you should resign seeing you were out of harmony with the church.

I replied that I was not competent to give advice but was sure that if you taught the things in your classes which you had talked to me the brethren would ask you to resign.

You assured me you were not teaching them but talked of them confidentially only to leading men.³³

From the Heritage Room of Andrews University (File VFM 998) comes the following letter:

Another interesting item came to me from three different sources, viz: that Prof. W.W. Prescott has made it known that he no longer believes in the investigative judgment. I wrote asking him what event marked the fulfilment of the 2300 days, if the investigative judgment did not begin at that time. It has been something like two months since I wrote him. As yet I have received no reply, and am confident he will not answer. So long as he is determined to maintain the denomination, his only safe course is to ignore my question.³⁴

W.W. Prescott moved to Washington and served the church there. At his death ten years later, he was greatly honoured both by the church and many beyond its borders.

L.E. FROMM

Froom needs no introduction. It is doubtful whether any other Adventist is known who laboured so untiringly at the task of church apologetics. He had an unusual faculty for pertinacity in research.

Well-versed in the issues raised by Ballenger and Fletcher, an intimate of Daniells, it is not strange that Elder Froom should have turned his extraordinary powers of microscopic concentration to the sanctuary issue. His files in the GC Archives demonstrate that the key areas were given intense research. The chief verses used by Ballenger and Fletcher are all listed according to approximately twenty different translations of each. Some lines he wrote concerning Fletcher after the latter's trial are of interest.

After reading with an open mind all the material submitted by Brother Fletcher, and listening with prejudice through the hours of deliberate verbal presentation, exposition and answer to related questions, I cannot but have certain personal reactions, and of course have come to certain definite conclusions. These I will state in condensed form, with no attempt to elaborate by inclusion of the Scripture basis. And I should perhaps repeat that they are solely my individual attitude, as I have conferred with no one else, and represent no one else.

I had hoped, before our conferences together, that the points in question were but technical, verbal, and secondary, and that satisfactory adjustment might yet be made by our brother. But it is evident that Brother Fletcher has developed an entire substitutionary system of teaching on the Sanctuary and the Judgment that, if accepted, involves abandonment of the denominational view.

I do not have a closed mind. I am open to advancing light. But I consistently believe that fuller light will not invalidate the light already received. It will not deflect the clear rays of the past. Rather, it will but fill with a fuller, deeper, richer content strengthening and supporting, amplifying and consummating the truths before delivered.

I am asked to cast away my confidence for uncertain inferences, private interpretations, and a speculative philosophy that to me is intangible and mysterious. This I cannot do. My personal duty appears very clear to me. I must earnestly contend for "the faith once delivered," in accordance with my ordination vows. And being unable to see other than danger, darkness, and disaster in the three propositions submitted, and in the essential corollaries, I must not only clearly deny them but must warn against them.

And this is said with full recognition and sincerest appreciation of the high personal character, the fine spirit, and evident sincerity of our brother, but whose views I solemnly believe to be wrong doctrinally, and inimical to the faith.

As a minister in the church of God, and an officer in the Association of the ministers of this movement, I earnestly entreat you Brother Fletcher as a brother, to retrace your steps. Come back with us, Brother Fletcher, in faith, in hope, in doctrine. I sincerely appeal to you to abandon these divergent private views and to return to the platform of this movement.

I solemnly admonish you to take heed to the united entreaty of the Australasian Division leaders and to your ministering brethren at headquarters. Turn, I beseech you, from the path upon which you have started. Where, I pray you, does it lead? Where have these digressive paths led through all the years of the movement in the past? Let the manifest answer be a solemn warning and deterrent to you.

To what and to whom will you go? It is too late to start a separate movement — eighty-five years too late. And the second coming of our Lord is too imminent. Stay by the old ship Zion.

For the sake of those across the seas, whom you will profoundly influence by your decision; for the sake of the unity and advancement in God's remnant church, and for your own soul's welfare, I plead with you to be admonished by the prayers and the appeals of your brethren. Start anew in a positive, confirmatory study of the truths which have been confirmed to this people, and that satisfy the minds of a conscientious, truth-loving host of God's remnant children. Won't you do it?³⁵

What is not so well known is that Froom found himself unable to answer the heretic, and that that fact gave him much mental anguish which he endured till his death over forty years later. It is not difficult to date the beginning of his conflict for we have a letter from one of the editors of the *Signs* written in reply to Froom on Jan. 28, 1930. There we read:

I think that we have to educate the most of our people, especially certain ones of our leaders, in regard to the fact that there are certain questions that will be forced upon us for discussion. **If we are not willing to discuss them frankly among ourselves, our enemies will drive us to this discussion.** And if we could only get together and properly discuss these matters among ourselves and arrive at reasonable conclusions, we would not make such scattering shots when the enemy turn their guns upon us.

We have had warnings through the Spirit of Prophecy of how that every position among us will be tested, and that we will have to learn how to defend our faith in the battle that lies ahead of us; and we can all see that this battle is coming. In this conflict we will be tempted to doubt the positions of our faith first. Then we will be led step by step in our doubting of the Spirit of Prophecy. Then we will be led on further in the doubting of the Bible itself, so that the great arch-deceiver can swing us under his tremendous deceptions; and among all those that will be deceived in these last days, none will be more thoroughly deceived than the Seventh-day Adventist who allows himself to wander off in the fog of unbelief.

Now I note particularly what you say about your studies of the sanctuary question, and how that in some details your conclusions are brought into — conflict with the teaching of the Spirit of Prophecy,” and that you — find it necessary to make some readjustments.”

I think, Roy, that we need to be on our guard when we get onto that ground. Personally, I have never regarded the Spirit of Prophecy as being the infallible Word of God, but on the other hand a constant reading of the writings of Mrs. White for the last fifty years has led me to the conclusion that there can be no mistake in regard to the source from which her writings come.³⁶

We should carefully observe Tait's concern, not only about Froom but about the many who took extreme positions on Ellen G. White — so much so that they neglected to make the Bible first in their study. His hope that the doctrinal problems facing the church (such as the sanctuary ones raised by Froom) would be thrashed out by very frank and free discussion was never fulfilled, and has not been until this day. His warning that “if we are not willing to discuss them frankly among ourselves, our enemies will drive us to this discussion” is pertinent for 1980.

When one reads Froom's discussion on the sanctuary truth in volume 4 of *Prophetic Faith*, one finds that his view of the “larger Intent” of the sanctuary doctrine tends to submerge the usual traditional exposition.

HAROLD SNIDE

Harold Snide was born before the turn of the century as a “blue-blood” Adventist whose ancestry went back to the Miller movement. His grandfather, Elder H.W. Lawrence, was a Millerite in 1844 and was later ordained by James White as a Seventh-day Adventist Minister.

By 1914 Harold Snide was a colporteur, and the *Review* in the twenties carries fervent material from his pen. He was the author of *Prophetic Essays*, a work which drew the attention of L.E. Froom. By the 1940's he was teaching at Southern Junior College after many years of dedicated service to the cause. While here he found difficulty with our traditional sanctuary positions, especially as he studied Heb. 9. These he took to L.E. Froom and other denominational leaders but received, he claimed, no help. A very studious man, he underwent great mental trauma and finally withdrew from the church, though his widow remains a faithful member to this day. After his defection he wrote *Some Serious Questions for Studious Seventh-day Adventists* — a tract calculated to arouse doubts concerning the Spirit of Prophecy and our doctrinal positions. Typical questions in his series include the following:

Does the author of the book of Hebrews make his Old Testament quotations mostly from the Hebrew or from the Greek (Septuagint)? What says M.L. Andreasen, *The Book of Hebrews*, p. 422? Do scholarly “Introductions” to the book of Hebrews refer to this fact? Do the texts of Westcott and Hart and of Nestle indicate by a different style of type the quotations from the Old Testament? Do these Greek New Testaments supply a key to indicate the Old Testament source of each quotation? Do they show that in Heb. 6:19 “within the veil” (εσώτερον του καταπετασματος) is a quotation? From which Old Testament book and chapter is it quoted? Would this fact give this expression in Heb. 6:19 a precise meaning, and determine which veil is meant? Would it make it as definite as does the word “second” in Heb. 9:3? How many times in the Septuagint does this phrase εσώτερον του καταπετασματος occur? What are the references?

In Daniel 8 what is the relationship between verse 13 and verse 14? Do they sustain the relation of question and answer? Is any light thrown on this by E.G. White in *PK 554*? By the comment on this verse in U. Smith, *et al.*, *Daniel and the Revelation*? By W.A. Spicer, *Certainties of the Advent Movement*, p. 120? By E.E. Andross, *A More*

Excellent Ministry, pp. 160-161? Is the period of 2300 days a time ~~to~~ give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot?" In Daniel 8, is anything said about the ram's taking away the daily sacrifice and treading down the sanctuary and the host? Did Persia, in fact, do this? In Daniel 8, is anything said about the goat or its first great horn's taking away the daily sacrifice and treading down the sanctuary and the host? Did Greece under Alexander the Great, in fact, do this? In Daniel 8, is anything said about the oppression of God's people by the four horns of the goat? Did they, in fact, notably oppress Israel before the rise of Antiochus Epiphanes? Is it true that in Daniel 8 the work of taking away the daily sacrifice and treading down sanctuary and host is predicted and predicated solely of the "little horn" which came out of one of the four horns? Does the reference to ~~the~~ "the vision of the evening and the morning" in Dan. 8:25 refer specifically to the time prophecy of Dan. 8:14? Does the question in verse 13 and its answer in verse 14 refer specifically to the work of the "little horn" described in verses 9-12? What says M.L. Andreasen, *The Sanctuary Service*, top of page 264, in the last paragraph beginning on page 263? Does the time period of Dan. 8:14 as certainly delimit the persecuting program of the "little horn" of that chapter as the period ~~a~~ "time, and times, and the dividing of time" marks the career of the "little horn" of Daniel 7? Did Rome cease treading down sanctuary and host in 457 BC? Is it reverent exegesis to date the Roman oppression of Israel from a Persian decree to restore and to build Jerusalem given nearly three centuries before Rome contacted Israel.³⁷

R.A. GRIEVE

About a decade passed, and the old controversy was revived in Australia over the case of conference president R.A. Grieve, a well-known member of a family whose members had served the church loyally and long at home and abroad in the mission fields. We do not propose to dwell on this history, but a single letter from him explains his view of problems connected with the sanctuary. Several ministers were separated from the work at the same time as Brother Grieve, and some members of the laity withdrew from the church. Here is the letter.

Dear Brother Lawson: Word has been passed on to me by Brother Lee that like most of your fellow-members of the church you are wondering why I have been dropped from the Adventist Ministry, and a reign of silence has been wrung down on the issue. Well I would not want to enter upon a long explanation to justify myself. Actually self and what happens to oneself really does not matter. The really big thing that counts is the truth of God and His saving gospel realized in the lives of God's people that really matters.

To begin with, what I preached in Queensland regarding two great truths was the start of the controversy. The *Sinless Nature of Jesus Christ*, and *Justification* were the twin truths God impressed me to preach before I left your conference. The extremists massed, if you remember, at the 1955 camp to oppose these truths. Criticisms were poured into the ears of F.G. Clifford, who himself was no more enlightened or understanding than those who appealed to him.

He commanded me not to preach these truths. What seemed to rile him most was that the people both in Queensland and New Zealand were rejoicing in the absolute forgiveness of their sins and the assurance of salvation. ~~Rejoicing in error~~ "he styled their heart-stirrings, and ruled at the trial of Pastor Drain ~~That the denominational position is: God neither forgives absolutely nor entirely.~~"

As a corollary to this heresy he added yet another, —That the same Spirit that inspired the Bible also inspired the writings of Mrs. White, and THEREFORE WE MUST HAVE THE SAME FAITH IN THE WRITINGS OF MRS. WHITE THAT WE HAVE IN THE BIBLE.” By this letter axiomatic deduction he automatically lifted the writings of Mrs. White to the plane of equality with the sacred scriptures.

The whole controversy I have had with the church leaders revolves around these twin heresies. I utterly rejected them as nauseating to the mind and intelligence of true Bible believers and Protestants. And in rejecting these untenable teachings at my trial, I was forced by the committee, elected to support Clifford, to look the Sanctuary teaching of Seventh-day Adventists fair in the face and decide whether that was correct according to the teaching of the great book of Hebrews. You may ask what the Sanctuary has to do with these issues. I reply, —Everything!” Why, because the whole understanding of the gospel by Seventh-day Adventists, the forgiveness of sins, the Investigative Judgment, and the final blotting out of sin all stem from this. Protestantism as inaugurated by Luther was founded on the book of Romans, which book makes no reference to the old Aaronic Sanctuary, and therefore all the churches in line with true Protestantism, have believed in the blotting out of sins for the believer at the acceptance of Christ. It was the acceptance of the Sanctuary teaching by the pioneers of the church that countermanded the teachings of Luther, Wesley and other great reformers, and set the teaching on the so-called pattern of Aaronism in opposition to Protestantism. Well I am getting ahead of myself for my understanding of these truths came after my trial not before.

At my trial I presented *Justification* in 25 pages of typewritten material. It was fairly exhaustive, so I cannot repeat the ideas here, suffice it to say that I proved that Justification in scripture is equivalent to the modern term acquittal, so modern translations indicate, and all Greek scholars acknowledge. When a man is acquitted of all charges and stands innocent, —just as if he had never sinned,” he is justified.

Secondly, forgiveness and pardon, must not be confused with or made synonymous for justification. In receiving forgiveness or pardon there is the acknowledgment of the deed, a record of wrongdoing; but in justification there can be no sustaining of the charge, no recording of wrongdoing. So David discovered, —Blessed is the man against whom no sin is recorded by the Lord” Rom. 4:8. So Peter declares, Acts 3:19. —He has forgiven you all your sins: Christ has utterly wiped out the damning evidence of broken laws and commandments which always hung over our heads, and has completely annulled it by nailing it over His own head on the cross.” Col 2:14 Phillips trans. *Letters to the Young Churches* (Only 3/3 paper edition, well worth getting).

My conclusion was: True Protestantism recognizes that in justification the **record** as well as the guilt must be blotted out, for record and guilt are indivisible. It is the very negation of justification to keep a man’s sins against his name after his acceptance of Christ. This raised a storm. The brethren began to quote —*Great Controversy*” by the yard. I asked for clear Bible proof that our sins still remained upon the record. This they promised to do, but my brother it was just a sham and a pretence. Three men were set up as a committee to study with me — Battye, Stewart, Conley. In true Adventist style and in the most childlike way they set out to give me a Bible study on the Sanctuary. When they got to the point of the record remaining there they broke down. They tried in good Jesuitical fashion to split the difference between sin as guilt and condemnation and sin as record. They told me that I could believe that sin and guilt is blotted out entirely on the acceptance of Christ, but that the record remains. They read

many statements from E.G. White that Christ on the cross bore our guilt and condemnation. They said Sister White **seems** to make a difference between guilt and record. On this **seem-so** from the writings of Mrs. E.G. White I was asked to recant. I did agree to use this formulae in order to go as far as my enlightened conscience would allow and to have harmony with my brethren, but F.G. Clifford although originally agreeing to this definition, this straw splitting terminology, refused to agree to it as a denominational position. He threw it overboard first in order to force me into the extremist camp or out altogether. I rejected it too, but I went over into Protestantism.

On my way back to N.Z. it became as clear as the noonday sun why the leadership of the church were in a dilemma over justification. For more than a century they had believed in a two-apartment sanctuary in heaven. They had resurrected *in toto* the Aaronic sanctuary, the Aaronic priesthood and every detail connected with it and pushed it into heaven where Christ was supposed to be after the order of Melchizedek, but in practice and service after the order of Aaron. This was the gigantic swindle.

Careful study of Hebrews 9:1-11 proves that the first apartment called the first tabernacle, was only for the time **then** present, was only to continue until the ~~new~~ order," verse 10 Moffatt. That Christ as a High Priest went into the Holiest of All, verse 12, Phillips trans. verse 24, and 10:19. And the RSV on Heb. 6:19 says that Jesus enters into the inner shrine behind the curtain." Moffatt, ~~Enters~~ the inner Presence behind the veil." So there is no holy place in heaven.

And if there is no holy place you would not expect Christ to be ministering after the pattern and performance of the common priests or even the High Priest in the Holy Place. And this is the very teaching of Heb. 7:26, 27. ~~Who~~ needeth not daily as those high priests, etc. for this He did once for all **when** He offered up Himself." In other words the practice and pattern of the priests in the first apartment met its complete and utter fulfilment in the one and only one act of Jesus when He presented Himself to the Father. Heb. 10:11, 12 makes the dissimilarity between the two priesthoods most apparent. Then it is an absolute heresy to teach that Christ was making applications of blood like Aaron did on earth—even to suggest that He is doing it antitypically from the time of the cross until now. Hebrews says that Christ sat down, ceased from offering, was not involved in repeated actions such as the priest of old was, for he never sat down in the sanctuary. The only place in the sanctuary where there was a seat was in the Most Holy Place, and he did not stay long enough to sit down. Christ won a place in the Most Holy Place, realized the goal of Old Testament prophetic enactments, and having realized it, never to go back, sat down.

Well this brings us to the next revelation of the book of Hebrews 9 and 10 that the writer after mentioning the activities of the priests in the first apartment, Heb. 9:6, then promptly forgets them. He is concerned to make a comparison between what the High Priest did on the great Day of Atonement, Heb. 9:7, and what Christ did when He entered Heaven, verses 11-13, and he continues to make a comparison between what the High Priest did on the great Day of Atonement and the antitypical acts of Jesus concerning that final national ceremony. On that day, and only on that day the High Priest went into the Holy Places (plural) verse 24. The priest went through the holy place on his way to the Most Holy; so Christ, verse 11, went through a greater and more perfect tabernacle on the way to the presence of the Father Who was in the Most Holy Place, verse 24. Nor did Christ have to **sacrifice** Himself repeatedly after the annual habit of the High Priest, verse 25. Nor does Christ have to keep offering Himself after

the pattern of the Day of Atonement. Both sacrifice and offering on the Day of Atonement order is over, for on the day of resurrection Christ ~~appeared~~ to put away sin" or as Moffatt and others translate ~~to~~ abolish sin" verse 26. It was on the Day of Atonement that the high priest appeared to put away sin for Israel, and symbolically after that there was no more remembrance of that year's sins. So after saying that Christ put away sin, in 10:1-18 Paul shows that since Calvary there is no more remembrance of sins for true spiritual Israel. When you grasp these two great facts, one apartment in heaven and one once for all atoning act of Christ, you can see how the message of Romans on Justification meshes completely with the ministry of Jesus in Heaven.

To clinch the whole thing, Paul proves in Heb. 9:16,17 that a covenant is of force after men are dead, not before. In other words the repeated ceremonial acts of Jewish priests were necessary because the testator Christ had not died, but after Calvary when the testator had been proved to have died, the covenant with all the benefits came into operation. We don't have to wait till 1844 for them. These benefits are enumerated in Heb. 8:12 and 10:15-17. But according to a letter received from W.E. Battye for and on behalf of the denomination who was about to sack me, only portion of the new covenant is of force now and that portion is Heb. 8:10 the law written on our hearts. He claimed that the other two sections were yet future, namely, not teaching every man his neighbour and their sins and iniquities will I remember no more'. When I replied, ~~that~~ just proves how foolish a man can become in the defence of an heretical system that is out of harmony with the plainest teachings of the word of God," they promptly sacked me. I do not wish to be critical of the brethren, some of whom were my superiors and some mine equal, but they were the smallest-minded group of theologians ever. They made me ashamed to think I had accepted everything on a platter as Q.E.D. and when I searched the Bible and the Bible alone, I found these apparently profound teachings the veriest heresy ever.

The two-apartment sanctuary in heaven is based on very superficial reading of the Scriptures. Because Moses was told to make everything according to the pattern showed him in the mount, the pioneers and their successors lumped to the unwarranted conclusions that the Old Testament sanctuary was an exact pattern of the one in the third heavens, whereas Paul declares, ~~It~~ was necessary for the earthly reproductions of heaven realities to be purified." Heb. 9:23. And again, ~~For~~ since the law has but a shadow of the good things to come" and not the very image (Authorized) ~~instead~~ of the true form of these realities." Heb. 10:1 RSV.

Basing their whole interpretation of the sanctuary on Dan. 8:13,14, they made the ministration of the priests in the first apartment apply to the ministry of Christ from His ascension till 1844; and the ministry of the High Priest in the Most Holy to Christ from 1844 till He comes. Thus they gave a time value of 1800 years to the first apartment ministry; and a time value of 112 years so far to the most holy ministration.

As the GC has laid it down that no doctrine can be built out of the types and shadows or from the symbolical books such as Daniel and Revelation, but on the clear unfigurative language of scripture, I simply ask for one text from the clear unfigurative books of the Bible for the warrant of giving time values to the shadowy ministry of the Aaronic priests. Just one text.

Further, the GC has stated that every sacrifice of the OT regardless of the time, place, or number, represents the one and only sacrifice made by Jesus on the cross. Well then on

what logical grounds can we say that the priests who ministered and offered those numerous sacrifices, represent two and not one ministry of Christ? If many sacrifices represent but so many facets of one sacrifice made on Calvary's cross, I ask on what logical grounds say, so many priestly actions and offerings do not represent so many facets of the one offering of Jesus at His ascension, one act of offering that one and no more?

But postulating two apartments in heaven and two ministries the church has split the atonement. Read the statement made by Mrs. White in *Patriarchs and Prophets*, p. 355, bottom of page, ~~the~~ offering of the blood in the daily service **had not made full atonement**, it had only transferred sin to the sanctuary." Elsewhere she speaks of **the "final atonement"** made in 1844. In other words, if the type be followed, during the first 1800 years since the cross, sins were confessed, the blood of Christ applied, but the blood of Jesus had not made full atonement for sin.

In proof that this is the position read *Patriarchs and Prophets*, p. 356, first paragraph, that in the daily service the sinner acknowledged the claims of the law confessed his sin, but he was not yet released from the condemnation of the law. So by parallel, those who lived before 1844 and even those whose names have not come up in the judgment have not yet been released from the condemnation of the law.

Why does this extraordinary position exist? Because it is stated in the same paragraph of *Patriarchs and Prophets*, ~~Not~~ until the day of atonement did the High Priest go in to the Most Holy and put blood over the mercy seat and consequently over the law to make satisfaction for its claims.'" In other words, according to the theory of the church and Mrs. White, the broken law went unsatisfied for 1800 years until in 1844 Christ took the blood in! Hence no one could be entirely released from the condemnation of the law until after 1844!

Thirty years ago W.W. Fletcher was declared a false and heretical teacher because he said the blood of Christ did not transfer sin, but in fact expiated or blotted sin out. This is what the great theologians of the church claimed 30 years ago. ~~Hence~~ it is that the sin offering (in the daily service) **did not completely expiate the guilt**. The sinner was not entirely released from the condemnation of the law until the type was completed on the Day of Atonement; **for the blood did not reach the mercy seat over the law until the type was completed on the Day of Atonement.**" Quoted in *Reasons for My Faith*, p. 34, W.W. Fletcher. What heretical nonsense! Yet the same spirit of ignorance and bigotry prevailed at my trial. This time they refused to answer me on these paragraphs. They said that all those who have questioned these paragraphs have trodden on dangerous ground. Dangerous because it is so damnably incorrect with scripture. Paul said the law was satisfied in his day. Rom. 3:20, 21, ~~Therefore~~ by the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified in His sight; but now apart from the law, the righteousness of God hath been manifested, **being witnessed, or attested by the law ...**". To witness or attest the validity of righteousness is to be satisfied with it. The law was satisfied all right for Paul says, ~~There~~ is therefore now (in AD 50 not 1844) no condemnation." Rom. 8:1. He did not say like our theoreticians, ~~not~~ completely expiated," partly expiated, partly not. He did not say like Mrs. E.G. White, ~~Not~~ entirely released from the condemnation of the law." No, he said, ~~There~~ is therefore NOW NO CONDEMNATION."

After all these pontifical pronouncements by the leaders of the church they discovered in the E.G. White archives (and they are always discovering when it suits them) this statement which contradicts both *Patriarchs and Prophets* and *Great Controversy*, and the AUC statement made to Fletcher 30 years ago. This is it — “Still bearing humanity, He ascended to heaven, triumphant and victorious. He has taken the blood of the atonement into the holiest of all, sprinkled it upon the mercy seat and His own garments, and blessed the people.” E.G. White, “Signs of the Times,” April 19, 1905. Quoted in *The Sanctuary Service* by Andreasen, p. 235.

Fletcher has been dead several years. They keep on quoting he died a frustrated man! Frustrated by a church which refuses to acknowledge that she has been wrong at any time in its history! Brother Froom, gentleman and scholar that he is, is making gigantic claims for the church, that we are the only true protestant church today, the successor and inheritor of all that has gone before, and under the cloak of such statements the church is being slowly aligned to the true protestant position. A young worker told me yesterday, “We don’t hold rigidly to the types today as in Fletcher’s day, we don’t have to believe in two apartments, we just believe in two ministries.” Of course I rejoice that such young men believe that way, but one man is thrown out to satisfy caprice and jealousy. But the statement also proves that the church was wrong 30 years ago, and I very believe, is wrong now. In another 30 years they will be where I am today, and I do not say that boastfully.

Well, brother, I have written you lengthily. I do not usually do this nor do I have any intentions of writing at so much length to all my friends. I am too busy to be able to do so. I am happy in my work though I have a pang of regret for the people that I cannot now minister to, not even open my mouth in the church at all for I am under the interdict of the church authorities. Still the Lord Jesus is my Saviour and friend and I get big opportunities for witnessing for Him.

Give my Christian regards to your wife and family, may see you some day.

Sincerely, yours,
R.A. Grieve³⁸

In studying the correspondence between the Australian church leaders and the General Conference president, one finds that R.A. Grieve claimed support for several of his positions from veteran evangelist and editor, R.A. Anderson. Certain of these positions such as the sinless nature of Christ, and justification, have now become widespread in the church, and the former particularly came to the fore through the efforts of the then editor of the Ministry. On the matter of the sanctuary, R.A. Anderson was well known for his protests against over-literalisation. His teachings on Heb. 9 in Australia in the forties had raised a storm, but none could sustain a charge of heresy against one who so ably and wholeheartedly served his church from childhood. At the time of his trial, R.A. Grieve used personal letters addressed to him by Elder Anderson.

The events of “down under” made it clear that the issue of Hebrews and the sanctuary was by no means dead. It was soon to be raised again in a deeply significant, though novel, approach from laymen.

R.D. BRINSMEAD

The end of the fifties in Australia saw the beginning of the “Awakening Movement” under the leadership of R.D. Brinsmead. While studying for the ministry at Avondale College, Robert

Brinsmead became convinced that the church's note on Dan. 8:14 had become strangely muted. Indeed, he asserted that the corpse of the investigative judgment doctrine had been denominationally interred. *Questions on Doctrine* was affirmed to be a "sell-out" to apostate Protestants. The real truth about Dan. 8:14, said Robert Brinsmead, was that it contained a most precious promise concerning the removal of original sin from the hearts and lives of God's faithful people who trusted in the merits of Christ. In order to give the Loud Cry, it was necessary that the Lord's people should become as sinless in the flesh as Christ had become through the same miraculous operation of the Spirit.

As chairman of the Bible department of Avondale College from the end of 1960, this present writer was deluged with inquiries on the new teaching regarding the sanctuary. He had earlier written Robert Brinsmead from USA pointing out that Heb. 9 gave a very different interpretation of the Day of Atonement to that proposed by the new movement. This was the opening sally of polemical interchanges in an unending "war" of approximately a decade — until Robert Brinsmead wrote a paper renouncing all hope of eschatological perfectionism, and thereby repudiated his former sanctuary teachings. This is not to infer that Des Ford was responsible for Robert Brinsmead's change of view, though some slight contribution may have been made to that end.

It was a new view of righteousness by faith which led R.D. Brinsmead to repudiate his former position on eschatological perfection. He frankly traced the development of his original and subsequent positions in a two-part paper entitled *A Review of the Awakening* circulated early in the 1970's. Simultaneously our general church paper changed its view on perfection as any study of the journal over the last two decades makes clear — but the direction was the opposite to Brinsmead's. Thus those in Australia, including the present writer, who had opposed the "Awakener's" position on Dan. 8:14 for over ten years, now found themselves at odds with the *Review*.

This was the setting for the Palmdale Conference where this writer as well as sharing in the discussions on righteousness by faith, also in private urged upon church leaders the necessity for studying problems in connection with our traditional sanctuary presentation. His booklet, *—Dan. 8:14 — The Judgment and the Kingdom of God,* was then placed in the hands of these brethren.

We gave this history to underline the relationship between the righteousness by faith message and our sanctuary teaching. They are closely intertwined, and to be wrong on one is to be simultaneously wrong on the other. R.D. Brinsmead inherited the traditional view of the sanctuary doctrine and it led him into eschatological perfectionism. In some respects his experience is a microcosm of that of many within the church. If living without a mediator after the close of the investigative judgment requires a character without blemish or shortcoming or any type of imperfection, how can perfectionism be avoided? On the other hand, if Gal. 2:16, 21; Rom. 3:20; 8:1, 23, 33, 34; and the doctrine of glorification are to be taken seriously, how can Adventists contend for perfection in the flesh at any time in this life?

R.A. COTTRELL

In 1959, Ford had talked at length with Raymond Cottrell on sanctuary and Daniel Issues, and contact has been maintained over the years with particular reference to these matters. From him he learned that the sanctuary problems had risen again to sharp focus here in Washington during the preparation of volume 4 of the *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*. Simultaneously had come the discussions between Walter R. Martin, Donald Grey Barnhouse, and such leaders as L.E. Froom, R.A. Anderson, W.E. Read. Indirectly, the editors of the

Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary were involved, as almost daily they engaged with their own brethren in the study of problems in Dan. 8 and 9.

Brother Cottrell was asked by the editorial committee on *Questions on Doctrines* to review, summarize, and evaluate the articles by those opposing our sanctuary doctrine. Such statements as the following made such a project necessary.

SDA claims its teachings are based upon the Bible, but an examination of its *—Fundamental Beliefs*” published in the volume *Questions on Doctrine* reveals some interesting exceptions. *—Fundamental Beliefs*” contain 22 propositions, beginning with a statement on the Scriptures and the Trinity, then moving through the gamut of theology. In each instance the biblical passages are listed at the end of each statement showing the grounds on which their convictions are founded. Without biblical backing, however, are statements 13, 14 and 15. These deal with one of the touchiest segments of Adventist teaching — the 70 weeks and 2300 years and the cleansing of the sanctuary. The date 1844, which involves the 2300 years and the cleansing of the sanctuary, are pivotal of Seventh-day Adventist faith. Destroy these and certain conclusions are self-evident. There would be no adequate basis for the existence of SDA. But there are **no** definite statements in the Bible which support the view of SDA on this point. Their conclusions are derived from the teachings of Mrs. White, which, in turn, are the result of her **interpretation** of the Bible.³⁹

The latter doctrine [the investigative judgment], to me, is the most colossal, psychological, face-saving phenomenon in religious history. We personally do not believe that there is even a suspicion of a verse in Scripture to sustain such a peculiar position, and we further believe that any effort to establish it is stale, flat, and unprofitable. [Farther on he characterizes the investigative judgment concept as *—unimportant and almost naive.*”]⁴⁰

In counsel with Elder Nichol, Elder Cottrell wrote twenty-seven leading Adventist Bible teachers for their insights on the contemporary problems. All twenty-seven replied, and many at considerable length. But the replies yielded no additional help and, according to Elder Cottrell, the replies demonstrated that we still had no satisfactory answer to criticisms of our position. For example, **all twenty-seven scholars admitted that there is no linguistic evidence for connecting Dan. 8:14 with Leviticus 16. The majority also asserted that there is no contextual evidence in Dan. 8 for our doctrine of the investigative judgment.**

As mentioned earlier, Elder Nichol took the results of the inquiry to the president of the General Conference, with the result of the appointment of a select group for a highly confidential committee on the problems in the book of Daniel. The committee consisted of:

H.W. Lowe as chairman, and R.A. Anderson, Raymond F. Cottrell, Richard Hammill, Edward Heppenstall, W.G.C. Murdoch, D.F. Neufeld, Leo Odom, and W.E. Read. Others later invited to meet with the committee included Earle Hilgert, S.H. Horn, Alger Johns, Graham Maxwell, and M.R. Thurber.⁴¹

In order to make freedom of expression easier, no minutes were kept over the five years of the meetings of this committee. Forty-five papers were considered, including four by the present writer.⁴² No unanimity was reached on the problems considered, the proposed written conclusions for the benefit of the church were never prepared. Elder Figuhr said it would not be necessary even for the committee to make any sort of official summary of their work for presentation to the officers. (This is the testimony of the committee members.)

Some members of the committee strongly affirmed that it is quite impossible to legitimately deduce the denominational sanctuary teachings from the Scriptures, and that the answer to the dilemma was to view the inspired writings of Ellen G. White as the authority for ~~re-~~interpretation” of the Biblical passages. **These members believed that Ballenger, Fletcher, Conradi, Prescott, Grieve and others had been correct in their reading of Heb. 9.** It is hardly possible to exaggerate the importance of this Daniel Committee for the church today. With the new administration, the committee was not continued, and has never been revived since. More on Cottrell’s work shortly.

C.G. TULAND

One Adventist scholar who spent a day with the Daniel Committee on special invitation was Dr. Carl Tuland. Dr. Tuland, a scholar and author in many languages, held pastoral and administrative responsibilities in the Middle East, USA and South America, etc. We quote from a paper on Dan. 8 prepared by him for the consideration of the church. (Style forms are his.)

Yom Kippur was the cleansing of the **sanctuary** itself from the accumulated sins of Israel, as well as the cleansing of the **people** from sin. That, of course, is quite different from the **defilement** brought upon the temple AND ITS MINISTRY by physical means such as the introduction of idols under Ahaz, and with them of pagan worship and destruction of the true worship, by pagan and papal Rome. These two different types of defilement, either by the moral wrongs of Israel, or its pollution by paganism and false religion, were two distinct problems, and, therefore, required two different kinds of ~~re-~~cleansing.” Thus it seems that our fundamental points of comparison are out of focus if we equate the **annual** cleansing of the sanctuary from the sins of Israel with the cleansing of the whole temple and its services from idolatry. One leads to the moral purification of Israel, the other to the restoration of the whole cult. Thus, neither Hezekiah’s restoration nor Dan. 8:14 have any direct reference to *Yom Kippur*. Such an analogy can be used only by introducing the (last phase of) the ministry of Christ, limiting it to the day of judgment (investigative judgment), which in my opinion is **an arbitrary and unilateral exegesis**.

It seems to be of extraordinary significance, the most prominent contemporary Seventh-day Adventist writers, including publications printed under the auspices of the General Conference have recognized the actual meaning of as ~~re-~~restored to its rightful state” or a rendering close to this concept. However, this admission has always been made with certain reservations and hesitancy which will be understood as we read their observations. M.L. Andreassen agrees that the word *sadaq* [KD^] means ~~justified~~” in Hebrew. ~~The~~ word contains the idea of restoration as well as of cleansing.” (*The Sanctuary Service*, p. 29) While the first part of this statement is right, **the second is definitely incorrect**.

Another instance how also Adventist authors can be prejudiced is found in George McCready Price’s book, *The Greatest of the Prophets*, when he SAYS: ~~The~~ literal Hebrew is not cleansed’, but rather justified’, or vindicated’, meaning that at the time specified the sanctuary or temple, in Daniel’s day lying in ruins, would again function as before, its services naturally culminating in *Yom Kippur*, the climactic ceremony of the year. Indeed, this passage might well be translated: Then shall the sanctuary have made atonement for it.” (*The Greatest of the Prophets*, p. 188) As

right as his acceptance of the correct meaning of the Hebrew term is, so incorrect is his conclusion and suggestion as to rendering that part of Dan. 8:14.

But it seems that more than most of our authors, McCready Price has struggled with the problem of correctly understanding the meaning of the text. He also says: ~~In~~ "In the light of these principles, we may well ask again, What is the real meaning of the clause, **Then Shall the Sanctuary Be Cleansed?** (emphasis his)." (*idem*, p. 197) He then proceeds quoting a number of translations which all support the Hebrew text in contradistinction to the KJV. (*idem*, pp. 197, 198) After that he makes a strenuous effort to reconcile the two different concepts, but not without sacrificing the meaning of the Hebrew term by making a near equation of cleansing and justifying. ~~From~~ "From all this discussion it should become clear that this answer, **Then Shall the Sanctuary Be Cleansed or justified**, has a depth of meaning in it, much more than might appear on the surface. In face, it may mean either or all of the following: ..." (*idem*, p. 198) In his subsequent interpretation he comes actually very close to the true meaning of the prophecy, yet he is not willing to give up the KJV. (*idem*, pp. 198, 199) But McCready Price has sensed the greater significance of that prophecy.

We may assume that in the book *Problems in Bible Translation* (1954), prepared by a committee specially appointed by the General Conference, we have an authoritative statement regarding the denominational interpretation of Dan. 8:14. The following excerpts are found on pp. 174-177. ~~The~~ "The Hebrew word *sadaq* is used here, for which no variant readings are given in any Hebrew Bible. All lexicons agree in giving the meaning of the word as to be just, to be righteous." In Dan 8:14 the word occurs in the Niphal form (the reflexive or passive), and would ordinarily be translated be justified, or be made righteous." (*Problems*, p. 175) After giving a few examples of translations supporting this right view, the writer continues: ~~It~~ "It therefore appears that the translators of the RSV as well as other versions have approached very closely to the correct translation of the word when they render then the sanctuary shall be restored to its rightful state." Those versions that render it be righted, be declared right, be justified, or be vindicated have also handled the word acceptably." (*idem*, p. 175) What follows is a quite accurate statement of the reason for our adherence to an inadequate interpretation: "The word itself does not really mean to cleanse in the sense to wash. That meaning is borrowed from the sanctuary ritual, as we shall note below." (*idem*, p. 175) Then, again, the writer reverts to what might be called as preconceived interpretation, but **not a translation**: "... as well as from the fact that the basic meaning of the word to justify, to vindicate, or to set right very definitely has a ceremonial aspect in all Semitic languages in which the word occurs." (*idem*, p. 175) To the latter view I would hardly subscribe, for the conclusions cannot be based on the premises that ~~to~~ "to cleanse" and ~~to~~ "to justify" can be derived from the same word *sadaq*. But we can avoid the censure of incorrect translation by a better exegesis of the text, i.e. understanding the ~~cleansing~~ "cleansing" of the sanctuary as what it is in reality, namely, only a **part** of the greater truth, which is the restoration of the sanctuary to its rightful state.

Another attempt in this direction is found in the *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*:

~~Be~~ "Be Cleansed." From the Heb. *sadaq*, ~~to~~ "to be just," ~~to~~ "to be righteous," the verb occurs in the form here found (niphal) only this once in the OT, which may suggest that a specialized meaning of the term is indicated. Lexicographers and translators suggest various meanings, such as ~~be~~ "be put right," or ~~be~~ "be put in a

rightful condition,” ~~be~~ righted,” ~~be~~ declared right,” ~~be~~ justified,” ~~be~~ vindicated.” The translation ~~shall be cleansed~~” is the reading of the LXX, which here has the verb form from *Katharisthesetai*. It is not known whether the translators of the LXX gave an adapted meaning to the Heb. *sadaq* or translated from manuscripts employing a different Hebrew word, perhaps *tahar*, the common Hebrew word for ~~to~~ be clean,” ~~to~~ cleanse.” The Vulgate has the form *mundabitur*, which also means ~~be~~cleansed.” (*Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* 4:844)

Of course, there are always possibilities of errors, but as we have read in *Problems in Bible Translation*, there are no variant readings in the Hebrew Bible for this text. It seems that there is no need for a steadying of the ark by improbabilities, and the truth is not in need of being saved by doubtful argumentation. We have been admonished to investigate the books of Daniel and Revelation for the wealth of truth still to be discovered in them, and it seems to me that by interpreting Dan. 8:14 in the larger context, as has been suggested, we can accept the Hebrew term without sacrificing our position.

In *Questions on Doctrine* (1957) additional information is found. ~~This~~, we believe, is the temple that not only is to be cleansed (Dan. 8:14), but is also to be justified (margin), put right, vindicated, as will be noted shortly.” (*Questions on Doctrine*, p. 263) This is followed by a lengthy discussion.

9. Intent of ~~be~~cleansed.” The significance of the various terms used by translators to indicate the full intent of the ~~be~~cleansing” (Hebrew *tsadaq*) of the heavenly sanctuary (Dan. 8:14) should not be lost. Eleven different renderings appear in standard translations. These are: (a) ~~be~~cleansed” (Septuagint, Rheims-Douay, Moulton, Boothroyd, Spurrell, Martin, Vulgate, Harkavy, Ray, Knox, Noyes, French-Osterwald, Segond, and Lausanne – the KJV, and the ARV); (b) ~~be~~ justified” (Leeser; Sawyer; ARV, margin; KJV, margin); (c) ~~be~~ victorious” (Margolis); (d) ~~be~~ righted” (Smith-Goodspeed); (3) ~~be~~ declared right” (Young); (f) ~~be~~ restored to its rightful state” (RSV); (g) ~~be~~ made righteous” (Van Ess); (h) ~~be~~ restored” (Moffatt); (i) ~~be~~ sanctified” (Fenton); (j) ~~be~~ vindicated” (Rotheram); and (k) ~~be~~ consecrated” (Luther). (*idem*, pp. 265, 266)

After a reference to *Problems in Bible Translation*, pp. 174, 175, a text already quoted above we again find the same kind of reasoning characteristic for this position: ~~We~~ recognize that the justifying, vindicating, and making righteous of the Levitical sanctuary was accomplished by the services on the Day of Atonement, when the sanctuary was cleansed from all defilement (Leviticus. 15:16).” (*idem*, p. 266) We can only repeat that the restoration of the sanctuary encompassed more than its cleansing, if the ministry of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary shall be understood in its totality and not be confined to a single phase, even if this happens to be one of great importance.⁴³

Dr. Tuland proceeds to give an interpretation of Dan. 8:14 along the lines of Conradi, Prescott, Daniells, W.C. White — in other words, the ~~new~~” view of the daily. But with Tuland, it is obvious that this is not an addition to the investigative judgment concept but the reality taught in the verse. Dr. Tuland also views Heb.9 identically to Fletcher.

E. HILGERT

This writer (Ford) spent much of 1959 in study at the Seminary in Takoma Park, and there engaged in discussions on the sanctuary with several of the faculty and students. He found that Dr. E. Hilgert had given much attention to the issues, and that his conclusions were essentially identical with those of some on the Daniel Committee with which he occasionally sat. The result of my discussion with Dr. Hilgert was a series of articles on the sanctuary published in the Ministry, and an MA. thesis entitled *“Daniel 8:14 and the Latter Days.”* Dr. Hilgert contended that it was impossible to prove the year-day principle from Scripture, and thus early in the articles mentioned above were two on this topic. He also referred to the contextual problem, and this prompted my writing of *“The Problem of Dan. 8:14 and Its Context.”* [See appendix.]

D. SIBLEY, D. FORD

Returning to Avondale at the close of 1960, Desmond Ford counselled with Pastor David Sibley, a leading administrator in the Australasian Division, as to how to teach the sanctuary doctrine to ministerial students. Should he present it traditionally, despite the defects of such an approach, or should he point out the problems and attempt to give answers? Elder Sibley had been appointed by the Australian leaders to study the Fletcher position, and to contest it around the country. He knew the issues intimately, and conceded that Fletcher was by no means entirely astray, and that therefore the new chairman of Avondale’s theology department should honestly admit the problems, but attempt the best possible resolutions of them.

Some years earlier, Ford, at Elder Sibley’s request, had publicly discussed the issues raised by Elder R.A. Grieve, before the main church in Queensland Conference, of which Elder Grieve had been president. Thus, during the sixties, the apologetic offered through the pages of the *Ministry* by Ford became standard for ministers in training in the Australasian Division. On Hebrews 9, the following was handed out in classes from year to year. This material of the 1960’s is a key to the present manuscript.

HEBREWS 9 AND THE SANCTUARY

Problems of Hebrews 9: Paul undoubtedly refers to the Day of Atonement in connection with what Christ has already done. He makes no allusion to a coming Day of Atonement near the end of the world.

Answer:

1. Paul’s objective throughout Hebrews is to show the greater privileges of Christians in this dispensation that the Jews possessed in the age prior to the cross. His main point in Heb. 8-10 is that believers now have immediate, unrestricted access to God through Christ, rather than only representative access through a high priest once a year. To this end he uses the Day of Atonement type but without any attempt to exhaust the fullness of the type. For example, there is no reference to the final disposition of sin upon Azazel.
2. All the Jewish feasts included types of Calvary and the first advent. Paul did wisely in drawing upon the Day of Atonement as well as upon the types of the daily ministry. Seventh-day Adventists have never contended that the antitypical goat was slain in 1844.
3. The feasts, all of which were linked with the harvest, pointed to the reign of God, which reign comprehends both the kingdom of grace and the kingdom of glory. The

privileges which will be available in all literal fullness at the time of the kingdom of glory appertain now in spiritual outline. Thus we now have spiritual access to God, but at the kingdom of glory we will have complete physical access. (Taught by the Day of Atonement.) Similarly, the Passover pointed not only to the cross, but to time when Christ shall eat the Passover feast with us in the kingdom of God. See Matt. 26:29. Thus in 1 Cor. 11 Paul speaks of the communion service pointing, like the Passover, forward ~~to~~ "till He comes." This demonstrates that the fact that an inspired writer can apply a typical feast to the first advent does not negate a further application to the later kingdom of glory.

4. A similar illustration lies in the Jubilee type which Christ applied to the first advent. See Luke 4:18-19, and compare with Lev. 25. (Christ's use of the phrase ~~to~~ "preach deliverance" parallels the expression in Lev. 25:10 ~~to~~ "proclaim liberty.") All commentators see the complete fulfilment of the Jubilee type in the kingdom of glory, but what will then be available literally is now available spiritually in Christ.
5. Furthermore, God's original plan was that the kingdom of grace and glory should not be far removed from each other. The Old Testament prophecies always link the two proclaiming ~~the~~ "the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow" in the one prophecy. Thus the New Testament references to the ~~end~~ "of the world" having come with Christ's first advent. See Heb. 9:26; 1:2. Had the church been faithful, the task of spreading the Gospel would have been completed in the first century and Christ would have returned. (See *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* introduction and notes on Rev. 1.) Thus the Day of Atonement type including the offering of the sacrifice, its presentation, and its final application of judgment would have quickly transpired each upon the other, and there would have been nothing remarkable in the application made by Paul in Hebrews of this significant Old Testament ceremonial.
6. Well-known scholars such as George Eldon Ladd have pointed out that the relationship between the kingdom of grace and the kingdom of glory is that of fulfilment and consummation. As the receiving of eternal life by faith now is an anticipation of immortality, and as the receiving of the Holy Spirit now is an earnest of His complete indwelling at glorification, so our free access to God's immediate presence through Christ's high priestly ministry points to the ultimate consummation at the final fulfilment of the antitypical Day of Atonement. Paul's application of the Day of Atonement to our present privilege should not be considered as denying the latter application when the type shall be consummated. (See Heb. 4 for a similar parallel re the ~~rest~~ "available now by faith, and the final ~~Sabbatismos~~" awaiting us in glory.)

The employment of Day of Atonement imagery eschatologically by the Revelator in 8:1-4; 11:19; 13; 15:5, etc., is complementary to Paul's usage of the type in Heb. 9.

Desmond Ford



ELLEN G. WHITE AND HEBREWS 9:23

Problem: Ellen G. White had often been criticized for applying Heb. 9:23 to a future work of Christ, and for applying the Day of Atonement in general to such a future work.

Answer:

1. Ellen G. White has innumerable statements implying the word ~~at~~onement" in such a way as to make it clear that she believed that the soteriological atonement took place at the cross. See the appendix to *Questions on Doctrine* for such references. In *Early Writings*, 251 and 253 she refers to Christ's work in the heavenly sanctuary from 1844 to the end as a ~~s~~pecial" and ~~f~~inal" atonement. These facts make it clear that she believed that the Day of Atonement had an initial application to the cross, but a subsequent, special, and final application from 1844 to the end.
2. The statement in *Desire of Ages*, page 25, regarding the atonement shows that Ellen G. White believed the Day of Atonement to have a very wide application indeed, including the type of Christ's incarnation, and also types of His final work for men which will culminate in His return in glory. The relevant quotations in *Desire of Ages* and *Acts of the Apostles* follow.

~~In~~ stooping to take upon Himself humanity, Christ revealed a character the opposite of the character of Satan. But He stepped still lower in the path of humiliation ... As the high priest laid aside his gorgeous, pontifical robes, and officiated in the white linen dress of the common priest, so Christ took the form of a servant, and offered sacrifice, Himself the priest, Himself the victim" (*DA*, 24).

~~As~~ in the typical service, the high priest laid aside his pontifical robes, and officiated in the white linen dress of an ordinary priest; so Christ laid aside His royal robes, and garbed Himself with humanity, and offered sacrifice, Himself the priest, Himself the victim. As the high priest, after performing his service in the Holy of holies, came forth to the waiting congregation in his pontifical robes, so Christ will come the second time, clothed in garments of whitest white, so as no fuller on earth can white them.' He will come in His own glory and in the glory of His Father and of all the angelic host who will escort Him on His way" (*AA*, 33).

3. The following quotation from the *Signs of the Times*, April 19, 1905, shows that Ellen G. White understood Heb. 9:23 to apply to the ascension of Christ and the dedication of the heavenly temple, and the inauguration of His priestly ministry as well as His final ministry in the heavenly sanctuary after 1844.

Still bearing humanity, He ascended to heaven triumphant and victorious. He has taken the blood of the atonement into the Holiest of all, sprinkled it upon the mercy seat and His own garments, and blessed the people. Soon He will appear the second time to declare that there is no more sacrifice for sin.

See *The Sanctuary Service* by Andreasen, p. 235.

Compare the foregoing quotation with Lev. 8 re the anointing of the priests and Ex. 40:9 and 30:26 regarding the anointing of the sanctuary. See also Dan. 9:24 re the ~~an~~ointing of the Most Holy."

4. Paul places Heb. 9:23 midway between the discussion of the dedication of the two covenants, and the Day of Atonement entrance into the Holiest of holies. He does this because on both occasions in the type the immediate presence of God was entered by the priest. This demonstrates that Paul's main purpose is to show available access rather than to exhaust the meaning of the Day of Atonement type.

The fact that the Jewish feasts fell into two main divisions, the second of which particularly emphasizes the kingdom of glory, indicates that the Day of Atonement has its complete apotelesmatic fulfilment in connection with latter-day events. Many commentators have seen this, and John the Revelator by his use of Day of Atonement imagery in chapters 8, 11, 13 and 15 demonstrates it. Thus Paul's presentation of the Day of Atonement with reference to the kingdom of grace is complemented by John's presentation re the kingdom of glory, and Ellen G. White in harmony with other inspired writers applies the type to both events.

Desmond Ford



These positions taken many years ago embody the essence of this present manuscript of 1980, and the following pages may be read with less trauma if the foregoing Avondale material is thoroughly understood. In essence, it asserts that Adventists have been right in asserting that the Day of Atonement applies to the judgment at the end of the age, but that we have erred in failing to see that it also pointed to the judgment of which Christ spoke in John 12:31. Ellen White saw both, while the rest of the Christian world, including ourselves, have seen only one or the other.

Inevitably, the attempt to strengthen our sanctuary conclusions by non-traditional arguments led to some misunderstandings.⁴⁴ Only a knowledge of our recent history added to understanding of our early church experience can alleviate such. The more the relevant materials of the White Estate and GC Archives are studied, the more apparent it becomes that Ellen G. White greatly feared a shift to subjective religion which minimized the objective atonement taught by the sanctuary doctrine. We have been caught up in that shift for over a decade, and only a correct understanding of the relationship between the sanctuary truth and the gospel can save the denomination from increasing trauma and loss. The recently discovered materials on the Minneapolis conference and the Bible conference of 1890 must become well-known to leaders and laity.

We have omitted much in this review, including less familiar protests from workers and laity overseas. For example, well-known in Germany and known to some in California is Curt Sinz, former chief editor of the *Adventbote* — the equivalent to our *Review*. In 1925, he confided to L.H. Conradi his inability to reconcile the sanctuary doctrine with the book of Hebrews, particularly chapter 9. At this time he had never heard of Ballenger and Fletcher. According to Sinz, it was this discussion with Conradi that initiated the latter's final break with the church. In 1928, Sinz published an article suggesting that the first apartment of the sanctuary represented the Old Testament era, and the second apartment the New Testament age, and that Christ at His ascension entered the Most Holy. This article provoked Elder L.H. Christian, president of the Central European Division to state at a public meeting: "We find articles in our church papers which do not reflect the teachings of the church." Another who agreed with Sinz was Dr. Michael, principal of Marienhohe Academy. The latter was consequently relieved of his post.⁴⁵

Also well-known to many was C.L. Price, brother of George McCready Price. Always a faithful Sabbath keeper, this believer wrote at length to the General Conference president and others, protesting the denomination's presentation of the sanctuary doctrine. There are a number of items in print representing his position which is akin to W.W. Fletcher's. Another old-time Adventist, still in good and regular standing, is Eryl Cummings, who has besieged the GC and its staff on the same issue over a period of years. These names but represent a

considerable group around the world, including administrators, pastors, scholars and laity, who find our current sanctuary teachings inadequate.

Influencing the current scene, is R.D. Brinsmead's *1844 Re-Examined*, which the BRI is now examining. Members of the present committee would do well to study it. It summarizes long-known problems with the traditional presentation. Compare and contrast it with the *Forum* presentation of Oct. 27, 1979, PUC, and the Xeroxed volume, *Dan. 8:14 the Judgment and the Kingdom of God*, written years ago.

From 1844 to the closing up of the work of the Daniel Committee in 1965 and consequent events — from James White's protests against the investigative judgment doctrine to similar protests over a century later — we seem to have come full circle, ending almost as we began. We wish now to show from our official literature of the second half of that period the gradual recognition of the inadequacy of the early denominational arguments. This review also will be incomplete, but we trust sufficient for the purposes of this document.⁴⁶

Most of the following pages trace the printed recognition of sanctuary problems, and the concessions made in result. The instances given from our literature all come from loyal Seventh-day Adventist scholars who, along with this writer, believe that Dan. 8:14 has special significance for our church and the world. But first we will allude to sanctuary materials also from loyal Seventh-day Adventist teachers, but belonging to categories different to the above.

There has been over the years a continuing flood of popular materials which have not recognized the exegetical problems involved, and because these have taken over the traditional positions unchanged, we do not, for the most part, include them for special attention. Typical of these would be W.D. Frazee's devotional interpretation in *Ransom and Reunion Through the Sanctuary*, and doctrinal works such as Reiner's *Atonement*. The fact that such writers seem quite oblivious to the issues at stake does have significance.

For example, on page 35 of his book Elder Frazee speaks thus: —. in the holy place... the sin-bearing priest ... He must bear this burden until the final blotting out ...” The priest referred to is Christ, and we can only say that doctrinally such a statement is unfortunate. Hebrews is emphatic that our victorious King-Priest is now seated at God's right hand, claiming the benefits of His atonement — not bearing guilt. Such works are helpful spiritually, but give no special aid to the troubled soul having difficulties reconciling Adventist positions on the investigative judgment with the facts of Scripture.

Let us cite another instance, this time from Reiner. Referring to Heb. 9:8, he says, —The author of Hebrews is simply saying that the heavenly sanctuary is more holy than the Hebrew one.”⁴⁷ Such a comment is amazing for its naïveté. But this very naïveté characterizes most of the sanctuary presentations in the church, whether in print, or from the pulpit or evangelistic platform.

Such presentations only disturb those who are informed, disappoint those who are troubled, and do little to energize a recalcitrant church towards fulfilment of its divinely appointed missionary task. Intellectually lacking, they leave us naked and defenceless towards our critics. While this continues, our attempt at a —Loud Cry” will yield but a muffled whisper, and all the trumpetings heralding new evangelistic endeavours will yield only disappointing results. Unless our doctrinal content can satisfy the greatest of honest minds, as well as humble, uneducated souls, much of our labour will be fruitless. —Error is never harmless” and —never sanctifies.”

A very small group of writers may lay claim to being in another category. Familiar with the problems, they have not yielded to them, or yielded very little. Some articles by W.E. Read seem to fit this category, but other articles by him do not. The significant and very carefully written articles by Gerhard Hasel and Alwyn Salom may belong here, and these have much to offer the church today. Salom's article on the linguistic issues of Heb. 9 is much more accurate than almost everything written prior to that time, with the exception of our *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*. It is possible that both these writers, who are exceedingly well-informed, may be most significant for what they do not say. Their articles will be discussed in the next chapter.

Also in this third category may belong the recently published work on Hebrews by William Johnsson.⁴⁸ Though doctrinally irenic, it is a superb contribution. Johnsson, after referring to the allusions to the Day of Atonement in Hebrews adds: "Not surprisingly, several students of Hebrews, among whom A.F. Ballenger is best known, have eventually parted company with the Seventh-day Adventist church."⁴⁹ This volume is an excellent basis for researching the New Testament interpretation of the sanctuary and Christ's priesthood, though it seems to us that certain of the issues affecting Adventist positions are not treated with the same thoroughness the author shows elsewhere. Johnsson reminds us that "In Hebrews ... Jesus as High Priest is a dominant idea and the book works it out in great detail."⁵⁰ But he himself has not felt it to lie in the domain of his own purpose to pursue those details where they touch on sensitive doctrinal positions. On page 116 we have a frank statement which stands in striking contrast to early Adventist claims. "The argument of Hebrews, then, does not deny the Seventh-day Adventist sanctuary doctrine, because basically it does not address the issue." In other words, if we wish to get the sanctuary doctrine, we will need to look elsewhere than the New Testament, for this is the only New Testament book which discusses the meaning of the Old Testament tabernacle typology!

Also noteworthy is the clear statement of Christ's present state as King, too often lacking in other Adventist literature. See page 128. And for the purpose of this present manuscript, Johnsson's reference to inaugurated [or proleptic] and consummated eschatology is important. He speaks on page 129 of the "already of Calvary and not yet of the Parousia stamped on all New Testament thought." When we apply this to the Day of Atonement in a much more comprehensive way than hitherto, some of our chief doctrinal problems in connection with Dan. 8:14 will dissolve.

Leaving now these subsidiary (for our purposes) categories of writers we turn to those who best indict the contemporary trend of Adventist scholarship on the sanctuary.

We wish to return to the work of one already named, in order to deal with a presentation of the sanctuary altogether unique in our history. From his quarterly on Daniel issued over a decade ago, just after the Committee on *Problems in Daniel* was dissolved, come most significant indications of new trends in Adventist scholarship regarding the interpretation of Dan. 8:14. As a significant official publication, this presentation on Daniel⁵¹ is a fitting introduction to the second half of this chapter.

R.F. Cottrell has probably done more research on Daniel and the sanctuary issues than any other person in the denomination ever. W.E. Read was untiring in this area, but his work centred chiefly upon the linguistic issue of Dan. 8:14, whereas Cottrell has wrestled with the broader involvements, including the entire prophetic scope of Daniel. He has not only mastered the Hebrew chapters of that book, but memorized whole passages in the original.

Over a thousand pages of closely argued exegesis on Daniel has been written, but not published, by Cottrell.

As associate editor of the *Review*, a leading editor of the *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* and a close confidant of F.D. Nichol, Raymond Cottrell has been thoroughly informed on the knotty problems facing the denomination doctrinally on Daniel and Hebrews. In volume 4 of the *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* we have his article, *“The Role of Israel in Old Testament Prophecy,”* which is noteworthy for insights both vital and revolutionary. Some of these insights went to our world church in his lesson quarterly on Daniel in the first quarter of 1967. If we wish to understand some of the new approaches to the difficulties which face us, this quarterly should be closely studied.

As material prepared for lay consumption, it is not entirely frank, but nevertheless it is light years beyond all previous studies in published form on Daniel and the sanctuary.

Key concepts of the 1967 quarterly on Daniel include:

- (1) The conditional nature of the prophecies of the Old Testament, including those of the seer in Babylon. This conditional nature means that because of Israel's failure, the prophecies will never be fulfilled in the precise way set forth, but like those of the major and minor prophets they require that reinterpretation which is to be found in the New Testament. (This principle applied may mean, for example, the omission of some details in later fulfilment or fulfilments — such as ~~two~~ two thousand three hundred evening-mornings,” if we understand Cottrell right.) But the matter does not rest there. Because the entire New Testament corpus assumes that the church would be faithful in spreading the gospel to the world in that generation, its reinterpretation of Daniel is also conditional. From Matthew to Revelation, it is taken for granted that Christ would return in the lifetime of the readers of the New Testament, and prophecy assumes a shape consistent with that expectation.
- (2) Dan. 8:14 is related to its context (a very rare acknowledgment in Adventist sanctuary literature). The ~~new~~” view of the ~~daily~~” is strongly affirmed.
- (3) The judgment of Dan. 7:9-13 and Rev. 14:7 apply primarily, not to professed believers in Christ, as we have traditionally taught, but to the wicked little horn. Babylon the great is judged.
- (4) It is plainly stated that Dan. 9:24 does not refer to weeks of days. Therefore the year-day principle is not seen as present in this prophecy.
- (5) When the author interprets Dan. 8:14, he omits any discussion of the investigative judgment.**

In summary, Cottrell is saying that, to rightly understand Daniel's prophecies, we must first study them in their original historical context, and according to God's primary intent if His people were faithful. Because of Israel's failure, we must not expect to be able to trace an absolutely ~~one~~ for one” fulfilment now of these prophecies — only in general lines do they apply to the Christian era. The year-day principle was no part of the original forecasts which point to a Messianic era that could have become universal ages ago, had Israel done her appointed work. The judgment brought to view in Dan. 7, and in Rev. 14, is primarily one focused on wicked powers, not the saints, and the cleansing of the sanctuary likewise. This is indeed revolutionary in Adventist literature, but it does express the thinking of some scholars

who have worked individually and without collusion. In an appendix we quote some of the most relevant passages of Cottrell's quarterly.

Let us underline the facts. In 1967 the world church was given an interpretation of Daniel and the sanctuary message quite distinct in its basic assumptions from anything hitherto presented. It was an attempt to wrestle with problems too long neglected. On the principle expressed in John 16:12 the writer did not feel free to say all that was in his thinking but he said enough to show the tremendous change in Adventist scholarly thought now commencing to assert itself. As regards the investigative judgment, the quarterly refuses to teach it and assumes the noncommittal objective "record of history" approach which is so prominent in the *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* wherever issues are strongly debatable. For example, we read on page 40, after a clear statement that the judgment pictured in Daniel concerns apostate powers, the additional comment that "Seventh-day Adventists have also thought of this scene as a portrayal of the judgment of individuals, as well as of organized human opposition to God and to the saints." "Seventh-day Adventists have also thought" is an anaemic defence of a position acknowledged as difficult to defend. Such difficulties are recognized by many of our writers, as we will now illustrate.

III. NEW SANCTUARY POSITIONS ASSUMED BY ADVENTIST SCHOLARS

The Atonement

Old Position: “Christ did not make the atonement when He shed His blood upon the cross. Let this fact be forever fixed in the mind.” U. Smith, *Looking Unto Jesus*, pg. 237.

New Position:⁵² See *Questions on Doctrine* for representative statements, particularly noticing the Ellen G. White appendix on the topic. In essence, the Atonement was made at the cross, and let that fact be forever fixed in the mind. According to *Questions on Doctrine*, Adventists “fully agree with those who stress a completed atonement on the cross in the sense of an all-sufficient, once-for-all, atoning sacrifice for sin. They believe that nothing less than this took place at Calvary” (pp. 342-343).

The well-known “Declaration of Beliefs” in 1872 affirmed:

With His own blood He makes atonement for our sins; **which atonement so far from being made on the cross, which was but the offering of the sacrifice, is the very last portion of His work as priest**, according to the example of the Levitical priesthood, which foreshadowed and prefigures the ministry of our Lord in heaven.

This was omitted in the 1931 declaration. Note that the latter is not an entirely new statement, but one purposely written to preserve what was defensible from the old, and to omit the rest.

This change in the matter of the atonement becomes chiefly relevant as we remember that the Day of Atonement was the Day of THE Atonement. To contrast the two in our thinking is to miss the Biblical point. After all, even the most zealous of traditional Adventists have never believed that Christ was slain in 1844.

Literal Apartments in Heavenly Sanctuary

Old Position: Christ from AD 31 to Oct. 22, 1844, was in the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary, and then at the latter day entered a flaming chariot to enter the second apartment.

New Position: From 1931 our Yearbook official statement of *Fundamental Beliefs* speaks of “phases” of ministry, not “apartments.” In an article written in the mid-sixties I listed similar quotations from current sources:

“To speak in terms of the symbolism of the earthly sanctuary, which was ‘a copy of the true one’ (Heb. 9:24 RSV). On the great antitypical day of atonement, beginning in 1844, our great High Priest may be thought of as leaving the holy place of the heavenly sanctuary and entering the most holy place. Accordingly, the ‘shut door’ would be that of the holy place of the heavenly sanctuary and ‘open door’ that of the most holy place, where Christ has been engaged in the work of the great antitypical day of atonement since that time (see *GC* 430, 431, 435; *EW* 42). In other words, the ‘shut door’ indicated the closing of the first **phase** of Christ’s heavenly ministry, and the ‘open door’ the beginning of the second **phase**” (*SDABC* 7:758, 759).

—.. when Christ ascended to heaven, there to serve as our High Priest He began the first **phase** of His heavenly ministry, or to borrow the figure of Scripture, He entered the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary. There, day by day through the long

ages of the Christian Era, He has ministered His shed blood in behalf of all who come unto Him by faith. Then we believe that in 1844 He began the second **phase** of His priestly work, as prefigured by the work of the earthly high priest in the second apartment of the sanctuary on the typical Day of Atonement.

—We have believed from the beginning that the year 1844 marks a significant last-day experience for the children of God, and indeed for all men, because the second **phase** of our Lord's priestly work concludes with the end of time, and the end of probation for all. We have always believed that the essence of this second **phase** of Christ's labour is the making of the final decision as to who, among all the professing Christians of the world, has truly appropriated the proffered grace and forgiveness offered by our Lord, and who is thus accounted worthy' (Luke 20:35) of a place in heaven above. We have held this position consistently with our Lord's statement describing last-day events: He that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved' (Matt. 24:13).

—We have therefore rightly seen in this second **phase** of our Lord's priestly ministry, a work of judgment. We have always described it as the investigative judgment, because, as just stated, it is during this time that investigation is made as to who is accounted worthy, a preliminary of the great day when God shall execute judgment upon all. Hence, borrowing the language of the ancient typical service, we have spoken of this work of our Lord from 1844 onward as the great antitypical day of atonement.

—... the greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands' (v. 11) is equated with heaven itself' (SDABC 7:456).

—In Heb. 6:19 Paul leaves the word veil' undefined. He wishes to call attention, not to the veil, but to that which is within (or behind) the veil, 'namely, the place where Christ our High Priest ministers. In other words, Paul is using the word veil (*katapetasma*), not in terms of a technical discussion of the structure of the heavenly sanctuary, but as a **figure of speech** to describe that which divides the seen from the unseen, the earthly from the heavenly. Hence, **„within the veil“ means simply to be in the presence of God**. According to this view, hope is represented as entering the very presence of God, where Christ Himself has gone (v. 20; cf. ch. 9:24)" (SDABC 7:437-438).

—... the earthly sanctuary, with its two apartments, and its cycle of services, is a shadow, 'or outline, of the work of Christ for sinners on Calvary and in heaven above. Indeed, we can probably feel to speak with more certainty regarding the sanctuary service than we can regarding almost any other aspect of God's ways toward man, for there is actually presented before us, as adequately as earthly symbols can do so, the great original in heaven.

—From what may be known of the earthly we can draw certain conclusions regarding the heavenly. As the earthly service could not begin until the priest had an offering to sacrifice, so Christ began His work as our High Priest in the heavenly sanctuary following the offering of Himself. As the earthly sanctuary service has two phases, represented by two apartments, **even so the heavenly has two phases**. And as the earthly service was in terms of the first phase until the climactic Day of Atonement, even so the heavenly service was in terms of the first phase until that time, near the close of earth's history, when our great High Priest entered upon the second phase of

His priestly ministry. The prophecy of Dan. 8:14 (see comment there) reveals that He began that second phase in 1844.

~~However~~, as noted in the comment on Ex. 25:9, **it is futile to speculate as to the dimensions, exact appearance, or precise arrangements of the heavenly sanctuary**, for no earthly structure could represent its vastness and its glory' (*PP*, 357). Man is in the image of God' (Genesis. 1:27), yet only Christ is the express image of his person' (Heb. 1:3). **The earthly sanctuary was patterned after that in heaven to the extent that it was a vivid representation of the various aspects of Christ's ministry** on behalf of fallen man (*PP*, 357). We may rightly speak of the holy place' and the most holy place' of the heavenly sanctuary, for thus we employ the language and symbols of the earthly sanctuary (Ex. 26:33, 34) to understand, as best we can, the truth regarding the heavenly sanctuary. But we should not permit any **finite perplexity in visualizing a heavenly sanctuary on the order of the earthly**, to glue in our minds the great truths taught by that earthly shadow, one of which is that Christ's ministry for us is carried on in two phases or two great divisions, to borrow the words of Ellen G. White (*PP*, 357). This truth is vital to a proper understanding of the work of our great High Priest. For a more extended discussion of this truth the reader is invited to see the comments on the texts cited.

The epistle of Hebrews discusses the work of Christ as our High Priest. In certain instances, for example chapter 9, Paul speaks of the two apartments of the earthly tabernacle and makes a certain application to Christ's ministry in heaven. Hence, this book has sometimes been the centre of theological discussion as to the interpretation of Paul's words on the matter, particularly as to whether he teaches that there are two apartments in the heavenly sanctuary or two great divisions' to Christ's priestly ministry.

~~Now this commentary believes unqualifiedly that Christ's heavenly ministry is carried on in „two great divisions,” or, to borrow the symbolism of Scripture~~, in the holy' and then the most holy place' of the heavenly sanctuary" (*SDABC* 7:468).

~~We speak of all this in the language of men; for only so, by symbol and speech, could God convey any idea to men of the great work of the atonement and the judgment.~~ Human mind cannot grasp the realities of that heavenly scene of judgment: the books of God — not like our books or records, but inerrant and complete; the symbolic blood — not actual blood but the life which the blood signifies; the holy place and the most holy — **not rooms as we conceive them but the ineffable abode of the great God** and His ministering spirits; the day of atonement — not a literal day, but a period the length of which is known only to God. **And so with all the other symbols.** ..." (A. Spaulding, *Captains of the Host*, 103).

~~While~~ He does not minister in places made with hands' (Heb. 9:24), seeing He is sovereign Lord, yet the two types of ministry carried out in the ancient sanctuary — first, that of reconciliation in the holy place, and second, that of judgment in the most holy — illustrate very graphically the two phases of our Lord's ministry as High Priest". *Questions on Doctrine*, 389.⁵³

Was Moses Shown the Actual Heavenly Sanctuary?

Old Position: Yes.

New Position: No.

—It is futile, however, to speculate as to the dimensions, exact appearances, or precise arrangements of the heavenly sanctuary, for no earthly structure could represent its vastness and its glory' (*PP*, 357). Man is In the image of God' (Genesis. 1:27), yet only Christ is the express image of his person' (Heb. 1:3). Anything finite can at best but dimly resemble that which is infinite. Moses was shown not the heavenly sanctuary itself, but a representation of it. The earthly sanctuary was patterned after that in heaven to the extent that it was a vivid representation of the various aspects of Christ's ministry on behalf of fallen man (*PP*, 357). We should focus our attention on what He is doing for us there as Paul does in Hebrews (Heb. 3:1; 10:12, 19-22; etc.)" (*SDABC* 1:636).⁵⁴

Did Blood From The Offerings Of The Common People Go Daily Into The First Apartment?

Old Position: Yes. See Smith's *The Sanctuary*. 203.

New Position: No. See Leviticus. 4:27-30 and note comments of *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*. See also Andreasen's *The Sanctuary Service*, 137.

Does Blood Defile?

Old Position: Yes. (All our old writers so affirm).

New Position: No. Blood cleanses. See Heppenstall's *Our High Priest*, 82-83.

What Sins Were Recorded By The Blood?

Old Position: Transgressions of the Ten Commandments.

New Position: Only accidental or ceremonial errors — never the deliberate transgression of any one of the Ten Commandments. See Andreasen's *The Sanctuary Service*.⁵⁵

Sin offerings sufficed only for sins done through ignorance. —If a soul shall sin through ignorance" (Leviticus. 4:2); —If the whole congregation of Israel sin through ignorance" (v. 13); —If any one of the common people sin through ignorance" (v. 27); —If ought be committed by ignorance" (Numbers. 15:24); —If any soul sin through ignorance" (v. 27) — these are statements connected with sin offerings. They concerned sins of error, mistakes, or rash acts, of which the sinner was unaware at the time, but which afterward became known to him.

Sin offerings did not cover sins done consciously, knowingly, defiantly, or persistently. When Israel sinned deliberately, as in worshiping the golden calf, and refused God's proffered mercy when Moses called them to repentance, they were promptly punished. —There fell of the people that day about three thousand men" (Ex. 32:28). So with the man who despite God's express command gathered sticks on the Sabbath (Nu. 15:32-36). He was put to death.

Concerning wilful or presumptuous sins, the law reads, —But the soul that doeth ought presumptuously, whether he be born in the land, or a stranger, the same

reproacheth the Lord; and that soul shall be cut off from among His people. Because he hath despised the word of the Lord, and hath broken His commandment, that soul shall utterly be cut off; his iniquity shall be upon him.” Verses 30, 31.

To this general rule there were some exceptions which will be discussed in the chapter “Trespass Offerings.” It should also be noted that though there was no provision in the daily ritual for conscious or wilful sins, sins ~~done~~ with a high hand,” the services of the Day of Atonement provided for such transgressions.

Within the Veil Heb. 6:19

Old Position: Can only mean ~~within~~ the first veil”. See works by Smith, Watson, Andreasen, etc.

New Position: It means ~~within~~ the second veil”. Said Andross:

Moses passed ~~within~~ the veil” and poured the holy anointing oil upon the ark of the testament, and also sprinkled the blood of consecration upon it before the regular service in the sanctuary began. In like manner, Christ, after making His offering on Calvary, passed ~~within~~ the veil” of the heavenly sanctuary and anointed the ark of the testament, and with His own blood performed the service of consecration.⁵⁶

The *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* allows for this position because so many among us now hold it. For example, a contemporary college Bible teacher has written:

The Adventist Problem

Seventh-day Adventists believe that Christ, at His ascension, began His high priestly ministry in the heavenly sanctuary. They see two phases to that ministry, corresponding to the two phases of the Levitical ministry: the daily and yearly services. Christ’s ~~daily~~” ministry began at His ascension when He entered the Holy Place of the sanctuary above to intercede for sinners; His ~~yearly~~” ministry began in 1844 when He entered the Most Holy Place above to begin the work of the investigative judgment.

But the writer of Hebrews describes Jesus entering the Most Holy Place at His ascension!

Where Did Christ Go At His Ascension?

According to the apostle, Jesus ~~sat~~ down at the right hand of the Majesty on high (1:3; 10:12); He is ~~seated~~ at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in heaven, a minister in the sanctuary and the true tent which is set up ... by the Lord,” 8:1, 2; 12: 2, 3. He has entered ~~into~~ heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God on our behalf,” 9:24, 25. God’s throne, in the sanctuary setting of the book of Hebrews, corresponds to the ark in the Most Holy Place. His presence on the throne corresponds to the Shekinah above the ark.

The author further states that He has ~~passed~~ through the heavens” (4:14, 16), through every barrier, ~~into~~ the inner shrine behind the curtain,” (6:19, 20). The Greek is *eis to esoteron tou (katapetasmatos)* — difficult to translate literally. *Esoteron* is the comparative of *eso*, which means **inner**. The expression literally reads, into the inner of the curtain. Arndt & Gingrich render it ~~what~~ is inside (= behind) the curtain, the Holy of Holies” (*A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, 314). The Revised Standard Version adds a noun: ~~the~~ inner shrine behind the curtain.” This seems to be a

clear reference to the Most Holy Place. It is no doubt the same curtain (the one veiling the Holy of Holies) through which the believer is invited to enter in 10:19, 20.

—Therefore, brethren, since we have confidence to enter the sanctuary by the blood of Jesus, by the new and living way which He opened for us through the curtain ...

The writer also states, —Through the greater and more perfect tent ... He entered once for all into the Holy Place,” 9:11, 12. In verse 25 —Holy Place” (*ta hagia*) clearly means the Most Holy Place: —the high priest enters the Holy Place yearly.”

The picture in Hebrews is unequivocal. Jesus, at His ascension, passed through the heavens, through every barrier, through the curtain, right into the presence of God on His throne. He went into the inner shrine, the Most Holy Place.⁵⁷

And another college Bible teacher, Dr. N.H. Young, writes:

The word itself then is hardly capable of deciding the issue over which veil is referred to in Heb. 6:19. There are some other factors, however, which can be considered as decisive.

1. The outer veil of the tabernacle was cultically unimportant, it was the inner veil which possessed the real significance. (C. Schneider, —*katapetasma*,” *TDNT*3:629.) The Epistle to the Hebrews is more likely to make reference to this theologically meaningful veil, than the more innocuous curtain at the tabernacle’s entrance. (An entrance into the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary would hardly represent the —better” motif that the author labours to project; for this would be less than what the Aaronic priesthood annually accomplished.)
2. The inner veil played a cultically rich role on the day of atonement. The Epistle to the Hebrews draws heavily upon the day of atonement imagery in portraying Christ’s self-offering and high-priesthood and thus presumably has the inner veil and its day of atonement role in view.
3. The immediate context of Heb. 6:19f speaks of Jesus’ entrance —within the veil” as the act of one who has —become a high priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek.” The only place in the Old Testament where it is said that the high priest enters —within the veil” is on the day of atonement (Lev. 16:2, 12, 15), and it here had reference to the Holy of Holies.
4. The Epistle to the Hebrews has a **penchant** for the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament. The actual phrase *to esoteron tou katapetasmatos* (= the inner of the veil) occurs in the Septuagint only in Ex. 26:33; Lev. 16:2, 12, 15 and refers **always** to the inner veil. We should notice that three of the four occurrences are found in the chapter referring to the day of atonement.

We conclude, therefore, on the ground of these considerations of Old Testament usage, Septuagint language, and the context of Heb. 6:19, that the phrase —within the veil” in Heb. 6:19 means —within the holy of holies.”⁵⁸

Many years ago the pastor of Battle Creek Tabernacle wrote to L.E. Froom as follows:

As Moses, when He ascended, He went into the Most Holy place of the heavenly sanctuary, **within the veil** (Heb. 6:19). I do not think we are right in interpreting that to mean the **first** veil. In every place in the Bible where the expression —the veil” or

—within the veil” or —without the veil” is used, it refers to the veil between the holy place and Most Holy place. There was **the hope**, within the veil. As Moses He anointed the Most Holy Place. Dan. 9:24; this was within the 70th week.⁵⁹

Better than all such testimonies is the evidence of the author of Hebrews himself. A parallel passage to Heb. 6:19 is 10:20 where we also read of Christ’s entrance beyond the veil. The allusion of this passage is to the rending of the second veil when Christ died on Calvary. See Matt. 27:51. Ellen G. White is only one of many Seventh-day Adventists who has clearly recognized the significance of this historical occurrence.

The mercy seat, upon which the glory of God rested in the holiest of all, is opened to all who accept Christ as the propitiation for sin, and through its medium, they are brought into fellowship with God. The veil is rent, the partition walls broken down, the handwriting of ordinances cancelled. By virtue of His blood the enmity is abolished. Through faith in Christ, Jew and Gentile may partake of the living bread.⁶⁰

It should be observed that if this new position is correct, and the evidence overwhelmingly supports it, then those who have claimed over the years that Christ at His ascension entered into that symbolized by the Most Holy Place were correct — and the entire debate is over. All that remains is an apologetic showing that what was fulfilled with inaugurated eschatology is filled full with the events of consummated eschatology — a not impossible task. See chapters four and five of this document.

Nature of the Judgment

Old Position: Since 1844 God has been examining the books to find whom He has the right to save.

New Position: —..not to be conceived as God’s poring over the record books.”⁶¹

Old Position: The Father judges, and Christ is the mediator.

New Position: The Father judges no man, but has committed all judgment to the Son. John 5:22.

Daniel 7:9.13

Old Position: This passage pictures an examination of the sins of the believers in Christ. (All Seventh-day Adventist comments on this chapter before 1950 so affirm.)

New Position: This passage pictures an examination of the sins of the little horn, judgment upon that power for the sake of the saints.

This judgment issues in a condemnation of the little horn, and a verdict in favour of the saints ... In this prophecy Daniel refers particularly to one group symbolized by the —little horn” which came in for examination, for sentence, and for condemnation ... He does not aim to list all whose cases are to be considered, he mentions only the —little horn.”⁶² (In the GC Archives, with Brother Read’s *magnum opus* — his unpublished manuscript — is a letter from his secretary protesting the fact that he had departed from the traditional mode of presenting the investigative judgment as taking only the saints into consideration. Apparently, Brother Read was not persuaded.)

Judgment is declared and given against the little horn and the opposing powers in favour of the saints. ... The nature of the judgment embraces judgment upon the little horn.⁶³

Revelation 14:7

Old Position: This judgment is the investigative judgment of the saints.

New Position: This judgment concerns the wicked world as well.⁶⁴

Daniel 8:14

Old Position: Then shall the sanctuary be cleansed — the investigative judgment will cleanse the heavenly sanctuary records.

On the basis of the KJV rendering (which is a mistranslation), Dan. 8:14 was linked with Leviticus. 16, and explained as the investigative judgment.

New Position: But in the twentieth century, an endeavour has been made to link the answer of 8:14 to the question of 8:13. Evangelists had had great difficulty in this area, and therefore the new view of the “daily” found enthusiastic acceptance, as well as energetic opposition of some such as S.N. Haskell, Leon Smith (the son of Uriah), J.S. Washburn, C.B. Starr, F.C. Gilbert and others who held extreme views on the nature of the inspiration of Ellen G. White. Such was the verdict of W.C. White as he surveyed the controversy.

Conradi, W.W. Prescott, A.C. Daniells, W.A. Spicer, W.C. White and others emphasized the new view of the “daily” as the ministration of Christ and thus made possible the interpretation of verse 14 as the restoration of the truth of the gospel. (This did not mean a denial of the investigative judgment but led to a de-emphasis of it.) Note the words of Prescott as recorded by Haloviak.

“Our message against the beast and his image centres right here, and that is to give Christ the place that belongs to Him. When we are preaching the person of Christ, as we have been doing here, we are preaching against the papacy, even though we do not mention the papacy. ... The vital thing is to give Christ His place as the living head of the church. ... His priesthood is a continual priesthood. His sacrifice is a continual sacrifice. His ministry is a continual ministry. All growing out of the fact that He in His own person continued. Now if you take away this, you despoil Christianity. ... Our continual experience is based upon His continual ministration. Our ability to continue as Christians, our ability to continue personally is based upon the Person of Him who continues, and that is based upon His work in His continual service for us. ... The continual sacrifice goes on. It is one sacrifice for sin continually, and we shall live because He gives Himself to us continually. So the whole question of our Christian experience, our ability to work for Him is all bound up in this one thing. Then when the papacy strikes at this one thing it strikes at that which will demolish Christianity. And that is its purpose: to abolish Christianity and put a man in Christ’s place. We must restore the law of God as interpreted by Christ. We must restore the dealing with that law as revealed in the scriptures. We must restore to the people the means of obeying that law, or else we are not giving this message to the world.”

As did other debaters on the ~~daily~~” question, Prescott believed he saw in the subject elements of truth that far transcended the immediate theological issue. As early as 1907 he stated that he believed his view of Dan. 8 established a ~~much~~ more vital connection with the real heart of this message” than had been possible under the previous interpretation. He believed that the ~~new~~ view” enabled a knowledge of the mediatorial work of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary that the denomination was especially called upon to present to the world just as the counterfeit mediatorial system was designed to encompass the world within its false system. He and others attached a special significance to the particular time in Adventist history when light was shining upon this view since it seemed to come at the time when Adventism was moving strongly into Roman Catholic countries. While the message exposed the false sanctuary, Prescott believed it also called the world to a restoration of the pure Word of God and supplied the power necessary for obedience to the law of God by faith in Christ’s mediatorial work.⁶⁵

Haloviak later discusses the attitude of Daniells:

As did almost everyone who engaged in the debate, Daniells believed that the real issues involved far transcended the question over whether or not the ~~daily~~” represented paganism and when it was taken away. If that was the only issue, said Daniells, ~~I~~ would not waste much of my time arguing with men who persist in making claims utterly at variance with all the reliable history of the world.” Daniells believed he received great blessing and deep insight into the glorious Biblical truths concerning the ministry of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary after having immersed himself in the study. Indeed, Daniells believed that the truth concerning the ~~efficacious~~ work of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary” should well have accompanied the presentation of righteousness by faith in 1888. No wonder, Daniells asserted, that Satan instituted the false system that he had through the Papacy. Daniells saw a controversy ~~whether~~ the enemy shall bring in the most stupendous counterfeit that he has ever foisted upon the human family, and put it in place [of] the vital, fundamental truth regarding man’s salvation.”⁶⁶

When W.A. Spicer wrote on the topic he emphasized that the meaning of 8:14 sprang from the issues set forth in verse 13.

The question was, ~~How long?~~” or, more literally, ~~Until when?~~ shall apostasy work its way, seemingly unhindered? When will the truths trodden underfoot by human tradition be lifted up again? When will the Lord give answer to great apostasy?

And the answer was, ~~Unto~~ two thousand and three hundred days [years]; then” then what? ~~then~~ shall the sanctuary be cleansed.” Then, according to the burden of the prophecy, we may look for God to lift up truths trodden underfoot by human tradition that has made void God’s law.

The cleansing of the sanctuary, then, brings God’s answer to error and apostasy. The cleansing of the sanctuary is to lead to the end of the way of error and the reign of sin. Apostasy may for a time exalt itself against God, and tread underfoot the people and the truth of God; but the just balances of the sanctuary will yet pronounce judgment, and the apparent prosperity of evil be cut short.⁶⁷

Years earlier, A.T. Jones, in *The Consecrated Way*, had written at length on the significance of Dan. 8:14. We look in vain for any elaboration of the doctrine of the

investigative judgment. Instead we find the new view of the daily, linking the eclipsing of the gospel by Antichrist in verse 13 and its restoration in verse 14. Jones equated the cleansing of the sanctuary with the finishing of the work of the gospel on earth, the destruction of the wicked, and the cleansing of the universe from all taint of sin. (See 120, 117, etc.) We quote from 112:

In 1844 also was the very time of ~~the~~ days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound," and when ~~the~~ mystery of God should be finished, as He hath declared to His servants the prophets."

At that time there would be broken up the horror of great darkness by which the mystery of iniquity had hid from ages and generations the mystery of God. At that time the sanctuary and the true tabernacle, and the truth of it, would be lifted up from the ground where the man of sin had cast them down and stamped upon them, and would be exalted to the heaven where they belong, and whence they will shine forth in such light as that the earth shall be lightened with the glory. At that time the transcendent truth of the priesthood and ministry of Christ would be rescued from the oblivion to which the abomination and transgression of desolation had consigned it, and would once more and forever stand in its true and heavenly place in the faith of the church, accomplishing in every true believer that perfection which is the eternal purpose of God which He purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord.

It should not be thought that this interest in the ~~daily~~" of 8:13 and its relationship to the reply of 8:14 was only a passing interest. It has remained a centre of attention since the stormy years at the turn of the century when the church was shaken to its foundations by the controversy. Not all, however, have seen its implications for the traditional mode of explaining 8:14 (the investigative judgment interpretation). Two men who did see the implications and who took opposing positions were W.W. Fletcher and C.B. Starr. The following should not only be read, but pondered.

In the eighth chapter of Daniel much is said about great calamities that would befall the ~~pleasant land~~," the ~~host~~," ~~the sanctuary~~," ~~the continual burnt offering~~," and the ~~place of the sanctuary~~." The sanctuary and host are to be ~~trodden~~ under foot." Then it is predicted, that after a long period the sanctuary would be cleansed, or justified. It is manifest that this cleansing, this justifying, or setting right, must be a reversal of or deliverance from the conditions that are described as ~~trampling~~ under foot," and ~~trampling~~ upon."

In Bible Readings 224-229, we have a setting forth of our interpretation of the eighth chapter of Daniel, from which I select the following passages.

~~In~~ Dan. 8:11-13, in the revised version, the words, ~~burnt offerings~~," have been supplied by the translators after the word ~~continual~~" but this rendering seems to place too restricted a meaning upon the word ~~continual~~." The fact that no word is connected with continual in the original text, although in the typical service of the sanctuary it is used with ~~burnt offering~~," Ex. 29:42, with incense, Ex. 30:8, here rendered ~~perpetually~~," and with ~~shewbread~~," Numbers. 4:7, indicated that that which is continual represents the **continual service or mediation of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary**, in which all that was continual in the typical service found its antitype and fulfilment. See Heb. 6:19, 20; 7:1-3, 13-16, 23-25.

~~The~~ action which made the Pope the vicar of God and the high priest of the apostasy, really took away from Christ, as far as human intent and power were concerned, His place and work as the only mediator between God and man (1 Tim. 2:5), and this took away from Him, as far as man could take it away, the continual mediation, according to the prediction of the prophecy.

In verse 13, R.V., the vision is clearly defined. It is the vision concerning the continual burnt offering (or continual mediation) and the transgression that maketh desolate, which results in giving both the sanctuary and the people of God to be trodden under foot."

If this interpretation be correct — and I believe it to be a good and scriptural interpretation — we have a description of the conditions that called for the cleansing or justifying of the sanctuary. What are these conditions, according to the foregoing interpretations?

The sanctuary and the people of God are trodden under foot by the papacy. The continual service or mediation of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary is taken away from Him by a false system of the papacy.

Now if these things constitute the need for a work of justification or cleansing — and I do not deny that they do, what must be **the nature** of the work of justification or cleansing? Manifestly it must be the setting right or correction of the wrong that has been wrought through the false system, by a vindication of the true service or mediation of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary, and the relief or deliverance of those who with the sanctuary have been trodden under foot.

The other side of the teaching affirms that the sins of believing men and women are ~~transferred~~, in fact, to the heavenly sanctuary," and that the actual cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary is to be accomplished by the removal, or blotting out of the sins that are there recorded.

Do these two sets of teaching agree? I would earnestly urge upon the consideration of the brethren that they do not at all agree together.

W. W. Fletcher

Copied by Elder G.B. Starr
Loma Linda, Calif., Sept. 17, 1930.

I wish to add also that Fletcher's interpretation appeals to me as consistent with the ~~New View of the DAILY~~," and calculated to lead away from the entire Three Angel's messages, as it has led him. And further, it led him to give up the teachings of the heavenly sanctuary, as a literal place, as shown to Moses, and to the spiritualizing of the ~~Most Holy Place~~," as ~~the~~ very presence of God." It also leads to appointing another meeting place than that ordained and named by God, ~~as~~ over the mercy seat, between the cherubims".

I wish to appeal to all Seventh-day Adventist ministers to return to the original and ~~correct~~ view of the Daily," as interpreted in 1844 and endorsed by the Spirit of God in *Early Writings*, 74, 75. That all the trumpets may give the same certain sound of the announcement of the ~~Hour~~ of His judgment come, and that at the end

of the 2300 days, in 1844 and onward, the sanctuary was to be, and is being cleansed. Here I have always stood and continue to stand.

Sincerely yours in faith and hope,
G.B. Starr.⁶⁸

Such warnings as Starr's have not prevented the church from pursuing the ~~new~~ insights on the ~~daily~~ — insights which actually reflect the prophetic interpretations of the Protestant Reformers of the sixteenth century. L.E. Froom has been prominent in recent decades in this as in other areas. See pages 60-65 in *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, volume 4, which we believe to be his work. See also *Prophetic Faith*, volume 4, pp. 1154-1156, which we now quote.

In inspired vision the prophet Daniel had seen apostasy entrenched in the church, magnifying itself against Christ, the ~~Prince~~ of the host." In historical fulfilment this perverting power took away man's sole dependence upon Christ's all-sufficient, vicarious, atoning sacrifice, made ~~once~~ for all" for all mankind (Heb. 9:25-28). And it has also taken away the understanding of, and reliance upon, Christ's unceasing priestly mediation thereafter for man, in the heavenly sanctuary. In this way this obstructing power robbed man of the supreme redemptive provisions of God — Christ's death as atoning Sacrifice on earth, eighteen centuries prior, followed by His mediatorial ministry as Priest in heaven ever since. And it has practiced and prospered long in its perversion and obscuring of the truth of these saving provisions (Dan. 8:11, 12).

~~How long,~~" was the anxious inquiry heard by the prophet, shall this lawless power be permitted to tread underfoot the cardinal truths and provisions of redemption concerning ~~the~~ sanctuary and the host" (verse 13)? Until the 2300 year-days shall expire, was the explicit response, and then shall the sanctuary be cleansed — at the close of that long, fateful period (verse 14). Then these downtrodden truths that have such vital relationship to the judgment hour and its immutable standard, the law of God, will again be lifted up under the banner of last-day reformation and restoration. Then, according to the prophetic promise, at the time of the cleansing of the sanctuary its provisions will be vindicated and restored to their rightful place.

Thus O.R.L. Crosier and James White had reasoned and clearly declared, as we have seen, in 1846 and in 1851 respectively. And this principle began likewise to be clearly grasped and declared by some back in the Millerite movement.

Eventually the Sabbatarian Adventists came to see that this basic prophetic portrayal, given not only through Daniel the prophet but supported and amplified by John the revelator, included the vital fact that, as the hour of God's judgment comes in heaven, a distinctive movement develops among men on earth, reviving and restoring these downtrodden truths. And this results in a people described as keeping ~~the~~ commandments of God" and having ~~the~~ faith of Jesus" (Rev. 14:6-12). They would thus lift up again, in this stipulated combination, the very truths that error, tradition, and gross departure had long trampled underfoot. And they would restore the larger understanding of the matchless ministry of Christ, first as all-sufficient Sacrifice, then as all-prevailing High Priest in the sanctuary above (Heb. 8 and 9), with its ~~ark~~ of His testament," and its mercy seat overshadowing the tables of the eternal law of God (Rev. 11:19).

Parallel with the teaching that 8:14 points to a restoration of the gospel taken away by Antichrist has been the insistence that the Hebrew term translated “cleansed” in the KJV should be given more accurate recognition. See *Problems in Bible Translation* 176-177, the *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* 4:845, and the writings of Edward Heppenstall.

Terminus for Dan. 8:14

Old Position: The cleansing reaches to the end of the investigative judgment at the close of probation.

New Position: The “cleansing” involves the whole work of judgment and extends to the setting up of the earth made new. See *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* 4:845, and note the words of L.E. Froom in *Prophetic Faith* 4:1159-1160.

Just so, the Sabbatarians came to understand, the final cleansing of the antitypical sanctuary, accompanied by a heart cleansing among the people of God, not only is to end in the judgment of all men, and in the redemption of the saints, but is finally to eventuate in a clean universe, through the ultimate banishment of all sin and perversion and the total eradication of all of its effects forever. (Rev. 20:9-11)

Little Horn of Daniel 8

Old Position: Cannot be applied to Antiochus Epiphanes.

New Position: Can be applied to Antiochus, though he does not exhaust it. This is believed by S. Horn, R. Cottrell, D. Neufeld, Ford, etc. At the 1919 Bible Conference, Lacey, Wirth, M. Wilcox and others saw the prominence of Antiochus in Daniel.

Hebrews 9

Old Position: A basis for our sanctuary doctrine. (All our early books so affirm.)

New Position: No basis for our sanctuary doctrine. From *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* 7:468, we quote:

This commentary believes unqualifiedly that Christ’s heavenly ministry is carried on in ~~two~~ great divisions,” or to borrow the symbolism of Scripture, in the ~~holy~~” and then the ~~most~~ holy place” of the heavenly sanctuary (see especially on Ex. 25:9; Dan. 8:14); but **that the book of Hebrews is hardly the place to find a definitive presentation on the matter.**

See also Wm. Johnsson on Hebrews 9 in his *In Fullest Confidence*.

“Holies” in Hebrews 9

Old Position: The plural form in such verses as 8:2; 9:8, 12, 24, 25; 10:19; 13:11 proves a reference to two apartments.

New Position: Inasmuch as the plural form is applied to each apartment separately it can never be used to prove plurality of apartments. The plural form may simply be an intensive plural with a singular application. In our next chapter we quote the *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* and others to this end.

Texts Such as Acts 3:19; 1 Peter 4:17, 1 Timothy 5:23, Prove the Investigative Judgment

Old Position: Yes.

New Position: No. Acts 3:19 means the same as 2:38, and 1 Peter 4:17 applied when Peter wrote. No text is known that directly teaches the investigative judgment.

The Year-Day Principle is a Biblical Datum

Old Position: Yes.

New Position: No. We quote the *Review*, April 5, 1979, "This Generation Shall Not Pass," by Don F. Neufeld:

If the events of Matt. 24 are supposed to apply both to the destruction of the Temple in AD 70 and to the events preceding Christ's second advent, why does Jesus say specifically, addressing the disciples who asked Him about end events, "I tell you this: the present generation will live to see it all" (verse 34, NEB)? Obviously He knew that the 2300-day prophecy needed to be fulfilled before His return.

Verse 34 in the King James Version reads, "Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled."

It seems obvious that if we had been one of the disciples who had asked the question, "Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?" (verse 3) we would have interpreted Jesus' response as *The New English Bible* states it. The "you" we would have applied to ourselves and the "this generation" we would have thought as designating the generation in which we were living.

The problem presented in this question has troubled many people, and many solutions have been proposed. For myself I like best the solution hinted at by Ellen White in *Selected Messages*, book I, pages 66 and 67. In this passage Ellen White defends herself against the charge that she was a false prophet because she had indicated years ago that Christ's coming was at hand. She says, "Am I accused of falsehood because time has continued longer than my testimony seemed to indicate?" Her response is, "How is it with the testimonies of Christ and His disciples? Were they deceived?" She then quotes the following passages: I Cor. 7:29, 30; Rom. 13:12, Rev. 1:3; 22:6, 7, in all of which the writers set forth the coming of Jesus as very near in their day. Although she does not quote Matt. 24:34, she refers to the Revelation passages as "Christ" speaking "to us by the beloved John," and since her general question is, "How is it with the testimonies of Christ and His disciples?" we see no problem in including Matt. 24:34 in the same category, since it presents the coming of Jesus as occurring in "this generation," most obviously the one represented by His hearers.

In view of the fact that some 1900 years later Christ has not yet come, she proceeds with her argument in this way: "The angels of God in their messages to men represent time as very short. Thus it has always been presented to me. ... Our Saviour did not appear as soon as we hoped. But has the word of the Lord failed? Never! It should be remembered that the promises and threatenings of God are alike conditional."

Thus she represents the promises concerning the time Jesus would return as being conditional. This means that if certain conditions had been met, Jesus would have come earlier, seemingly as early as the generation specified in Matt. 24:34.

If this explanation is accepted, and Jesus had come long ere this, what would have happened to the long-term time prophecies, the 1260 days and the 2300 days?

It should be noted that these prophecies were not understood as referring to long periods of time until many centuries after the birth of Christ. According to the researches of Leroy Froom, the year-day principle (a day in prophecy represents a solar year in fulfilment) was not understood until about the ninth century AD. Therefore no one would have detected any breaking of prophecy if Jesus had come earlier.

It should also be noted that these prophecies were expressed in terms such as ~~“days”~~ (Dan. 8:14; Rev. 12:6), ~~“times”~~ (Dan. 7:25), ~~“months”~~ (Rev. 13:5). There is no indication in the prophecies themselves that any scale measure ought to be applied to the ~~“days,” “months,” or “times.”~~ The Holy Spirit gave directions to do this only after the time was postponed. At whatever time the fulfilment would have come, the Holy Spirit could have provided the appropriate scale.

Some have felt that Num. 14:34 and Ezek. 4:6 establish the year-day principle as needing to be applied to all time prophecies. But a careful examination of these passages shows that the principle is applied only to specific cases and that there is no general statement in these passages suggesting that a universal principle is set forth. In fact, Seventh-day Adventists do not apply the principle consistently to all time prophecies. For example, the length of the millennium is stated in Rev. 20:3, 5, 7 as being a ~~“thousand years.”~~ This is accepted literally. If the year-day principle were applied, the length would be 360,000 years.

To me, the conditional element Ellen White applies to prophecy supplies the simplest solution to the problem of Matt. 24:34, one that is fair to the Biblical text. I know that people have proposed other solutions, all of which to my mind present certain problems. I suggest that those who have not previously considered the conditional element at least give it consideration.

The Prophecies of Daniel, Christ, and John are Conditional

Old Position: No.

New Position: Yes. See *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* 4:28-31; 7:728-729. We quote:

In one way or another the thought that the various events foretold in the book of Revelation were to take place in the not distant future is specifically stated seven times — ~~“things which must shortly come to pass [or, ~~be~~ done”]~~” (chs. 1:1; 22:6), ~~“the time is at hand”~~ (ch. 1:3), and ~~“Behold [or, ~~surely~~], I come quickly”~~ (chs. 3:11; 22:7, 12, 20). Indirect references to the same idea appear in chs. 6:11; 1:12; 17:10. John’s personal response to these declarations of the soon accomplishment of the divine purpose was, ~~“Even so, come, Lord Jesus”~~ (ch. 22:20).

The concept of the imminence of the return of Jesus is thus both explicit and implicit throughout the book.

The second coming of Christ is the great climactic event of the age-long conflict between good and evil that began when Lucifer challenged the character and government of God. Statements in the Revelation and elsewhere concerning the imminence of Christ's return must be understood against the background of this great conflict. God might justly have annihilated Lucifer when, in obdurate impenitence, he persisted in rebellion. But divine wisdom deferred the extermination of evil until the nature and results of sin became fully apparent to inhabitants of the universe (see *PP* 41-43). **At any one of various critical points in the history of this world, divine justice could have proclaimed, "It is done!" and Christ might have come to inaugurate His righteous reign.** Long ago He might have brought to fruition His plans for the redemption of this world. As God offered Israel the opportunity to prepare the way for His eternal kingdom upon the earth, when they settled the Promised Land and again when they returned from their exile in Babylon, so He gave the church of apostolic times the privilege of completing the gospel commission. Another such opportunity came with the great second advent awakening of the 19th century. But in each instance God's chosen people failed to take advantage of the opportunity thus graciously accorded them.

Encouraged by inspired counsel, the Advent Movement, after 1844, expected Christ to come very soon. When, toward the end of the century, Jesus had not appeared, the Advent believers were repeatedly reminded that the Lord might have come ~~ere~~ "this" (see *6T* 450; *8T* 115, 116; *9T* 29; *DA* 633, 634; *GC* 458). When challenged as to why time had Continued longer than her earlier testimonies seemed to indicate, Ellen G. White replied, ~~How~~ "How is it with the testimonies of Christ and His disciples? Were they deceived? ... The angels of God in their messages to men represent time as very short ... It should be remembered that the promises and threatenings of God are alike conditional" (EGW in F.M. Wilcox, *The Testimony of Jesus*, 99).

Thus it seems clear that although the fact of Christ's second coming is not based on any conditions, the repeated statements of Scripture that the coming was imminent were conditional on the response of the church to the challenge of finishing the work of the gospel in their generation. The Word of God, which centuries ago declared that the day of Christ was ~~at~~ "hand" (Rom. 13:12), has not failed. Jesus would have come quickly if the church had done its appointed work. The church had no right to expect her Lord when she had not complied with the conditions. See *Evangelism* 694-697.

Thus the statements of the angel of Revelation to John concerning the imminence of Christ's return to end the reign of sin are to be understood as an expression of divine will and purpose. God has never purposed to delay the consummation of the plan of salvation, but has ever expressed His will that the return of our Lord be not long delayed.

Justification of the Human Race

Old Position: This must not be said to have happened at the cross.

New Position: This must be said to have happened at the cross, though to be effective for individuals it must be accepted by faith.

Second Advent Could Not Come Till After 1844.

Old Position: Affirmed.

New Position: Denied. See *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* 7:728-728. (This has important implications for the investigative judgment doctrine. Where would it have fitted if Christ had come in the first century?)

Prophecies of the End

1844 As Beginning of the End Supported by Such Prophecies as Rev. 11 on the French Revolution, Rev. 9 on the Ottoman Power, Dan. 11 on the French Revolution and the Ottoman Power, Rev. 16 on the Euphrates and Armageddon, Matt. 24:34 “This Generation Shall Not Pass ..,” The Earthquake of Lisbon, The Dark Day, and the 1844 Meteoric Showers, and Dan. 12:4 Increase of Scientific Knowledge.

Old Position: Asserted that the atheistic revolution of France supported the “time of the end” beginning in 1798; the fulfilment of Latch’s interpretation regarding Aug. 11, 1840, indicated that the seventh trumpet began in 1844; the current deterioration of Turkey showed that the scroll of prophecy was almost completely unrolled; and the few still alive since the falling of the stars proved Christ must come within a few years.

New Position: None of these prophetic positions are reliable. All are based on erroneous exegesis, and history supports none of them.

Just prior to the research involved in preparing the new edition of *Great Controversy*, W.W. Prescott wrote a lengthy letter listing “errors” he felt needed correction. Prominent among these were the historical positions taken by 1888 *Great Controversy* on the French Revolution, and the sixth trumpet. Prescott pointed out that there was no evidence for a banning of the Bible in France for three and a half years, and that Latch’s prediction regarding Aug. 11 had not been made in 1838, and was quite invalid.

When the book Daniel and the Revelation came in for revision in the 1940 s, Prescott’s criticisms were revived and confirmed. The fruitless scouring of libraries in Europe and America that took place before the 1911 edition of *Great Controversy* was finalized now witnessed a replay. We quote the official statement of the revising committee on the matter of the trumpets.

It is interesting to note as an historical fact that when James White and even Uriah Smith, came to the subject of the seven trumpets they did not attempt an original interpretation of the first six but frankly state that they accepted and followed in the main an interpretation by Josiah Litch, which he had already repudiated. Like them your committee, while recognizing that a Bible student here and there among us has endeavoured to improve on this interpretation, has found nothing better to recommend beyond some minor adjustments that the presentation found in the book as it comes to our hands. We therefore —

Recommend, That the interpretation of the Seven Trumpets remain substantially as it is.⁶⁹

During the work of the committee we find such comments as the following exchanged in letters:

I am still struggling with the problem of atheism and the French Revolution, and do not know yet just how we will come out.⁷⁰

I especially looked up item number 7 to find some quotations to take the place of these old ones, but I cannot find any good material. I do not believe the second one, mentioning the date Aug. 26, 1792, should be used. I can find nothing in any of the histories of the French Revolution to show cause why this should be an outstanding day against Christianity.⁷¹

Such comments only echo ones made years earlier by Prescott, Spicer, and others. We offer typical instances.

It seems to me that a large responsibility rests upon those of us who know that there are serious errors in our authorized books and yet make no special effort to correct them. The people and our average ministers trust us to furnish them with reliable statements, and they use our books as sufficient authority in their sermons, but we let them go on year after year asserting things which we know to be untrue. I cannot feel that this is right. It seems to me that we are betraying our trust and deceiving the ministers and people. **It appears to me that there is much more anxiety to prevent a possible shock to some trustful people than to correct error.**⁷²

I notice that in the issue of the Signs for Nov. 21, you have let loose the Turk — and some other things besides. I had known for some time that the date, Aug. 11, 1840, would not stand the test of historical facts. Two years ago at the Fall Council we presented reasonably full information upon this subject, but nothing has been done and in the meantime our books and most of our publications are repeating the unwarranted statements concerning the chronology of the fifth and sixth trumpets.

I am rather glad to have this matter discussed, and the theological ice broken, but at the same time I am sorry that Brother Vuilleumier has tried to commit us to another scheme of interpretation which is just as unsound as the old one. I am writing Brother Vuilleumier about this matter, and am enclosing herewith a copy of the letter. I also enclose some further historical extracts, bearing upon this subject, and I would like to ask you to tell me why we should not select July 27, 1839, as the time when Turkey lost her independence, rather than some indefinite time in 1840, according to Brother Vuilleumier's presentation of the subject.

Furthermore, if the Emperor John, who died in 1448, never forgot that he was a vassal of the Ottoman Empire," why need we wait until 1449 to find that the Greek Empire of the East was subject to Turkey?

Beyond all this the fact remains that Turkey did not lose her independence at any of these dates. If Turkey lost her independence, how could she conduct a war with Russia, a war with the Balkan States, a war with Italy, and now join in the present war? A declaration of war is the act of a sovereign state. Why should we not cast aside all this effort to make history fit our ideas of prophecy, instead of allowing history to be the interpreter of prophecy?

I shall be glad to hear from you concerning this subject.

Yours faithfully,⁷³

I will also enclose some material that we have had out on the dates of the prophetic periods of Rev. 9. Some little time ago here the question was up, and Professor Prescott and I went down to the Congressional Library. He looked up the history of

Pachymeris, translated into Latin by Possinus, to which Gibbon refers for his date, July 27, 1299. I looked up Von Hammer, who is the heaviest German author, apparently, on Ottoman history in those times.

It is very clear that Gibbon made a distinct error, which Von Hammer and others have corrected these years. Gibbon's mistake is easily seen by looking at the book. He saw July 27 at the opening of chapter 25, and then over in the chronological tables given by Possinus he saw the date 1299 for the beginning of the events dealt with in this chapter; but he failed to note that while the chapter began with July 27, it later went back, as this first paragraph suggests, and dealt with earlier events. These earlier events were the events of 1299, and it was not until 1301 or 1302, as various authorities compute the Mohammedan era, that the battle of July 27 took place.

Well, then about this time Professor Benson, who is now with us here, formerly of Union College, came on with Blue Books that he had received from London, showing conclusively that the ultimatum of the Powers was not delivered to the Pasha of Egypt on Aug. 11, 1840. Then we began to look the thing up a bit, and presented some of these features to the recent council. You may well understand that some of the brethren had to sit up and take notice, as we say over here. The shadow of the "daily" controversy is still upon us. It is remarkable how loath people are to look at facts, or to correct any fact. But they had to agree that we must study this thing. I send you a copy of a statement presented by Professor Prescott on July 27, some notes presented by Professor Benson on Aug. 11, 1840, and a series of suggestive notes to help in the study of the question which the brethren asked me to prepare, giving some facts on the positive side. I told the committee that I would not endorse my own paper at the present time, but that I had merely tried to set down some facts that did seem to be established.

Personally, I would rather hold to 1840 if it could be done, but really it is pretty hard to figure out anything there. Our folks have taught right along that John Palaeologus died, one would infer, July 27, 1449; but he didn't, he died in the previous year.⁷⁴

Litch had uncritically accepted an erroneous date in Gibbon for the beginning of his prophetic periods, forgotten about the omission of certain days in the new calendar, and wrongly interpreted events in the 1840's, as well as displaying his ignorance of the original language of Rev. 9:15. Note how careful the *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* is on the matter:

It should be made clear, however, that commentators and theologians in general have been greatly divided over the meaning of the 5th and 6th trumpets. This has been due principally to problems in three areas: (1) the meaning of the symbolism itself; (2) the meaning of the Greek; (3) the historical events and dates involved. But to canvass adequately these problems would carry us beyond the space limits permissible in this commentary. (*SDABC* 7:796)

Dan. 11 has also come in for new attention. The 1919 Bible conference saw a strong emphasis on new positions which ultimately were to replace the old. Thus the revised *Daniel and Revelation* reduces Smith's fifteen pages on Dan. 11:45 to four short paragraphs. R.F. Cottrell has traced the swing away from the old positions regarding the French Revolution and the Turk. Similarly, none of our scholars today see any reference in Rev. 16 to Turkey.

—The sick man of the east” has at last come to his end as regards Adventist prophetic exposition, and with him many other —ailing” prophetic interpretations.

Matt. 24:34 was understood by our 19th century writers (and many in the first part of the 20th century) as teaching that those who saw the falling of the stars would witness the coming of Christ. The *Desire of Ages* certainly did not originate that view but it does express it as follows:

At the close of the great papal persecution, Christ declared, the sun should be darkened, and the moon should not give her light. Next, the stars should fall from heaven. And He says, Learn a parable of the fig tree. When his branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh. So likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things, know that He is near, even at the doors” (Margin).

Christ has given signs of His coming. He declares that we may know when He is near, even at the doors. He says of those who see these signs, —This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled.” These signs have appeared. Now we know of a surety that the Lord’s coming is at hand.⁷⁵

The following is found in the files of F.C. Gilbert:

The Last Generation as Located by the Spirit of Prophecy

At the General Conference at Battle Creek, May 27, 1856, I was shown in vision some things that concern the Church generally ... I was shown the company present at the conference. Said the angel, Some food for worms, some subjects of the seven last plagues, some will be alive and remain upon the earth to be translated at the coming of Jesus” (*IT* 131, 132).

The following list of names of those present was revised July 14, 1911, by Sister M.P. Comings of Battle Creek, Mich., in consultation with Elder G.W. Amadon, Sister Caroline Dodge, and Matilda Marvin. The vision was given at five o clock in the morning.

Living January 1, 1918

Hannah S. Hastings.....	—
Aceneth Smith-Kilgore	—
J.E. White	70
W.C. White.....	66
T.B. Lewis	76
Ogden Lewis.....	68
Lorinda Nordyke	—
Asheal Smith	83
Mrs. D. W. Reavis	67
Anna L Wilson	79
Julia K. McDowell	82
Smith Kellogg.....	85
Dr. J.H. Kellogg.....	68
Mrs. Emma Kellogg.....	70
Matilda Marvin	86
Griffin Lewis	78

Deceased

James White	Roxena B. Cornell
Uriah Smith	Clara Banfoey
Cyrenius Smith	Jennie F. Rogers
Deborah Lyon	Richard Godsmark
Sarah Beldon	Mrs. Richard Godsmark
H.N. White	David Hewitt
Dan R. Palmer	Mrs. David Hewitt
J.P. Kellogg	Walter Grant
Mrs. J.P. Kellogg	Jesse Dorcas
Leonard Eggleston	Elias Goodwin
Cynthia Bachellor	S.W. Rhodes
Henry Gardner	George W. Amadon
Mrs. Henry Gardner	J.W. Bachellor
George Lowry	Loisa Bovee
S.B. Warren	E.G. White
Martin Phillips	Albert Kellogg
S.H. Lance	Martha L. King
S.E. Belden	Carioline S. Dodge
Samuel Warren	Laura E. Brackett
Jarvis Munsell	S.C. Bovee

Total number of those in attendance at the conference, 61. Of this number, 17 are living, and 44 are dead.

Between us and eternity stand 17 persons, the youngest of whom is 66 years of age; the oldest 86 years.

—Transgression has almost reached its limit. Confusion fills the world, and a great terror is soon to come upon human beings. The end is very near. God's people should be preparing for what is soon to break upon the world as an overwhelming surprise" (Mrs. E.G. White).

Note — The last revision of this list was made by Mrs. D.W. Reavis, who was one of the number, and several names added at suggestion.⁷⁶

Compare words spoken at the 1919 Bible Conference:

Can you decide in your own mind whether in this generation of the proclamation of the message we have gone far enough, so the children of parents who first heard it are old enough so that the generation in your mind has begun yet? Is there any way to tell whether the generation has started yet or whether or not it has started?

PRESCOTT: I can't fix any date when it started. My father as a young man — he was 16 years of age when the time passed in 1844. He accepted with his father the message of William Miller, and they left their crops standing in the field in the fall of 1844, on the basis that the Lord was coming. I am his son, still living, trying to join with you in proclaiming this message. I am 64 years old. I think we have entered upon that generation surely, but I don't attempt to fix any date when it commenced or when it closed.

F.M. WILCOX: I got an article from W.C. White yesterday in which he referred to the time when he was seven years of age and someone preached in the tabernacle that the Lord should come in a few years. He asked the preacher how much a few years was, and they told him six or seven. He figured it out that the Lord would come when he was 14. But He didn't, and he is now many years older than that, and the Lord still delays. But he expressed the thought that he had learned this, that he was to live as though the Lord were to come today, and he was to prepare himself for labour and provide facilities to carry this message to earth's remotest bounds. The Lord says it isn't for us to know the times or the seasons, the Lord hath kept them in his own power. —But ye shall be witnesses unto me.” I think there is danger, brethren, of our catching up some expression in the Bible or the Testimonies, and we think this limits for certain things to be fulfilled, and we make a stir over it, and then the years go by and that thing isn't fulfilled. I can remember the time when I came into the truth, they preached that those who saw the dark day, that was the beginning of the generation. Then they changed it to 1798, then to 1833. We have advanced the dates as the years have gone by.⁷⁷

Gilbert and his contemporary Adventist believers considered the end imminent, not only because of Ellen G. White's prediction of 1856, but because of the Scriptural data in Matt. 24 regarding the signs in the heavens and the promise of Matt. 24:34.

In the *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* on Matt. 24:34 we read:

This generation. Commentators, generally, have observed that the expression —this generation” of ch. 23:36 refers to the generation of the apostles (see on ch. 23:36). Jesus repeatedly used the expression —this generation” in this sense (see ch. 11:16; cf. chs. 12:39, 41, 42, 45; 16:4; 17:17; etc.; see on ch. 11:16).

Christ did not intend that His followers should know with exactitude when He would return. The signs foretold would testify to the nearness of His coming, but, He declared emphatically, the —day and hour” of that event —knoweth no man” (Matt. 24:36). To make the expression, —this generation,” the basis for reckoning a period of time supposedly terminating with His return violates both the letter and the spirit of His instructions (see on verses 36, 42)⁷⁸

It should also be added that few New Testament scholars amongst us today believe that the events of 1755, 1780, and 1833 accomplished the prediction of our Lord in His Olivet sermon. The signs are reproduced in Rev. 6:12, 13, and the first is a great earthquake. This earthquake of the sixth seal, on the verge of Christ's coming, is found also in the later description of the seventh trumpet, and the seventh plague. See 11:19 and 16:18. This earthquake causes all the cities of the nations to fall, (and obviously has not yet transpired). Adventists who located the darkening of the sun **within** the 1260 prophetic days failed to notice that Mark 13:25 also placed the falling of the stars —in those days.” It has become obvious that the real accomplishment of these signs is yet future. Today it is well understood that the Dark Day was not global, and that the meteoric showers of 1833 were the recurring display of the Leonids, which have been witnessed about every 33 years, though not as grandly as in 1833. The Lisbon earthquake, as regards loss of life involvement, pales before several since that time. In the providence of God, these historic events encouraged the second advent movement, but the complete fulfilment of the prophecies regarding such signs is yet future. See the section on this in our last chapter.

When one reads such works of the last century as *Christ Our Advocate*, it becomes clear how far we have travelled since that time in prophetic understanding, and in repudiating positions once erroneously cherished. But it is not always understood that the inquiry must be made as to whether the early understanding of 1844 is in any wise affected by these new insights into apocalyptic exegesis. If Dan. 9:24 does not use the year-day principle (the Hebrew mentions ~~“seventy sevens”~~ — it does not refer to ~~“days”~~ at all), if, as the *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* in its additional note on Dan. 7 declares, it is impossible to date precisely the rise and fall of the papacy, if the word for ~~“hour”~~ in Rev. 9:15 has nothing necessarily to do with a twenty-fourth of a day, if the three and a half days exposition of Rev. 11:9 is erroneous historically, if the ~~“days”~~ of Mark 13:24 extend till the end of the world, if it is impossible to date the beginning of the seventh trumpet in 1844, if the signs of the sixth seal have not yet transpired, if neither the French Revolution nor the demise of the Ottoman power are signs of ~~“the time of the end,”~~ if Christ’s use of ~~“generation”~~ **always** applied to His contemporaries, if the New Testament always locates the Second Advent as an event for **that** generation of readers, if the seven references in Revelation to the imminent return of Christ — imminent in the first century — cannot be dismissed by a misuse of 2 Peter 3:8, and if the literal fulfilment of Daniel’s prophecies was dependent on Israel’s fidelity — if these things be so, or if only some of them be so, how is our interpretation of Dan. 8:14 affected?

If we have failed to set forth Biblical evidence for the year-day principle, and have shunned the task because of its impossibility of fulfilment, where are we then left? Are we pleasing God if we permit the ~~“urgent”~~ ever to crowd out the ~~“important”~~?

Furthermore, if the second advent movement was one raised up by God (as both this writer and his readers believe), how shall we understand its significance, and the message God intends this remnant to give to the world? **What is the practical significance of Dan. 8:14 that should now be proclaimed to every nation, kindred, tongue and people? In what way does it decide the destiny of souls? How is it related to the grand central truth around which all other truths cluster — the Cross of Christ? Is stress on celestial geography really that important for a generation dying through ignorance of the gospel?**

The author of this paper is aware that his realm is often dealing with abstract ideas. He does not have to handle many of the practical and urgent burdens which those in administration have to wrestle with daily. But he does believe that this issue over the sanctuary and investigative judgment is only one case in a question of much wider scope, which has implications which are extremely practical and urgent.

He feels that many intelligent people in the church, including lay-people as well as employees of the church, while wishing to be loyal to the denomination, find it extremely difficult to advance in research in many areas (from history to science, but particularly in theological research),⁷⁹ since any position which seemingly differs or re-expresses what has gone before, especially as expressed by Ellen G. White, is looked upon as treason or ~~“removing the landmarks.”~~ He feels that such a climate puts a strangulation-hold on research and true progress, and that it is in the church’s temporal and eternal interest to deal with such questions openly and without fear. The chief problem in many questions is the nature of the inspiration of Ellen G. White. Though we have never taken the position of verbal inspiration (i.e. infallibility), in our published literature, there is nonetheless much misunderstanding about the nature of how inspiration works. We plan to talk more about this in a later section of this paper, but believe that the present discussions on Ellen G. White will inevitably help the church to face honestly such problems as the sanctuary, without taking anything away from the true role of the Lord’s messenger.⁸⁰



The reader should read the following appendices at the close of this manuscript which are pertinent to this chapter. We cannot urge too strongly their importance and they should not be overlooked or treated as of marginal significance. The four appendices are:

Appendix 1: Waggoner on the Investigative Judgment

Appendix 2: The Problem of Dan. 8:14 and Its Context

Appendix 3: The Chequered History of the Phrase “Within the Veil”

Appendix 4: CUC Course Outline on the Sanctuary and 1844

ENDNOTES FOR CHAPTER ONE

- ¹ MA Thesis, 1959, *Daniel 8:14 and the Latter Days* (Potomac University), Ph.D. Thesis, 1972, *The Abomination of Desolation In Biblical Eschatology* (Manchester University).
- ² See appendix, *—The Chequered History of „Within the Veil“*
- ³ Edward Heppenstall, *Our High Priest* (Washington, 1972), 202, 207-208, 108.
- ⁴ James E. Bear, *—The Bible and Modern Religions—The Seventh-day Adventists*,” Interpretation, Jan. 1956, 0(1), 53, 54-55.
- ⁵ *Ev* 256.
- ⁶ It should be kept in mind that we never find the expression ~~the~~ “cleansing of the sanctuary” in Leviticus. 16, though it is certainly implied, but we do find a clear statement in Heb. 9 on the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary (V. 23).
- ⁷ Only in Hebrews is the priesthood of Christ discussed, and similarly only here do we find the sanctuary offered for our consideration.
- ⁸ Froome worried about the problem for forty years, but discussed it only with intimates. See later pages of this chapter for the discussion on the men, and their relationship to the sanctuary doctrine.
- ⁹ Letter from F.G. Clifford, president of Australasian Division of Seventh-day Adventists, to F.D. Nichol of Review & Herald Publishing Assn., Aug. 8, 1957. Emphasis ours throughout this manuscript, unless otherwise stated. G.C. Archives.
- ¹⁰ Letter from F.D. Nichol to F.G. Clifford and L.C. Naden of Australasian Division, Aug. 29, 1957. G.C. Archives
- ¹¹ P.G. Damsteegt, *Foundations of the Seventh-day Adventist Message and Mission* (Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1977), 123.
- ¹² *Ibid.*, 132.
- ¹³ D.M. Canright, *Seventh-day Adventism Renounced* (N. V., 1889), 117, 118-120, 121 -1 23.
- ¹⁴ D.M. Canright, *Life of Mrs. E.G. White* (Cincinnati, 1919), 101, 102.
- ¹⁵ See Canright’s LMW, 106-107, and Damsteegt, 157.
- ¹⁶ E.J. Waggoner, *—Confession of Faith*” (1916), 14-20. For the rest of Waggoner’s statement see appendix, *—Waggoner on the Investigative Judgment.*”
- ¹⁷ A.F. Ballenger, *—The Nine Theses*,” before the ministers attending the General Conference, Washington, D.C., May 21, 1905, 5:30 a.m. GC Archives.
- ¹⁸ See A.F. Ballenger’s *Cast Out for the Cross of Christ*, 67-82.
- ¹⁹ Probably she would also have questioned the following Ballenger positions.

—The veil in the earthly sanctuary was decorated with figures of angels, representing the real angels which guarded the approach to the throne of God, and it is before this cordon of living angels that the Melchisedec priesthood ministers from creation to the cross. For four thousand years, the sins of a world separated God’s only begotten Son from His place at the side of His Father on the throne. For four thousand years, Christ was barred from His Father’s face because He was the sinner’s substitute.

—How can men assert that Melchisedec was a mortal man who was born and died like other men when the Holy Spirit plainly declares that unlike mortal men who live and die, he, **like unto the Son of God abideth a priest continually?** and again, that ~~he~~ **liveth**,” in contrast to ~~men~~ who die”?

—Since Melchisedec was a priest of the heavenly sanctuary in the days of Abraham, it follows that the heavenly sanctuary, which all admit existed from the beginning with God upon the mercy seat in the holy of holies, was not closed to a fallen world, as some assert, for four thousand years, with no ministering priest to minister pardon and life (blessings of the New Covenant) from the mercy seat in the heavenly sanctuary to the penitent sinners of earth.

—Some of the more studious of my brethren in the ministry have admitted that there was a service conducted between the heavenly sanctuary and the sinning world, from the fall to the cross, carried on by ministering angels. But they are loath to admit that it was a **priestly ministry**. But if these ministering angels offered the penitent prayers of sinners before the heavenly veil, and carried back the new covenant blessings of pardon and life, what more could a **priest** do? This is just what the priest did in the first apartment of the typical tabernacle. O the power of a creed to shackle the mind of the search after truth” (A.F. Ballenger, *Cast Out*, 45, 84, 85, 87.)!

—The healing of the sick must, therefore, follow the preaching of the Word. Preach the kingdom of God and heal the sick, is the order in which the commission is given. It is therefore evident that if the Word is not preached, God will not confirm it with signs following. For God to confirm the preaching of anything but the

Word, would be for Him to confirm the preaching of a lie. If there is, therefore, any failure in the preaching of the Word, there must inevitably follow a failure in the signs following.

—The absence, therefore, of the confirming signs is a sad and solemn witness to the fact that there is a failure somewhere in the preaching of the Word” (*Ibid.*, 104, 105).

- ²⁰ *Ibid.*, 106-112. In his *Gathering Call* journal of June 1921, p. 3, Ballenger wrote, —. no reply was received from Sister White, though the letter was registered and a signed receipt received.” Of course, it is always possible that only W.C. White saw the letter rather than his mother.
- ²¹ A.F. Ballenger, *An Examination of Forty Fatal Errors Regarding the Atonement*, (Riverside, n.d.), 1-3.
- ²² See *DA* 757; *AA* 33; *ST* April 19, 1905; *EW* 55. This last reference uses —within the veil” for the second apartment, not the first.
- ²³ Letter from A.G. Daniells to L.E. Froom, Feb. 27, 1929. GC Archives.
- ²⁴ W.W. Fletcher, *Reasons for My Faith*, 11. Again we would remind the reader that our quoting of dissidents does not necessarily indicate agreement. The present writer finds considerable fault with the doctrinal positions of Waggoner, Ballenger, Fletcher, Conradi, etc., though aware they were correct in certain criticisms that they made.
- ²⁵ A.G. Daniells, Fernando, Thursday morning, May 12, 1910, 5 am. Before the faculty of the Fernando Academy. GC Archives.
- ²⁶ Statement of the Conradi Case, 4. GC Archives.
- ²⁷ *Ibid.*, 10.
- ²⁸ *Ibid.*, 10.
- ²⁹ *Ibid.*, 10.
- ³⁰ *Ibid.*, 10.
- ³¹ Officer’s Meeting Minutes, Jan. 22, 1934, 9:00 a.m. GC Archives.
- ³² Letter from W.W. Prescott to Elders W.H. Branson and I.H. Evans, Feb. 2, 1934. GC Archives.
- ³³ A.W. Spicer note, —*Bro. Prescott’s Statement*,” GC Archives.
- ³⁴ Letter from E.S. Ballenger to W. W. Fletcher, July 4, 1931.
- ³⁵ Statement made by L.E. Froom, July 20, 1930. GC Archives.
- ³⁶ Letter from A.O. Tait to L.E. Froom, Jan. 28, 1930. GC Archives. A letter from R.A. Grieve to this writer in April of this year stated that L.E. Froom had promised to visit Brother Grieve but did not keep his promise when he discovered that the latter could not accept the doctrine of the investigative judgment.
- ³⁷ Harold E. Snide, —*Some Serious Questions for Studious S.D.A.s*” question #7 and #5, in that order. (Housed in E.S. Ballenger’s library now owned by Donald Mote, Riverside, CA.)
- ³⁸ Letter from R.A. Grieve to Lawson, June 12, 1956. GC Archives. We give some documents at full length so reader can see the full context, and be assured that contrary evidence has not been omitted.
- ³⁹ Harold Lindsell, —*What of Seventh-day Adventism?*” *Christianity Today*, Mar. 31, 1958, 8. Emphasis his. (A second article appeared in the April 14 issue.)
- ⁴⁰ D.G. Barnhouse, *Eternity*, Sept. 1956. Emphasis his.
- ⁴¹ —*In the Critics Den*,” *The Eschatology of Daniel*, 9-10. Unpublished manuscript.
- ⁴² See appendix for the latter.
- ⁴³ C.G. Tuland, *A Partial Re-examination of Seventh-day Adventist Interpretation of Dan. 8:14, 10, 16-19*. Emphasis his, likewise stylistic forms.
- ⁴⁴ For example, the document, —*Dr. Ford’s Dangerous Doctrines*” by G. Burnside.
- ⁴⁵ This information was volunteered by the son-in-law of Elder Sinz after a conversation between the two in Jan. 1980. The article referred to was on the front page of *Der Adventbote*, May, 1928 (No. 9).
- ⁴⁶ The chief Adventist apologetics on the sanctuary are: U. Smith, *The Sanctuary and the 2300 Days* (Battle Creek, 1877); U. Smith, *Looking Unto Jesus* (Battle Creek, 1898); E.E. Andross, *A More Excellent Ministry* (Mountain View, 1912); S.N. Haskell, *The Cross and Its Shadow* (South Lancaster, 1914); C.H. Watson, *The Atoning Work of Christ* (Washington, 1934); F.C. Gilbert, *Messiah in His Sanctuary* (Washington, 1937); A. Andreasen, *The Sanctuary Service* (Washington, 1937); A. Andreasen, *Hebrews* (Washington, 1948); W.H. Branson, *Reply to Canright* (Washington, 1933); E. Heppenstall, *Our High Priest* (Washington, 1972).
- ⁴⁷ Reiner, *Atonement* 43.
- ⁴⁸ *In Fullest Confidence*, (Nashville, 1979).
- ⁴⁹ William Johnsson, *In Fullest Confidence*, 115.
- ⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 23.
- ⁵¹ R.F. Cottrell, *Sabbath School Lesson Quarterly on Daniel*, Jan-Mar., 1967. See our appendix summary of key statements from this quarterly.
- ⁵² We would stress that by —new position” in all this series we do not imply that there is unanimous agreement on such position, but only that the new view has become prominent among our writers and teachers whereas

such was unknown to the whole corpus of our 19th century literature (with the possible exception of the *Spirit of Prophecy* writings). Neither should it be assumed that this writer necessarily *carte blanche* endorses the new and discards the old. Another thing to keep in mind is that a mass of evidence on the new positions cannot here be shown because it belongs to the confidential documents of the Daniel Committee.

⁵³ Desmond Ford, *—The Reality of the Heavenly Sanctuary*,” 3-6.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 5

⁵⁵ M.L. Andreasen, *The Sanctuary Service*, 130-131.

⁵⁶ E.E. Andross, *A More Excellent Service*, 52.

⁵⁷ Beatrice S. Neall, *—Anchored to the Throne*” (n.d.), 4-5.

⁵⁸ Norman H. Young, *—The Chequered History of the Phrase „Within the Veil,”* 5, 6. See Ford’s *—Dan. 8:14: The Judgment and the Kingdom of God.*” Young’s article is an appendix of this present manuscript.

⁵⁹ Letter from J.C. Stevens to L.E. Froom, Jan. 2, 1930. GC Archives.

⁶⁰ *SDABC* 5:1109.

⁶¹ See *Doctrinal Discussions*, 182.

⁶² W.E. Read, *Doctrinal Discussions*, R & H, 48, 49.

⁶³ E. Heppenstall, *Doctrinal Discussions*, 168, 169.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 171. See also the lesson quarterly on Daniel, first quarter 1967, which agrees with Heppenstall.

⁶⁵ Bert Haloviak, *—In the Shadow of the „Daily Background and Aftermath of the 1919 Bible & History Teachers Conference,”* 35-36. (Written 1979.)

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 42.

⁶⁷ W.A. Spicer, *Certainties of the Great Advent Movement*, 121.

⁶⁸ Letter from W.W. Fletcher to conference presidents re Daniel 8, copied by G.B. Starr, and letter from G.B. Starr, Sept. 17, 1930. GC Archives.

⁶⁹ Report of the Committee on Revision and Republication of the Book *—Daniel and the Revelation,*” 7-8. GC Archives.

⁷⁰ Letter from M.R. Thurber to M.L. Neff, Jan. 15, 1942. GC Archives.

⁷¹ Letter from M.L. Neff to M.R. Thurber, Jan. 7, 1943. GC Archives.

⁷² Letter from W.W. Prescott to W.C. White, April 6, 1915. White Estate.

⁷³ Letter from W.W. Prescott to A.O. Tait, Nov. 23, 1916.

⁷⁴ Letter from W.A. Spicer to L.R. Conradi, Nov. 30, 1914. GC Archives.

⁷⁵ DA 632.

⁷⁶ From the files of F.C. Gilbert. GC Archives. Spelling as in document.

⁷⁷ 1919 Bible Conference notes, 26, 26a. GC Archives.

⁷⁸ *SDABC* 5:503.

⁷⁹ Especially theological research since this is everybody’s ball park.

⁸⁰ It will be noticed that we have almost ignored the apologetic works by Andross, Watson, Branson—this is because they no longer have general scholarly support. Similarly, Andreasen’s books on the sanctuary and Hebrews have grave inadequacies, and in apologetic areas are completely inadequate. One need only compare the *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* pronouncements by way of comparison to see that such is indeed the case. Documents belonging to the Daniel Committee are replete with glaring evidence to the same end.

In an attempt to summarize many of the new positions and their relevance in such a way as to leave intact the Seventh-day Adventist teaching of the eschatological application of Dan. 8:14 and the reality of a pre-advent judgment there was prepared in 1974.75 a Xeroxed booklet entitled *Dan. 8:14—The Judgment and the Kingdom of God—A Rebuttal of Criticisms of the Adventist Sanctuary Doctrine*. Copies were placed in the hands of officers of the General Conference and also at Andrews University. It has been used as a textbook in eschatology classes by the author for approximately five years, while most of its contents has been used prior to that time from 1961. It includes a classic study by Dr. Norman H. Young, who wrote his doctoral dissertation on *—The Day of Atonement in the New Testament.*” That study is found attached to this document as an appendix. Its title is *—The Chequered History of the Phrase „Within the Veil.”*

Much of the material delivered in the Oct. 27 Forum Lecture at PUC is available in this booklet which contains articles written between 1959 and 1974.

In the SPA Commentary on Daniel by the same writer, which was written in 1974, approximately 250 pages (about ¾ of the book) are devoted to some of the problems discussed on Oct. 27. As stated at the New Orleans meeting of college Bible teachers and others in 1979—this commentary is actually an apologetic for our eschatological application of Dan. 8:14. Much space in the prefaces to Dan. 8 and 9 is devoted to

evidence that this verse applies to the antitypical day of atonement—the judgment of the world. It should be noted, however, that many of the traditional arguments have been either avoided or rejected and replaced by some the writer felt to be Biblically sound. Many of the ~~new~~ positions listed above are embodied in *Daniel*, particularly the concept of conditional fulfilment of prophecy which implies that God's ideal plan was that the end of all things should have taken place in the first century, not long after the cross, if Israel had prepared the world for the Messiah's coming. See *PK* 703-704. The relationship between inaugurated [or proleptic] and consummated eschatology is stressed as the key to otherwise insolvable problems.

CHAPTER TWO

Hebrews And The Day Of Atonement

OUTLINE OF CHAPTER TWO

Hebrews And The Day Of Atonement	Page
Warning from M.L. Andreasen	111
Summary of Argument from Hebrews	112
The Importance of Hebrews for Seventh-day Adventists	119
The Setting of Hebrews 9, and Overview of the Chapter	120
The Day of Atonement in Hebrews 9	123
Day of Atonement Allusions, Other Than in Chapters 9 & 10: 19-22	132
The First Apartment—Symbol of Judaism’s Limitations in Time and Efficacy	138
Ta Hagia	145
The Copy and Shadow of Heavenly Things	146
Did Christ enter the Most Holy at His Ascension merely to Dedicate the Heavenly Sanctuary?	150
Summary	151
Adventism’s Rebuttals	155
W. Johnsson’s “Cultic Language of Hebrews” and “The Significance of The Day Of Atonement Allusions in the Book of Hebrews”	159
Conclusion	168
Regarding Dr. Hasel’s “Some Observations on Hebrews 9 in View of Dr. Ford’s Interpretation”	171
Endnotes for Chapter Two	174

Appendices particularly relevant to this chapter:

5. Quotations on the D.A. in Hebrews
6. Quotations Regarding Hebrews 9:6-9
7. Quotations Regarding Hebrews 10:20
8. Quotations Regarding the Significance of the First Apartment
9. Quotations Regarding the Antithetical Nature of the Sanctuary Type
10. References in the New Testament to the Day of Atonement Apart from
Those in Hebrews and Revelation
11. The Gospels and the Day of Atonement

HEBREWS AND THE DAY OF ATONEMENT

WARNING FROM M.L. ANDREASEN

The history of this movement shows that we have not always profited by heresies as we might. Ballenger headed a movement attacking the doctrine of the sanctuary. This occasioned a review of this question, but the study was mostly aimed at refuting charges levelled against us and did not involve the larger aspects and inspirations of our teaching. As soon as the immediate crisis was past, we did little or no further official study, though sharp differences and divergent views had been revealed that should have called for an exhaustive investigation of the subject.

When Conrad had his hearings, we were not much better off; and Fletcher was perplexed by the many different views he met among our men in Washington. True, we did some studying as we were faced with the necessity of meeting the issue; but again, as soon as the crisis was past, we felt our work done. To the best of my knowledge and belief, there has been no official or authorized study since then. We shall be unprepared when another crisis occurs.

I doubt that we fully appreciate how much these heresies have undermined the faith of the ministry in our doctrine of the sanctuary. If my experience as a teacher in the Seminary may be taken as a criterion, I would say that a large number of our ministers have serious doubt as to the correctness of the views we hold on certain phases of the sanctuary. They believe, in a general way, that we are correct, but they are as fully assured that Ballenger's views have never been fully met and that we cannot meet them. Not wishing to make the matter an issue, they simply decide that the question is not vital — and thus the whole subject of the sanctuary is relegated, in their minds at least, to the background. This is not a wholesome situation. If the subject is as vital as we have thought and taught it to be, it is not of secondary importance. Today, in the minds of a considerable part of the ministry, as far as my experience in the Seminary is concerned, it has little vital bearing, either in their lives or theology.

I dread to see the day when our enemies will make capital of our weakness. I dread still more to see the day when our ministry will begin to raise questions.

[M.L. Andreasen, field secretary of the General Conference, to J.L. McElhany and W.H. Branson, letter of December 25, 1942.]

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT FROM HEBREWS

We would plead that the reader give the most thorough attention to these few introductory pages to our chapter on Hebrews. If these are wrong in their central thesis, then our whole case collapses. On the other hand, if the central thesis here is correct, then our traditional mode of expressing the sanctuary truth is erroneous. The central thesis referred to is that Hebrews clearly affirms that in fulfilment of the Day of Atonement type, Christ by the cross-resurrection-ascension event entered upon the ministry prefigured by the sanctuary's **second** apartment.

Let us observe the testimony of Hebrews regarding this matter:

The Son is the radiance of God's glory and the exact representation of his being, sustaining all things by his powerful word. After he had provided purification for sins, he sat down at the right hand of the Majesty in heaven. (Heb. 1:3 NIV)

Therefore, since we have a great high priest who has gone through the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold firmly to the faith we profess. ... Let us then approach the throne of grace with confidence, so that we may receive mercy and find grace to help us in our time of need. (Heb. 4:14,16 NIV)

We have this hope as an anchor for the soul, firm and secure. It enters the inner sanctuary behind the curtain, where Jesus, who went before us, has entered on our behalf. He has become a high priest forever, in the order of Melchizedek. (Heb. 6:19, 20 NIV)

The point of what we are saying is this: We do have such a high priest, who sat down at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in heaven, and who serves in the sanctuary, the true tabernacle set up by the Lord, not by man. (Heb. 8:1, 2 NIV)

But only the high priest entered the inner room, and that only once a year, and never without blood, which he offered for himself and for the sins the people had committed in ignorance. The Holy Spirit was showing by this that the way into the Most Holy Place had not yet been disclosed as long as the first tabernacle was still standing. ... He did not enter by means of the blood of goats and calves; but he entered the Most Holy Place once for all by his own blood, having obtained eternal redemption. ... For Christ did not enter a man-made sanctuary that was only a copy of the true one; he entered heaven itself, now to appear for us in God's presence. Nor did he enter heaven to offer himself again and again, the way the high priest enters the Most Holy Place every year with blood that is not his own. (Heb. 9:7, 8, 12, 24, 25 NIV)

Therefore, brothers, since we have confidence to enter the Most Holy Place by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way opened for us through the curtain, that is, his body. (Heb. 10:19, 20 NIV)

The high priest carries the blood of animals into the Most Holy Place as a sin offering, but the bodies are burned outside the camp. And so Jesus also suffered outside the city gate to make the people holy through his own blood. (Heb. 13:11, 12 NIV)

(Compare also KJV, RSV, NEB renderings.)

The most important expressions in these passages are "the right hand of God," "the throne of grace," "within the veil," "through the veil," "the way into the holiest of all," "into the holiest

... by a new and living way,” “into the holy place,” “minister of the sanctuary,” “as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year,” “blood is brought into the sanctuary,” (KJV) or their equivalents.

It is vital that we understand that in the last six allusions it is the same expression which is variously translated “the holiest of all,” “the holiest,” “the holy place,” “the sanctuary,” “the holy place.” That expression is *ta hagia*. Thus, repeatedly, Hebrews affirms that Christ had by the time of the writing of that letter already entered and remained in *ta hagia* — He had thus been engaged upon a *ta hagia* ministry for at least thirty years. The NIV is correct in using “the Most Holy Place.”

“*Ta hagia*” is a plural form with a singular meaning. Modern lexical authorities include it in their lists of words of this ilk. Our own *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* recognizes this fact, and points out that *hagia* is used for the first apartment in verse 2 and for the second in verse 3 of Hebrews 9. *Ta hagia* is used repeatedly in the references given above for the place of Christ’s heavenly entrance. Thus according to Hebrews, *ta hagia* is the place (or, as most would prefer, represents the form of ministry) entered upon by Christ at His death and ascension. Context, not philology, must decide the meaning of this key term.

Practically every scholar of the Christian age has believed that Hebrews by *ta hagia* means the innermost sanctuary — the second apartment called “the holy place” in Lev. 16:2, 3, 16, 17, 23, 27. SDAs have traditionally questioned this on the basis of the Greek plural form, but no competent Greek scholar amongst us maintains such a position today — or if he does, he is a strange rarity in the denominational scholarship. We repeat, Hebrews clearly says Christ entered *ta hagia* and was there in Paul’s day, and the term applies to a single place or that represented by the second apartment.

The context makes it quite clear that “*ta hagia*” is the place “within the veil” or “through the veil”. It is the place entered once a year. It is “the holiest of all” and is the equivalent of “the second”. It is where the throne of God is located. Anyone there is at “the right hand of God.” See the above texts.

Heb. 6:19, 20; 10:19, 20 are emphatic that Christ at the time of the writing of Hebrews had already passed through the veil into “*ta hagia*.” That new and living way into “*ta hagia*” was symbolized by the rending of the second veil at the time of Calvary and it is to this that 10:19, 20 obviously refers. 9:7, 8 tell us that “*ta hagia*” is the equivalent of “the second” — the fact that the high priest only was permitted in-to the second, and that but once a year, showed that the way into the true second (the holiest of all — “*ta hagia*”) was not yet manifested because Jesus had not yet come. Heb. 9:12, 24, 25 as well as 9:7, 8 make this same point that it was the “*ta hagia*” into which the high priest alone went once every year on the Day of Atonement. The writer is saying repeatedly that what the high priest did once a year Christ has now already done.

There is no hint in Hebrews that Christ had gone into the *ta hagia* only to come out and return to the first apartment — indeed the first apartment is not applied to any special ministry of Christ in heaven above. There is no hint that at some time in the future according to the author of Hebrews Christ would enter upon a second phase of ministry, a future entering into the place He had already entered. This would make nonsense of the clear testimonies of these chapters. On the contrary it is a coming out, not a going in, that Hebrews expects. See 9:28.

It must be emphasized that “within the veil” is acknowledged by our New Testament scholars today to apply to within the second veil. This is not only my own position but is held by

E. Heppenstall, S. Kubo, J. Cox, W. Johnsson, F. Veltman, R. Cottrell, B. Neal, N. Gulley, N.H. Young, and many others. This present writer knows no New Testament scholar amongst us whose protests against such an understanding would be taken seriously by his fellows.

Hebrews is saying as clearly as words can say it that Christ already in the first century was engaged in the equivalent ministry to that which the typical high priest performed in the second apartment of the tabernacle on the Day of Atonement. No competent SDA New Testament scholar has offered any written rebuttal of this truth which has been acceptable to his fellows. The consequences of these facts are momentous for the church, but if we are to be blessed of heaven they must be faced and acknowledged.

Heb. 9:6-8

Let us now look at these same truths from other angles.

The significance of the two apartments of the sanctuary, and the cleansing of the second is found in detail only in the book of Hebrews, and specially in chapter 9.

Regarding the ministry of Christ, as already stated, Hebrews unequivocally asserts that He entered “within the veil” at His ascension, and that believers in that day anticipated He would soon come out to bless the waiting congregation (9:28). It knows nothing of a future entrance into a second apartment, or a special ministry so prefigured. Rather, the emphasis is upon atonement already made, redemption already acquired — a work already done, and done once for all in contrast to the protracted Levitical services. By the time of this letter, sin had already been put away (9:26; 1:3; 10:11-14; 9:12), and our King-Priest had sat down at the right hand of God.

SDAs in the past have avoided the force of the plain statements in Hebrews by the following arguments:

1. “Within the veil” means within the first veil.
2. *Ta hagia* is a plural term, and therefore the references to Christ’s entering the *ta hagia* means His entrance into a sanctuary with two apartments to perform two phases of ministry.
3. The fact that the earthly sanctuary was a shadow and type of heavenly things makes it essential that Christ’s ministry consist of two phases.

The problems with these arguments are:

1. It is impossible to support that “within the veil” means within the first veil. See our pages 134-136, 139, 131-131.
2. *Hagia* is acknowledged by all Greek scholars to be a plural form with a singular meaning. It is applied to the first apartment (9:3), and also to the second (repeatedly in vs. 8, 12, 24; 10:19). *Ta hagia* is said to be “within” or “through” the veil. Christ had to pass through the veil to enter *ta hagia*. *Ta hagia* is the place the high priest entered only once a year. These truths, set forth clearly in 10:19, 20 (cf 6:19, 20); 9:7, 8, 12, 24, make it impossible to contend that the term embraces both apartments. (Note that the plural form in verse 2 for the first apartment, as some other anarthrous forms, points to quality.) The first apartment is never mentioned again after verse 6, but the second is mentioned repeatedly and always in the plural form, and with the article (except when

contrasted with the first apartment and linked with *hagion*; verse 3 only). It is within the veil that the real holy place lies, just as in Lev. 16:2, 3, 16, 17, 20, 23, 27, 33.

Our traditional arguments have ignored the plain meaning of Heb. 9:68. **These verses assert that the significance of the regular use of the first apartment (rather than the second) was that the real way of access, “the new and living way through the veil” “into the holiest” (10:19, 20) was not yet available so long as there was a first apartment ministry (9:8). That is, a first apartment ministry would only be relevant until the cross and never after, and it represented the limited blessings of the typical era.**

It is clearly said in 9:6-8 that the first tabernacle (i.e. the first apartment, see verses 2,6) into which the priests went daily, only had standing (status) until the reality symbolized by the types arrived. See verses 9-14. The writer is affirming that now “Christ being come” and having “by his own blood entered in” to *ta hagia*, the first apartment ministry no longer exists. That is, the earthly first apartment ministry has now no meaning, for in heaven above there is only the ministry of *ta hagia* — that holiest of all presence of God typified by the second apartment. The limited access to God, and the ever unfinished work of the priests taught by the first apartment, is in contrast with the boldness wherewith all believers may now enter into the second with the great High Priest because of His once-for-all completed atonement. See Heb. 10:19, 20, and the preceding verses of the same chapter.

The reader should observe that “the second” in verse 7 is identical with *ta hagia* of verse 8. That is to say, the second apartment, the focus of the writer’s attention, was “the holiest of all” (or “the holy place” in the sense of Lev. 16:2, 3, 16, 17, etc.), the *ta hagia* now made manifest (or “open”) by Christ’s redeeming act on the cross. 9:8 with its reference to “way” must be compared with the use of that same term in 10:20 — where it is clearly stated to be a “way” “through the veil.”

Yet another feature of importance is that the following passages of chapters 9 and 10 expand verses 6, 7 and 8. In 9:9-10 we have commentary on the ministry of the first apartment (verse 6), while verses 11-12 comment upon verse 7, the ministry of the second apartment. This is repeated again, with verse 13 pointing back to the ceremonies involved in the ministry spoken of in verse 6, while verse 14 parallels verse 7, and “the way into *ta hagia*” of verse 8. But there are two more repetitions of this same contrast between the ministry of the first apartment and that represented by the second. Verses 18-23 parallel what is spoken of in verse 6, while verses 24-28 speak of the antitype represented by the “second” of verse 7. And in chapter 10, the first eleven verses speak of the type as enacted by the ministry of the earthly first apartment, but verses 12-20 give the antitype. See the accompanying graph of these parallels.

The comments upon time limitation should not be ignored. In verse 8 we have a “so long as” or “while,” but in verse 10 we have the parallel “until.” Thus (verse 8) “so long as the first apartment ministry had significance” is in meaning identical with “outward ordinances in force” (verse 10). Thereby we see that “the time of reformation” is the equivalent to what was represented by “the second,” “the holiest of all,” the *ta hagia*. This same thought is found in 10:1, where we are told that the typical offerings pointed forward to the good things **yet to come**. Thus the contrast is ever between the time before the cross represented by the limited and continuous ministry of the typical blood of animals by earthly priests, and the time after the cross where Christ opens unrestricted access and confers the “good things” of forgiveness, the law written on the heart, etc. The first apartment stands for the era before the cross, but the second apartment for the era after the cross.

The fact that according to Heb. 6:19, 20; 9:8, 12, 24, 25; 10:19, 20; Christ entered the equivalent of the second apartment at His ascension is confirmed by a multitude of other inspired evidences.

It does not matter whether we understand by *prōtē skēnē* either the tabernacle first in time (the Mosaic sanctuary), or first in space (the outer apartment). The significance remains the same, and it is clearly expressed in verses 7-9. What the first apartment was to the second, so was the first sanctuary of the Levitical age to the heavenly sanctuary. Thus it follows that the first apartment stands for the entire Mosaic sanctuary, and the second apartment represents the entire heavenly sanctuary. Never, after verse 6, does the apostle apply the first apartment, inasmuch as, from now on, his chief concern is with the heavenly sanctuary and it is always set forth as the true *ta hagia* “within the veil.”

Some have suggested that the term “sanctuary” is the best translation for *ta hagia* as leaving open whether a two-apartment schema is envisaged, or the ministry of a single apartment. But even those who so contend admit that the *ta hagia* references have chief reference to the second apartment. The evidence from translators and commentators is that “sanctuary” to them meant only the second apartment when used for *ta hagia*. This corresponds with the singular form “holy place” (the literal meaning of sanctuary) in Lev. 16 for the second apartment. We repeat, the fact that the high priest entered *ta hagia* yearly with blood (verse 25) makes it clear that *ta hagia* is that innermost sanctuary only open for entrance on the Day of Atonement. See Lev. 16:33 RSV and compare Heb. 9:2, which uses “sanctuary” for a single apartment (KJV).

To make “*ta hagia*” in verse 8 and elsewhere mean holy places (plural) would make nonsense of most verses employing the term. It would make 9:25, for example, say that the high priest once a year entered the two apartments, whereas the obvious meaning is that the high priest entered the inner room once a year. It would make 10:19, 20 say that there were two holy places beyond the innermost veil. And it would make two places the equivalent of “the second” in 9:8, instead of one.

The chapter in which we find this crucial passage of 9:6-8 is the Day of Atonement chapter of the New Testament. Its emphasis is on the high priest, *ta hagia*, once a year, the blood of bulls and goats, access within the veil — all of which are motifs of *Yom Kippur*. The entrance of our Meichizedekan King-Priest through the veil to the throne of God is found throughout the letter. See 1:3; 2:17; 4:16; 6:19, 20; 8:1; 9:8, 12, 24-25; 10:19; 13:11. This entrance fulfilled the Day of Atonement. The typical sprinkling of the warm, uncoagulated blood immediately on the mercy seat after the slaying could not possibly point to 1844.

The rest of chapter 9, after the preliminary Day of Atonement references (8, 12) sets forth other types of cleansing from sin such as the red heifer ceremonial, the sealing of the covenant, the anointing of the sanctuary, and its cleansing. Each of these is so “tailored” by the author so as to “mesh” with his key theme. The red heifer type never involved sprinkling with blood, nor did the covenant sealing or sanctuary anointing — but our author wishes to invoke the great efficacy of atonement blood and chooses language to fulfil that task. He never mentions the sprinkling on the mercy seat, for he wishes to make Calvary the place of the atonement lest readers think it incomplete requiring additional heavenly aspersion. It is the “shedding” of blood, verse 22, which cleanses the heavenly sanctuary (verse 23). This cleansing is already past in the first century, and means the same as purification for sins” in 1:3. Heb. 9:23 cannot legitimately be exegeted as applying to the future. All Adventist usage of this verse as part of an 1844 apologetic is erroneous. The first word of verse 24 links the

cleansing with what the high priest did yearly and affirms that Christ had now done that. See verses 26-28, which further elaborate that the cleansing of the sanctuary was Christ's putting away of sin by the sacrifice of Himself (identical with the significance of the blood-shedding of verse 22).

Having looked at 9:8 in context and found its testimony to Christ's entrance into the Most Holy at His ascension fulfilling the Day of Atonement type, it is appropriate to ask what the chapter should say if the traditional Adventist interpretation of a two-apartment heavenly ministry in successive phases is correct.

In verse 8 we would expect something like this: "the Holy Spirit thus signifying that there would also be two phases of heavenly ministry just as on earth." But it says rather that the restricted and rare entrance into the Most Holy prefigured what Christ did by the way of His flesh at the cross.

Furthermore, we would expect that later in the chapter we might find reference to a heavenly first apartment ministry, and then also the promise that ultimately Christ would, some time in the future, enter upon his final work typified by that "within the veil."

We might also expect that Dan. 8:14 would be invoked, or the thought of an investigative judgment to take place in the future before our High Priest returned. None of these likelihoods are realized, and it is no wonder that SDA scholars have told us not to look in Hebrews for support of our traditional two-apartment heavenly ministry schema.

The most common objection to the foregoing thesis is the third one listed earlier — that inasmuch as the earthly sanctuary was a shadow and type of heavenly things, there has to be a heavenly equivalent to the first apartment ministry succeeded by a later "second apartment" ministry.

This argument shows that the proposer of it has not given due weight to the many statements of Hebrews which contrast the type with the antitype. See, for example, 7:11-14; 7:27, 28; 8:4; 9:11-14; 10:1-4, 11-14. In the type, the priest was a sinner whose ministry was imperfect and terminated by death. He was forever offering, and knew no successful climax to his work. He belonged to the tribe of Levi and at the best could only enter the presence of God once a year. What a contrast to our Priest in the true sanctuary above. Christ does not belong to the tribe of Levi, His ministry is perfect and is never interrupted by death, and belongs to "a greater and more perfect tabernacle." He needs not to offer sacrifices continually, but after a single "once for all" offering sat down as Priest-King at the right hand of God, forever in the presence of His Father. Thus the antitype not only exceeds the type but is frequently in contrast or antithesis to it. 9:6-12 shows that the first apartment was but a symbol of the ineffectual typical priestly ministry, and had meaning only until Christ manifested the way into the holiest of all — within the veil, which He did at the cross.

Let any read at one sitting Heb. 6:19 to 10:20 (preferably in several versions) prayerfully and carefully, and for most the desire for debate will disappear. It will be replaced by joy that our great King-Priest has already accomplished our redemption, and set us apart for Himself, soon to be claimed at His glorious appearing, if we abide in Him.

(We have not in this summary set forth all the details of argument involved in interpreting Heb. 9. The following pages do that. Commentators are only quoted when their statements indicate some Scripture truth that many of us might otherwise miss. They have no authority other than the truth they offer us from the Word. Nor have we.)

The following chart should be closely studied and also those on page 139-140.

These five passages are parallel and illuminate each other.

Heb. 9:6-7

Continual ministry in the first apartment, but not permitted to enter the second except once a year. “The way into the *ta hagia* not yet manifested,” while the first apartment had a status.

Heb. 9:9, 10

The time of sacrifice and offerings which could not cleanse the conscience—were outward ordinances—until the time of reformation.

Heb. 9:13

Blood of goats and bulls, and the ashes of a heifer for external purity [until the cross].

Heb. 9:19-23

Blood of animals used for covenant ratification, dedication and cleansing of earthly sanctuary [until the cross].

Heb. 10:1-11

The shadow of “the good things to come”. Not the image of those things. Consists of repeated animal sacrifices which could not cleanse the conscience perfectly [until the cross].

These five passages are parallel and illuminate each other.

Heb. 9:8

The way into *ta hagia* [from the time of the cross].

Heb. 9:11,12

High priest of greater and more perfect tent—the *ta hagia* [from the time of the cross].

Heb. 9:14

The blood of Christ brings perfect cleansing of the conscience [from the time of the cross].

Heb. 9:24-28

Blood of Christ ratifies the new covenant, dedicates and cleanses the new covenant *ta hagia* [at the cross].

Heb. 10:12-20

One sacrifice for all time—the sacrifice by Christ our Great High Priest—has cleansed us from sin and given us access “through the veil” into *ta hagia*, the presence of God [at the cross].

THE IMPORTANCE OF HEBREWS FOR SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS

The Hiram Edson story of the cornfield experience on October 23, 1844, has been handed down to us by J.N. Loughborough in five different accounts with varying degrees of accuracy. Edson's own account was written approximately thirty years after the event when his own memory may have grown somewhat dim. We find no allusion to the experience in material printed from his pen in 1845.¹

One of the most interesting parts of the story is that when Edson was searching for light after the great disappointment, he purposely dropped his Bible on a table in such a manner that it would fall open. The result was Heb. 8 and 9 exposed to view. What could be more appropriate and symbolic of the Adventist claim that these chapters hold the key to the meaning of 1844 and Dan. 8:14.²

That claim is crucial for Seventh-day Adventists. Only in Heb. 9 do we have didactic expression of the meaning of (1) the first apartment ministry; (2) the second apartment ministry; (3) "the cleansing of the sanctuary" — for New Testament believers. Nowhere else in Scripture can be found a detailed explanation of the significance of these three elements of the sanctuary doctrine so vital to us.

All our early works draw heavily on Heb. 9 when explaining Dan. 8:14, but in recent time there have only been four scholarly expositions which dwell on this chapter; one by Gerhard Hasel which is a strong apologetic for the traditional position; one in the *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* which says that no apologetic for the traditional position can there be found; and those by Salom & Johnsson which agree with the *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*.

Certain things stand out immediately as one reads Heb. 9. There is no obvious allusion to the book of Daniel, and certainly none to Dan. 8:14. The cleansing of the sanctuary is referred to in this chapter, and more than once, **but always it is applied to what had already occurred in the Christ event before this epistle was written — i.e. the cleansing is past**, not future. The chapter as a whole is an application of Lev. 16 for New Testament times.

Other things that are less obvious, but nonetheless vital for us as Adventists, include the following:

1. The Day of Atonement is specifically discussed in verses 7, 8, 12, 24, 25, and almost certainly is alluded to in verses 23, 27, 28.
2. The Greek term *ta hagia*, and the genitive *tōn hagiōn*, while plural in form, are certainly used with a singular meaning in the majority of instances, and therefore all previous arguments based on the plural are erroneous.
3. Heb. 9 must be interpreted in its context, and on both sides of the chapter (e.g., 6:19-20 and 10:19-20) we have further allusions to the Day of Atonement in connection with what Christ has already done.

Before looking at the text itself as the first and final arbiter, we will make some observations regarding translators and commentators on this passage.

We wish to avoid all that smacks of pedantry in this chapter, and hasten to point out that we see value in the work of commentators or translators only as they indicate something in the sacred text that otherwise we might have overlooked. That is, we give them no weight on the basis of their personal authority, but only as they make particular evidence from the Word itself apparent. Such evidence must either be accepted or rejected on sound Biblical grounds rather than sectarian prejudice. Secondly, we do not purpose to draw on esoteric issues usually canvassed in textbooks on New Testament Introduction unless, and only so far, as they impinge on our doctrinal concerns.

1. Almost all commentators are agreed that this is the New Testament Day of Atonement chapter. We know of no classical commentary on Hebrews which does not see in Heb. 9:8, 12, 24, 25 the Day of Atonement discussed and interpreted.
2. Again, we know of no exegete of note who does not recognize that these verses affirm that the Day of Atonement has already been fulfilled in the Christ event.
3. At least the majority of those who comment on the original text allude to the fact that the plural form has here, in most instances at least, a singular meaning. Grammarians list *hagia* as typical of those nouns with a plural form but not a plural meaning. See *A Greek Grammar* by Blass, Debrunner, and Funk, section 141.8; *Handbook of Grammar of the Greek Testament*, by S.G. Green, p. 203; *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, by A.T. Robertson, p. 408; *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, by T. Blass, pp. 83, 84; and *A Grammar of the Idiom of the New Testament*, by G.B. Winer, p. 176. *Ta hagia* is only one of a series of words in the New Testament which though plural in form have a singular meaning. "Heaven," "world," and other terms in some instances have a plural original. The phenomenon is related to a general, Grecian or Biblical point of view of manifoldness or comprehensiveness.
4. The expressions "within the veil," or "through the veil," found before and after chapter 9, speak of the high priest's entrance into the Most Holy Place on the Day of Atonement. (Evidence on these points is provided later in this chapter. These early pages as indicated by the heading provide merely an "overview," and indicate the setting of key passages. Argumentation of the central issues begins on page 123. Discussion of counter arguments is found chiefly from 155 on. Our approach is primarily thematic lest we blot out the "sun" of the overall thesis of Hebrews by concentrating on a mere daub held too close to the eye-pupil of the mind. Detailed consideration of minutiae only baffles unless the setting and thought-flow is first perceived.).

THE SETTING OF HEBREWS 9, AND OVERVIEW OF THE CHAPTER

Hebrews is like a fifth gospel, applying as it does to the work of the Saviour, but this time to work not only on earth but in the heavenlies. The whole epistle finds its focus in Christ's person, offering, and post-resurrection ministry. Most scholars believe it was written to Jewish Christians in danger of backsliding as they mourned the loss of a significant system of external forms. For this reason, the writer of this epistle uses "better" (eight times) as he shows how the substance has now replaced the shadow, and that in Christ believers have the blessings for which the faithful in earlier times had longed. This probable historical setting explains the recurring motif of contrast throughout the epistle with its interspersed exhortations to "hold fast."

In chapter one, His divinity is emphasized, but in chapter two His humanity. Chapters three to seven show that He is greater than Moses, Joshua and Melchizedek. Chapter eight stresses

His more excellent ministry than the typical priestly ministry, just as also the covenant He mediates is better. He ministers in a better tabernacle, even a heavenly, which He cleansed through a better sacrifice than Israel ever knew. Therefore all believers have better privileges, having received perfection of conscience and freedom to boldly enter as priests and kings through the veil into the very presence of God.

These privileges depend on the maintenance of faith, a faith that conquers kingdoms, enforces righteousness, receives promises, shuts the mouths of lions, quenches raging fire, escapes the edge of the sword, wins strength from weakness, and contemplates a “better” resurrection than will be the lot of apostates. Looking to Jesus, this faith is nourished to survive divine chastening and worldly persecution. It leads to brotherly love, service, and contentment, feeding on the altar of gospel gifts, provided by Him who “suffered outside the gate in order to sanctify the people through his own blood.” To Him we go forth bearing whatever abuse the world may heap upon us. Even the final benediction enshrines Jesus, extolling His redemptive work.

May the God of peace, who through the blood of the eternal covenant brought back from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep, equip you with everything good for doing his will, and may he work in us what is pleasing to him, through Jesus Christ, to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen. (Heb. 13:20-21 NIV)

Chapter nine shows Jesus as better than Aaron and his successors. Aaron had to pass with the Day of Atonement blood through the veil year by year, but Christ entered to that within the veil immediately upon His own offering, once and for all. He needs not, as other high priests, to pass over the same ground again and again with new sacrifices. Once at the end of the world He has appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself, and now we in the outer court await His coming “without sin” from the holy of holies to save His own. “Yet a little while, and the coming one shall come and shall not tarry. ...”

Aaron could approach the divine presence only once a year, but Jesus has gone to dwell at God’s right hand. Aaron went in tremblingly, but Jesus as a conqueror. Aaron was but a human priest, but Jesus is a divine king, as well as human priest. Aaron approached with incense lest he die. He dare not enter without blood, and his ministry was interrupted by death. Our “Aaron” needs no shield of sweet aromas, no external “passport,” and His ministry is that of an endless life.

The foregoing is a conspectus of the letter, offering the contextual setting for the key verses on the Day of Atonement which we must now survey, keeping in mind the contrasts just indicated. First, let us take a swift overview of the main passages.

Now the first covenant had regulations for worship and also an earthly sanctuary. ... When everything had been arranged like this, the priests entered regularly into the outer room to carry on their ministry. But only the high priest entered the inner room, and that only once a year, and never without blood, which he offered for himself and for the sins the people had committed in ignorance. (Heb. 9:1, 6, 7 NIV)

Consider the restricted access before the cross. Gentiles could enter their own distant court, Jewish women the court of the women, Jewish men theirs, Levites as far as the first veil, the ordinary priests as far as the second, and the high priest “within the veil,” but only once a year, only with incense, only with blood, only as a forgiven sinner, and only for a few moments. In the first Biblical discussion of the division between the apartments, it is made

clear that the veil represented limited access, with death as the penalty for those who presumed. (Lev. 16:2)

The Holy Spirit was showing by this that the way into the Most Holy Place had not yet been disclosed as long as the first tabernacle was still standing. This is an illustration for the present time, indicating that the gifts and sacrifices being offered were not able to clear the conscience of the worshiper. They are only a matter of food and drink and various ceremonial washings — external regulations applying until the time of the new order. When Christ came as high priest of the good things that are already here he went through the greater and more perfect tabernacle that is not man-made, that is to say, not a part of this creation. He did not enter by means of the blood of goats and calves; but he entered the Most Holy Place once for all by his own blood, having obtained eternal redemption. (Heb. 9:8-12 NIV)

The sealed-off inner apartment taught the temporary limitation of access during the time of the old covenant prior to Christ. All the ministry of the earthly high priest and his assistants could not perfect the conscience of the worshiper. It dealt only with outward matters, regulations for the body which were temporary only, anticipating a coming era of reformation. When the high priest did enter the Most Holy, He did not secure any eternal redemption, but only a temporary reprieve. But Jesus ministers in a greater sanctuary, even the heavenly, and entered “once for all,” not with animal sacrifices, but the merits of His own vicarious sacrifice, having secured by that death eternal redemption for all who believe.

The blood of goats and bulls and the ashes of a heifer sprinkled on those who are ceremonially unclean sanctify them so that they are outwardly clean. How much more, then, will the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself unblemished to God, cleanse our consciences from acts that lead to death, so that we may serve the living God! (Heb. 9:13-14 NIV)

Animal blood gave ceremonial cleansing, but the blood of Christ brings cleansing of soul and peace of conscience. Animal sacrifices often resulted in a life of “dead works,” but the sacrifice of Christ received leads to spiritual service of the living God.

For this reason Christ is the mediator of a new covenant, that those who are called may receive the promised eternal inheritance — now that he has died as a ransom to set them free from the sins committed under the first covenant. (Heb. 9:15 NIV)

The old covenant made nothing perfect, was never final. Christ ended such limitations by sealing a new covenant with His own blood.

It was necessary, then, for the copies of the heavenly things to be purified with these sacrifices, but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these. (Heb. 9:23 NIV)

All cleansing ceremonies, including the dedication of the sanctuary and the Day of Atonement only had to do with samples of “copies,” but Christ has fulfilled the reality.

For Christ did not enter a man-made sanctuary that was only a copy of the true one; he entered heaven itself, now to appear for us in God’s presence. (Heb. 9:24 NIV)

Observe that the cleansing of the sanctuary, and Christ’s entrance therein has already taken place by the time of the writing of Hebrews. The “cleansing” of the heavenly things themselves must be interpreted by the context which throughout is speaking of the

forgiveness of sin accomplished by the shedding of sacrificial blood. Heb. 9:23 is an equivalent of John 1:29; 2 Cor. 5:18, 21; 1 Cor. 15:3; Gal. 1:4; Eph. 1:7; Col. 1:14; Rom. 3:24, 25; Rom. 5:18.

Aaron entered the kindergarten earthly type, but Christ the reality in heaven.

Nor did he enter heaven to offer himself again and again, the way the high priest enters the Most Holy Place every year with blood that is not his own. Then Christ would have had to suffer many times since the creation of the world. But now he has appeared once for all at the end of the ages to do away with sin by the sacrifice of himself. (Heb. 9:25-26 N IV)

Aaron knew each time he would need to go through it all “once a year,” again and again, but Christ’s work was “once for all time.”

So Christ was sacrificed once to take away the sins of many people; and he will appear a second time, not to bear sin, but to bring salvation to those who are waiting for him. (Heb. 9:28 NIV)

After Aaron’s offering on the Day of Atonement, there must needs come another time “to deal with sin” though ever so ineffectually. Not so with Christ.

The *Interpreter’s Bible* offers a helpful comment and summary on the first half of Hebrews 9:

A casual reading of these verses may not reveal the meticulous care with which the writer develops his comparison. It can best be shown in a table.

The Earthly Priesthood (vs. 1-10)

1. The **place** where it functions and a description (vs. 1-5)
2. Its action and **approach to God** (vs. 6-7)
3. Its **offering** (v. 7)
4. An **estimate** of the whole institution (vs. 8-10)

Christ’s Priesthood (vs. 11-14)

1. The **place** where he functions (v. 11)
2. His action and **approach to God** (v. 12a)
3. His **offering** (v. 12b)
4. An **estimate** of the worth of his priesthood (vs. 12c-14)

The greater space allotted to the earthly ministry (ten verses as against four) is due to the fact that points 1 and 2 have been already developed, and points 2, 3, and 4 will be further developed as regards Christ’s priesthood. In these verses the reader sees the superiority and finality of Christ’s ministry stated in a neat summary form.³

Verses 15-28 enlarge the second half of verse 12.

Thus far we have given a broad overview. Now we wish to approach the real target of our investigation — the specific Day of Atonement references in Heb. 9.

THE DAY OF ATONEMENT IN HEBREWS 9

Can any imagine that the writer of Hebrews in extolling the superiority of Christ and Christianity over the Jewish system, particularly in the areas of ritual and the sanctuary, would omit reference to the Day of Atonement? Exegetes of this epistle universally (so far as

this writer is aware) find the Day of Atonement **at least** seven times in Hebrews. These references are not esoteric, but by such statements as “once a year,” “into the second [apartment],” “within the veil,” “the blood of bulls and goats,” “a remembrance of sins made again every year,” “only the high priest,” “through the curtain,” “first for his own sins and then for those of the people,” indicate as far as is verbally likely that *Yom Kippur* is the theme.

We give typical quotations on this point in the appendix.⁴

Let it be remembered that the apostle refers to Christ three times as priest, but nine times as high priest. The only distinctive work of the high priest was the Day of Atonement service. Having shown that Christ is fitted to be our High Priest because of His two natures, and His sufferings, the writer had then found his prototype in Melchizedec — the one both king and priest, “without father or mother, beginning of days or end of life, but abideth a priest continually.” Then at the beginning of chapter 8 we are told that the very high point of all said to date is this: “We have such a high priest, one who is seated at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in heaven, a minister in the sanctuary and the true tent.” The word translated “point” in 8:1 is *kefalion* and means the principal idea. Christ’s high priestly work is the main theme of Hebrews, and the only distinctive work of the high priest was that of the Day of Atonement.

Verse 6 of the same chapter moves to the ministry of our great High Priest, and stresses that He is the mediator of a better covenant which accompanies the better sanctuary, even a heavenly. The rest of chapter eight after verse six sets forth the Old Testament promises in Jeremiah regarding the new covenant. Then, at the opening of the following chapter, the writer reverts to the discussion of the ministry of our High Priest. To stress the “betterness” of the new arrangement, the writer first outlines the old, and emphasizes its limitations in quality and time. It consisted only of outward ordinances, bringing ceremonial purification to a people without direct access to God, and it was imposed only until the time of reformation the coming of the Messiah. He tells us that as the first apartment was to the second, so the Mosaic tabernacle is to the heavenly sanctuary. Note his words carefully:

When everything had been arranged like this, the priests entered regularly into the outer room to carry on their ministry. But only the high priest entered the inner room, and that only once a year, and never without blood, which he offered for himself and for the sins the people had committed in ignorance. The Holy Spirit was showing by this that the way into the Most Holy Place had not yet been disclosed as long as the first tabernacle was still standing. This is an illustration for the present time, indicating that the gifts and sacrifices being offered were not able to clear the conscience of the worshiper. (Heb. 9:6-9 NIV)

Other translations may be helpful, as regards the significance of this passage.

By this the Holy Spirit means that the way into the Holiest Presence was not disclosed so long as the first tent (which pre-shadowed the present age) was still standing. ... (Moffat)

In all this the Holy Spirit was seeking to show that there was no free access to the sanctuary while the outer tent was still standing. (Smith and Goodspeed)

By this the Holy Spirit shows that the way into the sanctuary was not revealed while the outer tent was in existence. (*The Translator’s New Testament*)

Notice also translations of one clause in particular:

while as the first tabernacle was yet standing:

So long as the first tent hath a standing — Rotherham

while still the outer tabernacle standeth — Conybeare

as long as the outer part of the Tabernacle still remained — TCNT

While the outer tent was still in existence — Williams

as long as the former tabernacle maintained its standing — Knox

That is, so long as the first tent and all it stands for still exist — Phillips

while the old covenant was still in force — Norlie

the outer room and the old system it represents was still in use — Taylor

as long as the former [the outer portion of the] tabernacle remains in a recognized institution and is still standing — Amplified⁵

Certain questions here arise. What is meant by the *prōtē skēnē* of verse 8? Is it identical with the same in verse 6? Translations differ, but the *Interpreter's Bible* offers the key when it says:

The RSV translation, for a tent was prepared, the outer one, is interpretation, although unquestionably correct interpretation. The Greek is σκηνη ... η πρωτη the writer's intention is to say that the first covenant provided for a "**first** tent." He proceeds to give a double meaning to the word "first" — he relished this sort of play on words — "first," not only as over against the last, i.e., the heavenly, but also "first" as over against the second (v. 3), i.e., the Holy of Holies. The second curtain perhaps is meant to emphasize the progressive difficulty of access to God in the earthly tabernacle. Of course a tent implied an entrance, but the way into the outer tent or Holy Place was not actually barred against the people's entrance.⁶

We wish to stress that the end result is the same, whichever way we understand *prōtē skēnē*. If it means the same in both verses 6 and 8, then the apostle is affirming that so long as the first apartment ritual operated — for that period Christ's entrance into what was symbolized by the second apartment was not possible.

Or, if we take the other view of *prōtē skēnē*, and apply it to the tabernacle as a whole, then the passage is affirming that so long as the earthly sanctuary functioned, the antitype of the ministry in the second apartment could not begin. It is important to observe that the sequence of ministries in the apartments mentioned in 6 and 7 "indicated" something very important. In other words, the fact that most of the time the Most Holy Place was barred, and only the holy place operated, "indicated" that the privileges symbolized by that Most Holy Place had not yet come. If some wish to say that the second apartment represents the heavenly sanctuary as a whole, we have no quarrel with that, provided it is recognized that the passage is affirming that what the first apartment was to the second, so the earthly tabernacle was to heavenly, and that therefore the first apartment represented the Mosaic system, and the second the Christian era. We are left with the fact that the Day of Atonement applies to the time since the cross, since the veil was torn at our priest's death — i.e. when He offered Himself once and for all, when the Mosaic system symbolized by the first apartment was abolished. See Matt. 27:51.

This is so important we wish to spell out the matter with more precision. As we do so let every reader observe that the argument does not rise or fall with these verses. Rather, the following verses, particularly 12, 23-25; 10:1-10, 19-20, are the check for our conclusions regarding verses 6 to 9.

As a help to a closer understanding of 6 to 8, let us attend to the last part of the sentence in 8 which begins v. 9: “which is symbolic for the present age.”

The Greek has: *hētis parabolē eis ton kairon (ton enestēkota)*

Parabole here has been seen since the day of Chrysostom as meaning the same as *typos* — type. The system represented by the first apartment (or first tabernacle) was provisional only, typical only, functioned thus until the coming of Christ. In other words, the first apartment ministry was symbolic of the limited privileges of the pre-cross era. The later expression about the washings, etc., imposed “until the time of reformation” is similar in meaning to the opening words of verse 9. The outer apartment ministry represented the earthly rituals which were practiced (or “had a standing” — *exousēs stasin*) till the substance, “the reformation,” came with Christ.

There are alternative ways of reading the Greek in the first half of verse 9. The AV has “the time then present” rather than “the time now present.” This would mean that the first apartment’s limiting veil indicated to the Jews that access to God was not yet possible. The RSV translation suggests that now, in our age, we can see clearly the typical meaning of the limited first apartment ministry. It matters not which we settle upon — both are saying that the first apartment represented a barrier to the way into the second until the coming of our High Priest and His entrance into the antitype of the Most Holy Place.

Note typical statements by commentators which we have given in the appendix, “Quotations Regarding Heb. 9:6-9.”⁷ These are not selected atypical expositions as all can readily prove for themselves by recourse both to Scripture and any range of exegetes in any country or time since the Reformation.

That the foregoing exposition is essentially correct is confirmed by verse 12, which follows in logical sequence the train of thought suggested above.

He did not enter by means of the blood of goats and calves; but he entered the Most Holy Place once for all by his own blood, having obtained eternal redemption. (Heb. 9:12 NIV)

The references to “once,” *ta hagia*, and the blood of bulls and goats, are all allusions to the Day of Atonement.

That the NIV is correct in translating *ta hagia* by “Most Holy” Place is clear from the contextual support of verse 11 regarding Christ as High Priest; the reference to the blood of goats and calves in verse 12 itself; and the fact that verse 12 is commentary upon the preceding verses which had stressed that in the typical era, represented by the first apartment, only once a year, only with blood, and only for a few moments, did the typical high priest enter the Most Holy Place. Observe the following parallels:

But only the high priest entered the inner room, and that only once a year, and never without blood, which he offered for himself and for the sins the people had committed in ignorance. (Heb. 9:7 NIV)

He did not enter by means of the blood of goats and calves; but he entered the Most Holy Place once for all by his own blood, having obtained eternal redemption. (Heb. 9:12 NIV)

For Christ did not enter a man-made sanctuary that was only a copy of the true one; he entered heaven itself, now to appear for us in God's presence. Nor did he enter heaven to offer himself again and again, the way the high priest enters the Most Holy Place every year with blood that is not his own. (Heb. 9:24-25 NIV)

We have this hope as an anchor for the soul, firm and secure. It enters the inner sanctuary behind the curtain, where Jesus, who went before us, has entered on our behalf. He has become a high priest forever, in the order of Melchizedek. (Heb. 6:19-20 NIV)

Therefore, brothers, since we have confidence to enter the Most Holy Place by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way opened for us through the curtain, that is, his body. (Heb. 10:19-20 NIV)

Let us draw near to God with a sincere heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled to cleanse us from a guilty conscience and having our bodies washed with pure water. (Heb. 10:22 NIV)

All these passages have to do with **entrance** into the presence of God. 9:7 says the high priest made the typical entrance on the Day of Atonement. 9:12 says Christ fulfilled that type after shedding His blood. 9:24 repeats the essence of verse 12. (Note also the parallel between "the greater and more perfect tent — not of this creation" in verse 11 and "the true one — heaven itself" of verse 24.) 10:19-22 admonished Christians to follow Christ by faith, and with holy boldness, inasmuch as they also are now king-priests, and need not, like the typical high priest, tremble as they approach the presence of God.

We feel that the evidence is clear that the author of Hebrews is throughout his ninth chapter stressing that the blood of Christ had done what the typical blood could never do — given access to the very presence of God as typified by the High Priest's entrance into the Most Holy Place on the Day of Atonement. It is not sufficient to say that the blood of Christ is the theme of Heb. 9. We must say that "the blood of Christ brings access to God's right hand" is the message of the chapter, as indeed the rest of the book. And the reason the blood brings access is plainly stated. The believer in Christ and His cross have "full assurance" because their hearts have been "sprinkled clean from an evil conscience" through the blood of the cross. 10:22. Because Christ has already made atonement for them, they, like Him, have immediate access to God in "the Most Holy Place."

At this point we must stress that verses 13-22 of Heb. 9 do not wander away from the theme of the Day of Atonement, as some have suggested. On the contrary, the references to the cleansing accomplished by blood-shedding express the very essence of the Day of Atonement ceremonial. The author of Hebrews carefully avoids saying Christ has sprinkled His blood on the heavenly mercy seat, though he has repeatedly spoken of His entrance into the Most Holy. Nothing is allowed to detract from the finished work of the cross, and therefore sprinkling is linked not with the mercy seat, but with typical rites which represented the cleansing of **persons**.

We wish to enlarge this emphasis, inasmuch as Heb. 9 cannot be rightly understood until the reader becomes aware of the intention and method of the apostle as he applies the significance of the blood shed on the antitypical day of atonement.

The sprinkling of blood has always been recognized by scholars as alluding primarily to the services of *Yom Kippur*.⁸ Only in the exceptional cases of sin by the priest or the congregation was the blood of a sin offering **sprinkled**, and the sprinkling of Num. 19 was that of “water”, and in most other instances of sprinkling, oil was the medium. See Lev. 4:6; 4:17; 5:9; 8:11; 14:16, 27; Num. 19:4

The word found in the LXX Lev. 16 for sprinkling, *hrainō*, is never used by the New Testament except as a variant reading in Rev. 19:13. The typical New Testament word *hrantizō* is found only in the LXX for Lev. 6:20 (6:27), 2 Kings 9:33, and Ps. 50:9.

It is important that we recognize that Heb. 9:13 offers a fusion of ideas, because it is just not true that the blood of goats and calves was sprinkled on persons to sanctify them. As with the Talmud, Qumran, and Philo, we have here a linking of the Day of Atonement with the red heifer ceremonial. The apostle wishes to emphasize, not a continued atonement by sprinkling on a heavenly mercy seat, but a completed atonement at the altar of Calvary which henceforth provides cleansing for all people who believe.

Similarly, while the apostle elsewhere has not hesitated to use *hilaskomai* (2:17), he does not do it here because he is drawing terminology from the sprinkling of the outside altar to show that Christ’s blood had provided cleansing before He entered the heavenly temple. Compare Heb. 1:3 which assures us that purification of our sins was accomplished before our High Priest sat down as King on His throne above. The Greek phrase here — *katharismōn tōn hamartiōn* — is only used once in the LXX, and that is for purifying of the outside altar on the Day of Atonement. See Ex. 30:10.

In his thesis on the Day of Atonement’s influence on the New Testament, Dr. Norman H. Young writes:

It is rather clear, therefore, that our author is labouring to modify the type to fit Christian beliefs about Christ’s death: in the old cult the high priest comes out from the holiest to the altar before the Lord in order to complete the blood aspersions, now the high priest of the good things that have come enters the holiest having once-for-all performed the act of cleansing. We must emphasize again that to interpret the work of Christ woodenly from the Day of Atonement imagery is to reverse the method of Hebrews.⁹

The apparent confusion in Heb. 9:19ff, where the writer departs so markedly from the Old Testament accounts, finds its explanation in the special purpose of the apostle to stress the virtue and power of the blood of the atonement. Only this can account for the variations from the historical facts, and there are at least six of these, as most exegetes point out.

By allusions to the sealing of the Old Testament Mosaic covenant, and the red heifer ceremony, Hebrews intensifies the importance of that blood typified on the Day of Atonement offering. The dedication of the ancient sanctuary is also invoked for the same purpose, and let us remember that it was not Aaron but Moses who performed this. Thus the apostle “tailors” that which he draws from Scripture to underline what our High Priest accomplished by His offering “once for all.” Even though the sprinkling of the tabernacle and its vessels is not present in Ex. 24, the apostle invokes it without any reference to his departure from the

covenant ratification account in that chapter. Neither is he bothered by the fact that the sanctuary was anointed with oil rather than blood. (See Ex. 40:8ff.)

Dr. Young summarizes his discussion of these verses as follows:

In all our writer's references to sprinkling is an oblique allusion to the Day of Atonement blood aspersion, only oblique because, as we have repeated ad nauseam, he is anxious to define the cross as the final and once-for-all cultic act with blood. If there is any post-Calvary application of the blood it is in the act of Christ's intercession and the cleansing of Christian worshipers; but these are results of the cross not continuations of it or subsequent cultic acts, they have nothing to do with a blood application in the heavenly holiest not even metaphorically. This, then, is why he chooses to speak of the inauguration of the tent rather than directly of the Day of Atonement cleansing. The mention of that tent in v. 21 prepares the way for v. 23f and the fulfilment of the Day of Atonement inner aspersion by the death of Christ.¹⁰

Let us now move to the next direct reference to the Day of Atonement in Hebrews 9.

It was necessary, then, for the copies of the heavenly things to be purified with these sacrifices, but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these. For Christ did not enter a man-made sanctuary that was only a copy of the true one; he entered heaven itself, now to appear for us in God's presence. Nor did he enter heaven to offer himself again and again, the way the high priest enters the Most Holy Place every year with blood that is not his own. (Heb. 9:24-25 NIV)

Verse 23 links the blocks of material on each side of it, namely 15-23 and 24-28. All three passages are underlining the truth of the introductory postulate found in verses 13-14.

The blood of goats and bulls and the ashes of a heifer sprinkled on those who are ceremonially unclean sanctify them so that they are outwardly clean. How much more, then, will the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself unblemished to God, cleanse our consciences from acts that lead to death, so that we may serve the living God! (Heb. 9:13-14 NIV)

The apostle, prior to verse 23, has alluded to the copies of heavenly things. He has listed the book of the covenant, the sanctuary of the covenant, and the people of the covenant. All these were cleansed by blood, he declares, so now the higher cleansing must find its accomplishment through the "better" sacrificial blood of Christ.

In order to rightly understand the significance of verse 23, we must not err by looking only to the preceding context about the dedication of the sanctuary. We must observe the "for" (*gar*) of the following verse which demands that we see the linkage between verse 23 and the description of the Day of Atonement in type and antitype which follows.

Seventh-day Adventists have always applied verse 23 to the cleansing of the Day of Atonement, but our popular literature does not recognize that here it is said that the antitypical reality belongs not to 1844, but to the cross. It is linked with the sufferings of Christ. See verse 26. It is describing something already in the past when Hebrews was written — the heavenly things themselves had now been purified already. The sufferings of Christ, His entrance into the Most Holy Place of heaven, and the cleansing, all belong together, and cannot be separated by over eighteen centuries. The cleansing of verse 23 is identical with the putting away of sin in verse 26, and Christ's being offered in verse 28. The cleansing is nothing other than the dealing with sin also referred to in the latter passage.

Thus chapter nine of Hebrews both begins and ends with reference to the Day of Atonement. Verses 1-7 presented the furniture and then the ritual of the typical sanctuary, climaxing in the yearly *Yom Kippur*. Verses 8-14 contrasted the efficacy of the antitype with the inefficacy of the type. That contrast was further underlined by illustrations of the work of blood in verses 15-22, and then verses 23-29 returned to the antitypical Day of Atonement in the cross of Christ and His ascension to Heaven — the true Most Holy Place.

Note the parallels between verse 7 and verse 25. (We defer discussion of 9:27-28 to chapter four, where it is pointed out that these closing verses are based on the imagery of the high priest on the Day of Atonement about to return from the Most Holy Place to the courtyard.)

But only the high priest entered the inner room, and that only once a year, and never without blood, which he offered for himself and for the sins the people had committed in ignorance. (Heb. 9:7 NIV)

Nor did he enter heaven to offer himself again and again, the way the high priest enters the Most Holy Place every year with blood that is not his own. (Heb. 9:25 NIV)

There is no legitimate way to dodge the conclusion that Heb. 9 teaches that the Day of Atonement was fulfilled by Christ in AD 31.

Yet more evidence should be offered on this point, for the significance of Heb. 9 is only fully elaborated in the chapter which follows it. Chapter 10 also begins with the Day of Atonement, and the chief exhortation of the entire book grows out of that discussion. We should carefully observe that the topics of the ratifying of the covenant, the dedication of the sanctuary, and the cleansing of the consciences of penitent believers by blood in order that they may enter with their Representative into the Most Holy dealt with in chapter nine are enlarged upon in ten.

In chapter nine, the original description of the typical ceremonial was succeeded by comments on its inadequacy and its temporary nature. It was shown that the first apartment sealed off from the second by a veil testified to the limitations of the ancient sacrifices and priesthood. They could not cleanse the hearts and consciences, they could not provide bold access to God. Then verses 11-14 showed that Christ's death accomplished all that the former sacrifices could not. This was followed by reference to the sealing of the old covenant, and the dedication of the sanctuary. Let us now compare with this account chapter ten.

Verses 1-4 of chapter ten speak of the Day of Atonement recurring yearly and show that the very repetitive nature of the Jewish ceremonial proved its temporary nature and its ineffectiveness. Verses 5-10 tell us that Christ came to remove the inadequate system, and to accomplish all it could not. The climax here is in verses 11 and 12.

Day after day every priest stands and performs his religious duties; again and again he offers the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins. But when this priest had offered for all time one sacrifice for sins, he sat down at the right hand of God. (Heb. 10:11-12 NIV)

Dr. Johnsson reminds us of the contrasts here summarized.

The argumentation of 9:1–10:18 is shaped to bring out the superiority of the blood of Christ. Its force is that, whatever value the Old Testament sacrifices might have had, they could not in themselves provide final putting away of sins: “For it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins” (10:14). So the argument is

that the Old Testament services, **even at their high point**, were inadequate. They provided but woefully limited access to God (one man alone!) and their very repetition showed their failure: “Otherwise, would they not have ceased to be offered?” (10:2). So even the annual days of atonement hammered home Israel’s need: limited access, no finality in purging sins.

So the entire old cultus is to be set aside at length in the divine plan (“until the time of reformation” — 9:10). If the sacrificial system falls short at its high point, the complete structure must be branded inadequate. But, says Hebrews, the good news is that of **better blood!** All that the old system failed to do because of its inherent insufficiencies, all that the repeated Days of Atonement could not accomplish, has now been done by Calvary. Instead of many, repeated sacrifices, there is one Sacrifice, once for all. By that one Act all barriers have been abolished between God and man, so that we may come boldly into the presence of God. A Sacrifice has been provided which at last is able to provide thoroughgoing purification of sins.¹¹

Next, we have a parallel to Heb. 9:15. The new covenant promises are rehearsed and declared fulfilled in Christ. See verses 16-18.

Now observe 19-22.

Therefore, brothers, since we have confidence to enter the Most Holy Place by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way opened for us through the curtain, that is, his body, and since we have a great priest over the house of God, let us draw near to God with a sincere heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled to cleanse us from a guilty conscience and having our bodies washed with pure water. (Heb. 10:19-22 NIV)

The favourite theme of “entrance” meets us once more. The Most Holy Place is again in focus, and the “boldness” referred to contrasts with the fearfulness of the typical high priest on his entrance. The “way” mentioned in 9:8, which in Old Testament times, was not yet opened, is now shown to be open. “Way” (*hodos*) is found in each passage. “Through the curtain” alludes to the barrier separating the two apartments as intimated by 9:6-8. “His flesh” reminds us of the shedding of His blood — the theme so recurring in the previous chapter. The “draw near” of verse 22 contrasts again with the former impossibility of that, as indicated by the first apartment ministry (see again 9:6-8). The “true heart,” “full assurance of faith,” “hearts sprinkled clean,” “bodies washed,” also look back at chapter nine, especially verse 13 and 14 which speak of purification of the conscience of sinners.

The comparison is stronger still. The Greek term *egkainizō* signifies “inauguration” or “dedication” and thus alludes to 9:21-22. When Christ passed through the curtain at His ascension, by virtue of His sacrifice the heavenly sanctuary was dedicated for service. (See appendix, “Quotations Regarding Hebrews 10:20.” By “passing through the curtain” we refer to the rending of life from Christ’s flesh by death. Heb. 10:19, 20 is a reference to Mark 15:37, 38.) Not only so, as the ancient priests had to be also dedicated to their service by the blood of sprinkling, so this passage tells us that every Christian is now a priest, having been washed and sprinkled like his ancient counterparts. See 10:22. More than that, like the high priest of old, He may now enter into the very presence of God.

10:19-22 not only enlarges on chapter nine, but it does the same for 6:19-20. In both places we are assured that our High Priest had already, at the time Hebrews was written, entered “within the veil,” into the Most Holy Place — heaven itself.

Hebrews beyond a doubt teaches that the “cleansing of the sanctuary” which followed the high priest’s entrance into the Most Holy was fulfilled by Christ at His first advent. **In chapters four and five we wish to show that that which has been fulfilled is yet to be consummated in harmony with the well-known “now and not yet” motif so prevalent in the New Testament.**

DAY OF ATONEMENT ALLUSIONS, OTHER THAN IN CHAPTERS 9 & 10: 19-22

Most scholars believe there are at least seven or eight passages in Hebrews that apply to the Day of Atonement. The most important of these are in chapters six, nine and ten.

Hebrews 1:3

The Son is the radiance of God’s glory and the exact representation of his being, sustaining all things by his powerful word. After he had provided purification for sins, he sat down at the right hand of the Majesty in heaven. (Heb. 1:3 NIV)

As mentioned earlier, the Greek phrase here, *katharismōn tōn hamartiōn* is found only once in the LXX, and there it is used in connection with the Day of Atonement. See Ex. 30:10 (29:36 LXX). Reihm and Lohse discuss this in some detail.¹² The plural *hamartiōn* is in the LXX only found in connection with Day of Atonement passages.¹³ In Hebrews, chapters 9 and 10, it is repeatedly intimated that only the antitypical Day of Atonement brought true purification for sins. The parallels should be observed between 1:3; 8:1-3; 9:12-14; 10:11-14.

The Son is the radiance of God’s glory and the exact representation of his being, sustaining all things by his powerful word. After he had provided purification for sins, he sat down at the right hand of the Majesty in heaven. (Heb. 1:3 NIV)

The point of what we are saying is this: We do have such a high priest, who sat down at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in heaven, and who serves in the sanctuary, the true tabernacle set up by the Lord, not by man. Every high priest is appointed to offer both gifts and sacrifices, and so it was necessary for this one also to have something to offer. (Heb. 8:1-3 NIV)

He did not enter by means of the blood of goats and calves; but he entered the Most Holy Place once for all by his own blood, having obtained eternal redemption. The blood of goats and bulls and the ashes of a heifer sprinkled on those who are ceremonially unclean sanctify them so that they are outwardly clean. How much more, then, will the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself unblemished to God, cleanse our consciences from acts that lead to death, so that we may serve the living God! (Heb. 9:12-14 NIV)

Day after day every priest stands and performs his religious duties; again and again he offers the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins. But when this priest had offered for all time one sacrifice for sins, he sat down at the right hand of God. Since that time he waits for his enemies to be made his footstool, because by one sacrifice he has made perfect forever those who are being made holy. (Heb. 10:11-14 NIV)

These verses make clear what the writer of Hebrews meant by the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary. Compare with the above, 9:23-25.

Hebrews 2:17

For this reason he had to be made like his brothers in every way, in order that he might become a merciful and faithful high priest in service to God, and that he might make atonement for the sins of the people. (Heb. 2:17 NIV)

The use of *hilaskesthai* (to make reconciliation) and the plural form “sins” are strong links with the Day of Atonement. *Hilaskomai* is found in the LXX twenty-seven times, and twenty-two of these instances translate the Hebrew term *kapporeth* for the mercy seat, and there is evidence that the other five instances have a similar relationship, though not so directly. As for the plural “sins” — *tas hamartias* is a form limited in the cult to the Day of Atonement ritual. See, for example, Lev. 16:34 LXX.

This verse offers succinctly all the perspectives of the epistle. Its primary reference is to Christ’s atoning death rather than His intercession. By linking that death to the mercy seat of the Day of Atonement ritual, the apostle has (as in 1:3) taken us to the zenith of Israel’s ritual experience — the annual expiation.

Hebrews 4:16

Let us then approach the throne of grace with confidence, so that we may receive mercy and find grace to help us in our time of need. (Heb. 4:16 NIV).

This whole chapter is significant for those studying the Day of Atonement in Hebrews. Both the previous chapter and this one are talking about “entering in,” a theme which recurs in the later allusions to the Day of Atonement in chapters 6, 9 and 10.

The climactic exhortation in Heb. 10:19-22 has to do with “entering” with boldness within the veil where our great representative has already gone. What a contrast to the Old Testament taboo of Lev. 16:2. Then “to enter” meant death!

Notice the conclusions of one who has summarized his findings as follows:

It is in Hebrews, however, that the whole idea of a break through the barrier imposed by this division of the temple is most diligently and interestingly worked out. The first use of the word “to enter” (*εἰσέρχομαι*) is in a quotation from Psalm 95:11 (*יְהוָה יֹאמַר אֶל־מֹשֶׁה וְאֶל־כָּל־בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל*) which seems at first to have precious little to do with entering the temple. Yet the flow of ideas from one to the other in Hebrews is easy and natural as chap. 4:14 make apparent, (*ἔχοντες οὖν ἀρχιερέα διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανούς ... κρατῶμεν τῆς ὁμολογίας*) which follows closely behind his final exhortation in connection with the “rest” theme in v. 11, (*Σπουδάσωμεν οὖν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ἐκείνην τὴν κατάπαυσιν*). R. Williamson says concerning the very clear relationship of these two **enterings** in Hebrews, one into God’s rest, one into God’s presence, that “rest was a thought connected in the mind of the devout Jew with atonement and in particular with the Day of Atonement.” It was such, he goes on to say “because on it the barrier of sin between earth and heaven was broken down and man and God were at one, at peace.”

The strong exhortations concerning God’s rest are anything but unconnected with the admonitions to enter the holiest.

We agree wholeheartedly with O. Hofius when he asserts that it is essential to recognize that *κατάπαυσις* and *τὰ ἁγία* (holiest) symbolize the same thing, in order to relate 3:1-4:13 to the rest of the epistle.

The relationship between “rest” and “God’s temple” is not one invented by the writer of Hebrews. Ps. 132:7 (LXX 131:7) not only invites the worshippers to enter (LXX *εἰσελευσόμεθα* = *יבאון*) his sanctuary (lit. *dwelling* of v. 5), but also invokes *Yahweh* to come to his resting place (LXX *τὴν ἀναπαυσίν σου* = *מנוחתו*). The declaration of Acts 7:49 (= Isa. 66:1), though polemical, is nevertheless based on the idea of the temple as God’s resting place (*τίς τόπος τῆς καταπαύσεώς μου*). Schierse even notes the use of *κατάπαυσις* in Solomon’s dedicatory prayer in connection with the temple (1 Kings 8:56). When we approach, therefore, the exhortations of Heb. 4:14f; 6:19f; 10:19f; and the great doctrinal exposition in chapter nine on which all these are based, we should realize that we are dealing with ideas which are basically identical with those in chapters three and four.¹⁴

With all this in mind we are in a better position to rightly understand the sixteenth verse of the chapter. Many commentators have found in the throne of grace there mentioned an allusion to the mercy seat of the Most Holy Place. Verse fourteen, viewed in the right of Heb. 9:8, 11, 12, 24, applies also to the entrance of the high priest into the second apartment on *Yom Kippur*. We view the overall evidence on 4:16 as applying to the Day of Atonement to be less than compulsive, but nevertheless strongly impressive.

Hebrews 5:3

This is why he has to offer sacrifices for his own sins, as well as for the sins of the people. (Heb. 5:3 NIV)

The remarks made on 1:3 apply to this verse also, inasmuch as here we read again of *hamartiōn*. But we have an even more precise allusion to the Day of Atonement at this place for we are told the precise sequence of the high priest’s work on that day, he offers first for his own sins, and then for the sins of others. While this was true in general terms as a possibility on other days, it was a necessity on one day only — the Day of Atonement. We should not miss the force of *opheilei*.

Hebrews 6:19-20

This is a key passage which almost all exegetes have applied to the Day of Atonement. Let us consider several translations.

We have this as a sure and steadfast anchor of the soul, a hope that enters into the inner shrine behind the curtain, where Jesus has gone as a forerunner on our behalf, having become a high priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek. (Heb. 6:19-20 RSV)

We have this hope as an anchor for the soul, firm and secure. It enters the inner sanctuary behind the curtain, where Jesus, who went before us, has entered on our behalf. He has become a high priest forever, in the order of Melchizedek. (Heb. 6:19-20 NIV)

Which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that within the veil; Whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus, made an high priest for ever after the order of Melchizedec. (Heb. 6:19-20 KJV)

The key to the passage is the phrase *to esōteron tou katapetasmatos*. For Adventists the inquiry is always: “Within which veil — that before the first apartment, or that before the second?”

We say that for Adventists that is the question. No others would ask it for the following reasons:

1. Only the second veil within the tabernacle is stressed in both Testaments as highly significant. To go beyond it (except for the high priest on one occasion only in the year) meant death. See Lev. 16:2. It is given a distinctive name in the Hebrew Old Testament — *paroketh*, while the first veil is the *masak*. (The LXX does not always preserve this distinction, but it is certainly characteristic of the Masoretic text.)
2. This distinctiveness of the second veil is indicated by other phrases such as “without the veil” and “before the veil.” Had the term *paroketh* been ambivalent to the Jews, the books of Exodus and Leviticus would have proved unnecessarily puzzling in several places. Such phrases are shown by each context to apply to the first apartment of the sanctuary.
3. In the New Testament the word is found six times, and again all classical commentaries apply the six references to the second veil. See Matt. 27:50-52; Mark 15:37-38; Luke 23:44-45; Heb. 6:19; 9:3; 10:19. But because two of these are troubling to us as Adventists, we will not reason here in a circle by deciding our case ahead of time.
4. In the Old Testament we find “within the veil” five times — Ex. 26:33; Lev. 16:2, 12, 15; Num. 18:7 — passages applied by the Jews in general to the second apartment. Four of the passages are unequivocal because of their contexts, and while some have debated the Numbers reference, such are quite unable to prove that the meaning here is not identical with the other instances. “... all that concerns the altar and that is within the veil” is a reference to the work of the daily services and the yearly — the daily done usually by the priests, and the yearly by the high priest.
5. Hebrews relies heavily on the LXX, and in that version *to esōteron tou katapetasmatos* always applies to the second apartment. See Ex. 26:33; Lev. 16:2, 12, 15. For Num. 18:7 we have *endothen* instead of *esōteron*, because of the measure of ambiguity.
6. The phrase is prefaced by the article in Heb. 6:19, indicating that what we have here is a well-known technical expression having but one meaning. Thus Westcott and Hort’s Greek Testament indicate the source as Lev. 16:2, 12 — the Day of Atonement texts which certainly apply to the second apartment. Because of this phrase being of the nature of a well-known formula it was not necessary for the writer of Hebrews to use the adjective “second” as in 9:3.

The evidence is so overwhelming that many Adventists have capitulated to it throughout our history. Even when Andross wrote against Ballenger he conceded this point. The *Seventh-Day Adventist Bible Commentary* offers it as an option, and scholars such as Loasby, Cottrell, and others have chosen that option. See appendix, “*The Chequered History of ‘Within the Veil’*” by Dr. N.H. Young for an excellent appraisal by one whose doctoral dissertation was on the Day of Atonement, and whose verdict is as above.

If one asks “So what?” the answer is that Heb. 6:19 unambiguously affirms that the antitype of the Day of Atonement came with the death and ascension of Christ. To have Him go into the “Most Holy Place” and come out again to minister in the “first apartment” is not exegesis,

but playing games. He went in, according to Hebrews, “once for all,” and sat down at the right hand of God — not in a state of quiescence, but as King after His finished work of reconciling the world.

τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος is the sanctuary within the veil, the holy of holies. *τὸ καταπέτασμα* (called *τὸ δεύτερον καταπ* 9:3., or *ἐνδότερον* [Jos.] when specially distinguished from the *κάλυμμα*, which hung before the holy place) is always in the New Testament (without needing other descriptive epithet: see Philo, ii. 150, 32; 148, 30) the veil that hung before the holy of holies, and is called in Hebrew the פֶּרֶכֶת.

Εἰς πορεύεσθαι εἰς τὸ ἅγιον ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος is the usual formula for the entering of the high priest into the holy of holies on the day of atonement (Lev. xvi. 2, 12, 15; comp. Ex. xxvi. 33). This liturgical use of the formula was floating in our author’s mind.¹⁵

That He thus, in His entering in for us, is at the same time our *πρόδρομος* is what distinguishes Him from the typical high priest of the law, who represented a congregation which was entirely excluded from their holy of holies. But this is not all. Christ is not only High Priest, but also King; and High Priest not merely for a time, but for eternity.¹⁶

As the high priest on the day of atonement entered into the Holy of holies, so Christ entered the heavenly Holy of holies through His final, complete and all-sufficient sacrifice. It does not say that He entered God’s **presence** to offer His sacrifice, for this had already been done when He offered Himself to God on the cross, but that He is visibly present **for us**, or ‘on our behalf.’ Leonard rightly says, ‘In reality the idea that Christ officiates before the throne of God by any sort of liturgical action or by any active pleading of His passion is nowhere to be found in the Epistle to the Hebrews. ... We are simply told that He has gone into heaven itself to appear before God on our behalf, ... and that He is able to save in perpetuity all who come through Him to God, always living to intercede for them.’ He is there as the representative of His people, and thus reinstates humanity in God’s presence. He is also the great intercessor of all believers, ever making intercession for them and presenting their cause before their heavenly Father.¹⁷

Hebrews 7:27

Unlike the other high priests, he does not need to offer sacrifices day after day, first for his own sins, and then for the sins of the people. He sacrificed for their sins once for all when he offered himself. (Heb. 7:27 NV)

It was never the case that the High Priest offered daily for his own sins and then for those of the people. The apostle has conflated the daily and the yearly services at this point, because the Day of Atonement summed up all.

The stress here in the threefold reference to Israel’s high priests (vs. 26, 27, 28) should not escape us, nor the statement that the sins of the entire community were dealt with by him after offering for his own. Otto Michel declares that it must be admitted that both 5:3 and 7:27 only apply to the Day of Atonement, a day wherein the sin offering encompassed all other daily offerings.¹⁸ Norman Young warns us against the usual error of concentrating on *thusia* and *hameron* instead of attending to the term *archiereis*.

Hebrews 8:1-3

The point of what we are saying is this: We do have such a high priest, who sat down at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in heaven, and who serves in the sanctuary, the true tabernacle set up by the Lord, not by man. Every high priest is appointed to offer both gifts and sacrifices, and so it was necessary for this one also to have something to offer. (Heb. 8:1-3 NIV)

Again our High Priest is in focus, and indeed we are told that the principal truth the author has to convey concerns this view of our Saviour. As in 4:16, which some authors also apply to the Day of Atonement,¹⁹ the throne of God is brought to our attention as the resting place of Christ after He finished His atonement. We need to read with this verse the other references in Hebrews to Christ's being seated above. See 1:3; 10:12; 12:2.

Hebrews 10:1-4

The law is only a shadow of the good things that are coming — not the realities themselves. For this reason it can never, by the same sacrifices repeated endlessly year after year, make perfect those who draw near to worship. If it could, would they not have stopped being offered? For the worshipers would have been cleansed once for all, and would no longer have felt guilty for their sins. But those sacrifices are an annual reminder of sins, because it is impossible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sins. (Heb. 10:1-4 NIV)

This is one of the “unambiguous references to the Day of Atonement,” according to W. Johnsson and a multitude of other scholars. The reference to the “bulls and goats,” the “reminder of sin,” “year after year,” point directly to *Yom Kippur*.

It should also be noticed that this paragraph stands in contrast with later verses of the chapter which assure us that because of Christ's offering, His entrance “through the curtain” we need now have no more consciousness of sins but can approach God with holy boldness as confident high priests of the new order.

Hebrews 13:1-13

We have an altar from which those who minister at the tabernacle have no right to eat. The high priest carries the blood of animals into the Most Holy Place as a sin offering, but the bodies are burned outside the camp. And so Jesus also suffered outside the city gate to make the people holy through his own blood. Let us, then, go to him outside the camp, bearing the disgrace he bore. (Heb. 13:10-13 NIV).

The reference here to the Old Testament sanctuary system could fit those rare occasions when the whole community or the anointed priest were guilty of sin, as the procedure with the blood and the flesh on those occasions was identical with that on the Day of Atonement. But the reference in this place seems to assume a service that was regular rather than occasional and thus best fits the Day of Atonement.

What is the significance of these references in Hebrews that we have considered in this chapter? They show that the Day of Atonement is a dominant motif of the book from beginning to end, and the recognition of its presence in Heb. 9 is to be expected. Furthermore, all the references see the Day of Atonement as already fulfilled in what Christ had done before the writing of this epistle, and one way of expressing that truth is by referring to this entrance “within the veil” into the Most Holy Place of heaven.

By “atonement” throughout this manuscript we have in mind the traditional understanding of evangelical Christendom — the dissolving by the cross of the barrier between God and man, the payment of the debt incurred by our guilt. Our Lord’s death “finished the transgression, made an end of sin, made atonement for iniquity, and brought in everlasting righteousness.”

But in Hebrews where the Day of Atonement is so frequently in focus we must recognize that the type of *Yom Kippur* is made to span the whole period from the cross to the Coming. This does not in the least deny the “once for all” emphasis given in the same book to our Lord’s sacrifice, but it implies that the antitypical day of atonement reaches its climax in eschatological salvation. See Heb. 9:27, 28. Thus to the writer of Hebrews the heart of the Lev. 16 ceremonial had already met its antitype in Christ’s redeeming work, though its consummation (in contrast to fulfilment) belonged to the end of time.

The First Apartment—Symbol of Judaism’s Limitations in Time and Efficacy

We have offered a brief overview of the message of Hebrews regarding the high priestly ministry of Christ, as reflected by the antitypical day of atonement. We wish now to approach the same topic from another direction, repeating an emphasis already made, but with added material.

To show the finality of Christianity in contrast to the temporary nature of Judaism is the main burden of the author of Hebrews. To do this he draws upon the cultic aspects of the Torah, rather than its moral elements. As certainly as Romans and Galatians show that covenant relationship with God cannot be earned by even the most strict fulfilment of the Ten Commandments (and the unnumbered multitude of rules springing from them), so now Hebrews assures us that, similarly, covenant relationship with heaven could never be achieved by the typical sanctuary ritual.

Again and again in this epistle, the inadequacy of the Jewish ceremonial is stressed. This inadequacy was publicly proclaimed by the repetitive nature of all the tabernacle activities. Neither full access to God, nor assurance of sins forgiven completely and finally, was available through the Old Testament services.

The law is only a shadow of the good things that are coming — not the realities themselves. For this reason it can never, by the same sacrifices repeated endlessly year after year, make perfect those who draw near to worship. If it could, would they not have stopped being offered?

AARONIC			CHRIST
Heb. 9:7	Heb. 9:25	Heb. 13:11	Heb. 9:11,12
1. The High Priest (<i>archiereus</i>)	the high priest (<i>archiereus</i>)	the high priest (<i>archiereōs</i>)	an high priest (<i>archiereus</i>)
2. [enters] (<i>eiseisi</i>)	enters (<i>eiserchetai</i>)	brought in (<i>eispheretai</i>)	entered (<i>eisēlthen</i>)
3. into the second (<i>eis tēn deuteran</i>)	into the Holiest (<i>eis ta hagia</i>)	into the holiest (<i>eis ta hagia</i>)	into the holiest (<i>eis ta hagia</i>)
4. once a year (<i>hapax tou eniautou</i>)	annually (<i>kat'eniauton</i>)	—	once for all (<i>ephapax</i>)
5. not without blood (<i>ou chōris haimatos</i>)	with blood not his own (<i>en haimati allotriō</i>)	blood for a sin offering (<i>to haima peri hamartias</i>)	not by means of the blood of goats and calves but by his own blood (<i>oude di' haimatos</i>) <i>tragon kai moschon</i> <i>dia de tou idiou haimatos</i>)

The parallel nature of these verses makes it clear that the equivalent to "into the second" in 9:7 is "into the holiest" in 9:25, 13:11, 9:11-12. There is no way of avoiding this, for 9:7 is quite specific; into the second cannot mean the sanctuary in general, nor the outer apartment; it means what it says, "the second 'tent,' " i.e. the Holy of Holies (9:3, 7) N.H. Young.

AARONIC PRIESTHOOD**HOLY PLACE****EARTHLY TABERNACLE**

OLD COVENANT (SINAI)

Limited Access to God—Ex 25:8

First Tabernacle = Holy Place

v. 2 Lamp. Table, Bread

v. 6 Priests Serve Often

Earthly Sanctuary

Second Tabernacle = Most Holy Place

v. 3 Ark, Mercy Seat

v. 6 High Priest: Once Yearly

MELCHIZEDEK PRIESTHOOD**MOST HOLY PLACE****HEAVENLY TABERNACLE**

NEW COVENANT (CALVARY)

Full, Unlimited Access to God—Jn 1:14

- A. The Sanctuary of v. 8 is Contrasted With the Sanctuary in v. 1.
- B. This Sanctuary Was Not Yet Manifest While the “Holy Place” Was Yet Standing
1. This Sanctuary is Obviously the Heavenly Sanctuary.
 2. The “Holy Place” has Reference to the Entire Earthly Sanctuary.
- C. This Sanctuary Must Then Be the “Most Holy Place,” i.e. “Heaven Itself” (v. 24).

HOLY PLACE

OLD COVENANT - SINAI

LIMITED ACCESS

AARONIC PRIESTHOOD

EARTHLY TABERNACLE

GLORIOUS – 2 Cor. 3

MOSES – Heb. 3

LAW – Jn. 1:17

TYPES SHADOWS

MOST HOLY PLACE

NEW COVENANT – CALVARY

UNLIMITED ACCESS

MELCHIZEDEK PRIEST

HEAVENLY TABERNACLE

MORE GLORIOUS – 3 Cor. 3

CHRIST – Heb. 3

GRACE, TRUTH – Jn. 1:17

REALITY SUN

CHRIST: SEPARATES AND UNITES

BOTH ARE NECESSARY. TOGETHER THEY COMPRISE THE SANCTUARY OF GOD'S
SALVATION FOR MAN

(Prepared by one of our North American pastors)

For the worshippers would have been cleansed once for all, and would no longer have felt guilty for their sins. But those sacrifices are an annual reminder of sins, because it is impossible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sins ... Day after day every priest stands and performs his religious duties; again and again he offers the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins. But when this priest had offered for all time one sacrifice for sins, he sat down at the right hand of God. (Heb. 10:1-4, 11-12 NIV)

The stress on “once,” and “once for all,” with reference to the offering and heavenly entrance of our great High Priest, has a view to the continual traversing of the same old ground by the Old Testament priests. Their steps were forever being retraced — but His never. All commentators on Hebrews stress this key emphasis of the book.

The sign of the unsatisfactory, temporary, nature of the ceremonial of the earthly sanctuary was the series of restrictions placed upon worshippers in their approach to the Most High. These reached their climax in the second veil which separated even the chief priest from the presence of God. Even on that day when he was permitted access to the Holy of Holies, it was only by virtue of blood and incense, only for a few moments, and then he needs must step out through the veil once more, leaving a barrier between him and God. Thus matters proceeded year after year.

Christ’s achievement is repeatedly contrasted with the treadmill activities of the earthly priests. By one offering He obtained entrance into the presence of God having accomplished a perfect redemption. Having thus in one priestly act fulfilled the distinctive Aaronic ministry, He then sat down on His throne as the true Melchizedec.

But when this priest had offered for all time one sacrifice for sins, he sat down at the right hand of God. (Heb. 10:12 NIV)

Notice that this last passage began with “but.” It can only be understood in the light of its context so now let us put with it the preceding verse, and the two that follow.

Day after day every priest stands and performs his religious duties; again and again he offers the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins. But when this priest had offered for all time one sacrifice for sins, he sat down at the right hand of God. Since that time he waits for his enemies to be made his footstool, because by one sacrifice he has made perfect forever those who are being made holy. (Heb. 10:11-14 NIV)

Christ’s atonement is thus contrasted with the unceasing daily ritual of the earthly priests who could never sit down, and who never perfected the worshippers. In the light of this passage the ministration characterized by the first apartment typified the tentative incomplete work of the Jewish economy — its monotonous round testified that the true Priest had not yet come, and that the real offering had not been offered, and that therefore the worshippers could not enter within the veil. In 7:27 we have another testimony to the same effect:

Unlike the other high priests, he does not need to offer sacrifices day after day, first for his own sins, and then for the sins of the people. He sacrificed for their sins once for all when he offered himself. (Heb. 7:27 NIV)

There is no law in the Pentateuch requiring the earthly high priest to offer sacrifices daily first for his own sins and then for those of the people. We have a conflation here of the yearly and daily services — for both were repetitive. They were never final, unlike the offering of our great high priest. Observe the closing words of the verse: “he (Christ) did this once for all when he offered up himself.” That is, Christ’s death and entrance into heaven fulfilled both

the daily and yearly services at a single stroke. Again we notice that the continual daily round by the priests of the sanctuary's first apartment testified to the ineffectiveness of that typical economy and thereby "signified" that the way into the true sanctuary, the heavenly one, was not yet opened.

Let us read again 9:6-12 in the light of the foregoing, observing the same contrast in this passage as present in 10:11-14 and 7:27.

When everything had been arranged like this, the priests entered regularly into the outer room to carry on their ministry. But only the high priest entered the inner room, and that only once a year, and never without blood, which he offered for himself and for the sins the people had committed in ignorance. The Holy Spirit was showing by this that the way into the Most Holy Place had not yet been disclosed as long as the first tabernacle was still standing. This is an illustration for the present time, indicating that the gifts and sacrifices being offered were not able to clear the conscience of the worshiper. They are only a matter of food and drink and various ceremonial washings — external regulations applying until the time of the new order. When Christ came as high priest of the good things that are already here, he went through the greater and more perfect tabernacle that is not man-made, that is to say, not a part of this creation. He did not enter by means of the blood of goats and calves; but he entered the Most Holy Place once for all by his own blood, having obtained eternal redemption. (Heb. 9:6-12 NIV)

Could words be found to say it more clearly than this passage says it — that **the separate first apartment ministry testified that not yet had come the true Priest, and the true offering, to open the way into heaven?** Compare the "way" of 9:8 with the "way" of 10:20.

Therefore, brothers, since we have confidence to enter the Most Holy Place by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way opened for us through the curtain, that is, his body. (Heb. 10:19-20 NIV)

Observe that these verses parallel 6:19-20, as previously mentioned.

Thus 9:6-8 says the way to the true sanctuary had not been disclosed so long as the first apartment ministry continued. 10:19-20 and 6:19 indicate that the way was disclosed when the flesh of Christ was rent. "... into the second ... but once a year," "the high priest goes" of 9:7 finds its antitype in the other two passages which were fulfilled at Christ's death and ascension.

This is confirmed by the crystal clear statements of not only verse 12, but 24-25.

For Christ did not enter a man-made sanctuary that was only a copy of the true one; he entered heaven itself, now to appear for us in God's presence. Nor did he enter heaven to offer himself again and again, the way the high priest enters the Most Holy Place every year with blood that is not his own. (Heb. 9:24-25 NIV)

Similarly, in 8:1-2 we have the apostle's summary of what he wants to say about Christ's ministry, and we should observe that he stresses our high priest is not standing to perform a daily service like the typical priest, but that He has accomplished His atonement, and is now seated at the right hand of God in the Most Holy Place. This is a repetition of an initial declaration at the beginning of the letter where we read, "When he had made purification for sins, he sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high. ..." 1:3.

Thus Hebrews again and again assures us that Christ needs not the continual priestly service symbolized by the first apartment, and that by virtue of His offering on Calvary and ascension to the Father He fulfilled not only the daily but the yearly services. Redemption has been accomplished forensically, though not yet have all its outworkings taken place. He now “sits” “waiting till his enemies should be made a stool for his feet.”

If some are reluctant to read the epistle as suggested above, we would suggest recognition of the following facts:

1. This epistle is about Christ as **high priest**, and the only distinctive work of the high priest was on the Day of Atonement. On that day blood was sprinkled in order to cleanse, and this is the essence of the examples in Heb. 9.
2. The first apartment ministry was more truly a **courtyard** ministry. The only work usually done in the first apartment day by day was the lighting of the lamps and the incense. It is not true that the priests were continually running in with blood from sacrifices to minister such at the altar of incense. Not one drop of blood was taken into the first apartment from the sin offerings of the people. And when flesh was eaten, the “holy place” where that was done was not the first apartment but the courtyard. See Lev. 6:16. The only times when blood was ministered in the first apartment was on those rare occasions when an offering had to be made for the entire congregation or “the anointed priest.”
3. There is no hint anywhere in this letter that when Christ ascended on high He began a ministry that was the equivalent of the first apartment ministry. After the detailed reference of 9:6, the outer apartment is ignored in the rest of the letter. The following verses right through to the end of the chapter, and in the next chapter, and again in the closing chapter, are concerned with the ministry of the second apartment — not the first. When Christ our High Priest is compared with His predecessors, that comparison ever revolves around the Day of Atonement. If **contrast** is in focus, the daily service then enters the picture, for the very reason that Christ has no part in any such daily round of sacrificial activities.
4. There is a tremendous disparity between the types and their antitype. The former are no closer to the latter in their symbolism than a goat physically or spiritually resembles Christ, or a tent made with skins resembles the dwelling place of the infinite God and the angels on high. We are told distinctly that the types were not the very image of the reality. See 10:1. Every shadow is a distortion. Furthermore, types often teach by way of contrast rather than by way of similarities.
5. To assert that Christ, the Substance of all the shadows, the better Priest of a better Sanctuary having offered a better sacrifice, entered only a first apartment ministry is to degrade Him below the privileges of the earthly sinful priest who at least “made it” to the second apartment once every year. This is inconceivable in a covenant ministry which is said to be in every way “better.”
6. The Day of Atonement was the day of the atonement and that atonement everywhere in the New Testament is set forth as finished on the cross. From the altar the High Priest went straight to the mercy seat with the warm blood — promptly, lest it coagulate. There was no intermediary administration in the first apartment. Never once does the New Testament tell us that the heavenly sanctuary has two apartments. True, in the Apocalypse we have the symbols of the furniture of both apartments, but there is no hint

of a veil. Christ by His death made both apartments one, having broken down the veil of partition. If we assert that Jesus entered the heavenly equivalent of a Holy Place, we thereby set up the same problem of limited access which existed in the Jewish tabernacle. The great point made by the author of Hebrews is that the superiority of Christianity over Judaism is seen in the direct access made available by the torn flesh of Christ, replacing that system of gradated restrictions. The heavenly sanctuary is not trammelled with curtains or antechambers or death-dealing taboos. Hebrews does not set forth an antitype which in every way matches the type. Rather it declares the type to be a teaching device underlining the imperfections of the temporary system. This was the significance of the restricted access and the unsatisfied consciences of worshippers. The holy place outside the veil was known as “the tabernacle of the congregation” and represented the believers in their limited approach to the Lord, while the second room told of the glory of Him whom they worshipped, setting forth the emblems of His reign.

On the basis of 8:5 and 9:23, 24 we have too often tried to measure the heavenly system by the earthly, and thus prove a heavenly ministry in two apartments. This is to ignore the repeated testimony of the rest of the book that some of the symbolism was but a parable of the temporary nature of the shadowy system, rather than an image of Christ’s priesthood during the Christian era. We have not seen the incongruity of having an empty “Holy of Holies” for 1800 years, and of postulating an obscuring veil in heaven above. Nor have we given due weight to the difference between a priest after the order of Aaron and one after the order of Melchizedek, which involves in consequence the setting aside of the earthly sanctuary “specifics” because of their “weakness and uselessness.” See 7:18, 12, 27; 8:1; 9:10. These were only “imposed until the time of reformation.” The first apartment ministry, symbolic of the whole tabernacle system in the Jewish age, is affirmed to be a parable which pointed to the necessity of the Christian solution in the cross of Christ. Judaism’s sealed off sectors, its veils, its repeated offerings, its failure to ever “arrive,” shouted through those long centuries that something better was coming. Concerning that something better, the epistle to the Hebrews is everywhere vocal.

Just as the different types of sanctuary offerings all find their fulfilment in the death of Christ, so all the aspects of priestly ministry pointed to His one offering and its presentation above.

The usual objection made in our early literature to the view affirmed here is that the term translated “holiest of all” or “holy place” is a plural term and therefore points to a heavenly sanctuary with two apartments. Such an objection is impossible to sustain, and most of our scholars recognize that fact. See our discussion on *ta hagia*.

Yet another objection that has been fashionable among us is that 6:19 does not necessarily mean the inner veil. See our discussion on that passage.

In this section we have suggested that Hebrews clearly affirms that the first apartment of the sanctuary was a parable of the limited adequacy of that whole temporary system, whereas the second apartment ministry pointed to the coming of One who would enter the veil into the presence of God as our Representative and Forerunner, having accomplished that redemption which no typical priest with all his offerings could ever achieve. This is no novel view. Far from it, this has been the understanding of Hebrews in all ages by the great majority of those who have studied it. Consider representative statements. See appendix, “Quotations Regarding the Significance of the First Apartment.” These find their authority only in the Biblical evidence already presented.

TA HAGIA

Ten times in Hebrews we have the plural of *hagion* (holy), and literally the translation would be “holies,” yet translators only rarely have so rendered the original. Why?

In the chief passage describing the earthly sanctuary we find the neuter plural used separately for both the first apartment and the second. See 9:2, 3. This makes it obvious that the plural form does not necessarily point to a plurality of places, but may be what some have called an intensive plural (akin to the plural *Elohim* in the Old Testament where the majesty of the One God is thus indicated). To translate literally would give us holies of holies, or holy (places) of holy (places) in 9:3 for the innermost room — clearly untenable if clarity is sought rather than mystification. Few there be that wish to ease the problem by contending for an unaccented feminine singular. The weight of manuscript evidence is against such.

Surveying the generality of commentators, one finds that most of them believe that the meaning for *ta hagia* in at least seven instances of the ten is ‘the Most Holy Place’. Others contend for nine out of ten. We know of none that see the term as fitting the first apartment in any case other than 9:2. Those who have not chosen to interpret the term as applying to the Most Holy more than seven times, think of it as signifying the tabernacle as a whole in the remaining instances (except for 9:2 where it can only mean the first apartment). Heb. 8:2 and 13:11 are the cases which have sometimes qualified for meaning the entire sanctuary. One needs to exercise great care wherever one sees this latter term in English translation, for often, by ‘sanctuary’ the inner apartment is intended and not the bipartite structure. No doubt this springs from the use of “holy place” repeatedly in Lev. 16 for the inner room.

Let us consider some testimonies of those without a sectarian bias in this area.

The Expositor’s Greek New Testament

Tōn hagiōn ... as in 9:8,12,25; 10:19; 13:11 = *hagia hagiōn* of 9:3. In 9:2, 3, the outer part of the tabernacle is called *hagia*, the inner *hagia hagiōn*, but verse 8 is conclusive proof that *hagia* without addition was used for the holiest place.²⁰

P.E. Hughes

... our author’s repeated designation of the wilderness holy of holies as *ta hagia* (9:8, 12, 24, 25; 10:19; 13:11; in 9:2 it is used of the holy place; cf. also *to hagion* in 9:1 and *hagia hagiōn* in 9:3). It can hardly be doubted that this usage, within the immediate context, in which Jesus is conceived as having entered as our High Priest into the heavenly holy of holies, determines the authentic understanding of the expression here [that is in 8:2].²¹

The simple plural *ta hagia*, which our author also uses ... probably corresponds with the simple singular *to hagion*, found in Lev. 16:2, 3, 16, 17, 20, 23, 27. Such an expression, which in itself is more general and less emphatic, is shown by the context to relate specifically to the holy of holies.²²

F.F. Bruce

... the principal reason for preferring the rendering “sanctuary” is that this is the regular sense of the neuter plural (*ta*) *hagia* in this epistle (cf. chs. 9:2, 8,12, 24, 25; 10:19; 13:11).²³

A.P. Salom

It could be argued that, inasmuch as all the uses of *ta hagia* from Heb. 9:8 on are found in a Day of Atonement setting, a connection must be made between these six uses (at least) and the seven uses of this same word in Lev. 16. It is true that these latter references are to the inner compartment of the sanctuary. However, it should be pointed out that each of the uses in Leviticus is singular, while in Hebrews (with one exception) they are plural.²⁴

Arguments from whether the form is articular or anarthrous, or on the ground of number, gender, or case are quite irrelevant to the meaning of *ta hagia* in Hebrews. Only the context is decisive, and in the vast majority of instances the context is discussing the inner room “within the veil.”

The Sanctuary Passages of Hebrews

8:2	tōn hagiōn	genitive plural
9:1	to hagian	accusative singular. (Observe singular form here where the whole bipartite sanctuary is intended.)
9:2	hagia	nominative plural (though for first apartment only, still in plural)
9:3	hagia hagiōn	nominative plural and genitive plural. (Only in this form when it applies to the earthly inner apartment in comparison with the outer. Never used again in Hebrews.)
9:8	tōn hagiōn	genitive plural. (Identical with 8:2, but in contrast with 9:1. Parallels not only 8:2 but 9:12; 9:24, 25; 10:19; 13:11, which are also plural.)
9:12, 25	ta hagia	accusative plural
9:24	hagia	accusative plural (but without the article, for an indefinite supposition is invoked).
10:19	tōn hagiōn	genitive plural
13:11	ta hagia	accusative plural

The majority of instances are plural, applying to the second room in antitype. The plural cannot be used to argue for an application to a heavenly bipartite sanctuary. **The context, not grammar, is decisive, and the context shows that the “*ta hagia*” was that place reached once a year by passing through the second veil.** In order to understand the book of Hebrews aright and its use of the Day of Atonement, this truth must be recognized. And tragically, so far our official literature has not acknowledged the overwhelming nature of the evidence for this point, though our individual New Testament scholars, for the most part, do concede it.

THE COPY AND SHADOW OF HEAVENLY THINGS

Passages such as Heb. 8:5 and 9:23, 24, have often been applied as teaching that the heavenly sanctuary is a replica of the earthly, only larger and more grand. Is this really what the author of Hebrews intended?

We are thus brought into immediate encounter with typology — its purpose and boundaries, not to say dangers. E. Earle Ellis speaks to the point when he says:

The Old Testament type not only corresponds to the new-age reality but also stands in antithesis to it. Like Adam, Jesus is the representative headman of the race; but unlike Adam, who brought death, Jesus brings forgiveness and life. Jesus is “the prophet like Moses” but, unlike Moses’ ministry of condemnation, that of Jesus gives righteousness.

Similarly, the law “is holy, just and good” and its commandments are to be “fulfilled” by the believer; yet as a demand upon man it can only condemn him. One may speak, then, of “synthetic” and of “antithetic” typology to distinguish the way in which a type, to one degree or another, either corresponds to or differs from the reality of the new age.²⁵

In other words, types teach by way of contrast as well as by parallels. Every student of Hebrews knows that it is particularly this element of typological contrast which the apostle stresses throughout his work, as well as alluding to the other. We have discussed this earlier in our consideration of the meaning of the first apartment.

Consider the type chiefly used in Hebrews — that of the Day of Atonement. In the type a man went into the Most Holy once a year, recurringly. In antitype the God-Man entered once for all time. In the type the one who entered in was a sinner and mortal and needed to offer first for his own sins. In the type the blood was not the priest’s own, but that of an animal. The slain creature did not revive on the third day. In the type, the Most Holy was almost empty, and its borders could be easily seen.

When the apostle refers to the typical Day of Atonement which involved a passing through of a year-long barrier he added: “By this the Holy Spirit indicates that the way into the sanctuary is not yet opened as long as the outer tent is still standing (which is symbolic for the present age). According to this arrangement, gifts and sacrifices are offered which cannot perfect the conscience of the worshipper, but deal only with ... regulations for the body imposed until the time of reformation” 9:8-11. Thus having refused to speak in detail of the elements of the type (verse 5), the one point the author stresses is that the whole system was a parable teaching by way of *contrast*. Its limited access taught that a time of reformation was coming when access would be available. That time of reformation would not consist of mere ordinances for the body but a cleansing of the heart and conscience.

We find the same stress in verses 12-14 and 10:11, 12. The earthly priest worked with the blood of goats and bulls and was ever on his feet in view of an unfinished and unfinishable task. But the true Priest (not of Levi — again showing the inadequacy of the type) offered His own blood through the eternal Spirit and sat down in heaven above as King in the presence of ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands.

Never in Hebrews do we find a setting forth of a first apartment ministry in heaven. Here again, the element of contrast confronts us. Lange speaks to the point:

Every interpretation that undertakes to carry into the heaven of the New Testament the distinction between the inner and the outer sanctuary of the Mosaic tabernacle, ignores the very fundamental idea of that distinction. And if it be urged that the Mosaic tabernacle was itself but the copy of the heavenly tabernacle, and that, therefore, the anti-type must have the same divisions as are found in the pattern, I reply that this is pressing unduly the figurative language of the author. The real actual pattern of the Mosaic tabernacle was that which God showed to Moses in Mount Sinai, an exact model after which he was to construct his earthly material tabernacle, and nothing more. Now that the author again should make a figurative application of that literal language, need not surprise, and should not mislead us. Literally that tabernacle was modelled precisely after the pattern or the direction which God had given Moses in the mount. Figuratively that tabernacle becomes a copy, a type of the heavenly tabernacle or sanctuary, inasmuch as the high priest ministering there in a symbolical expiation or removal of sins, typifies the heavenly high priest officiating on high in a real expiation

and forgiveness of sins. But that we are thence to carry **all** the special features of the earthly tabernacle into the figurative heavenly New Testament tabernacle, does not follow; and is in fact impossible. For the essential characteristic of the outer tabernacle as distinguished from the inner — the very thing it denoted was separation from God.²⁶

Our original text (8:5) is succeeded by *nuni de* (but now), and these must be given their full force. The same verse affirms that Christ's ministry is as much more excellent than the typical ministry as His covenant is better than the old — an infinite superiority. No wonder Hebrews uses *kreitton* (better) thirteen of the nineteen times it is found in the New Testament.

Heb. 8:5 refers to Ex. 25:40 which speaks of the pattern given to Moses. Was this a scale model of the heavenly sanctuary? We must remember that the temple of Solomon was also described by divine revelation, but it had ten sets of candlesticks, ten tables of shewbread, four cherubim, etc., etc. Which is the scale model — the tabernacle or the temple?

Cody concludes as follows on this issue:

In Ex. 25:40 (the text quoted in Heb. 8:5) Yahweh tells Moses to make the tent of the Covenant and its furnishing according to the *תְּבִנֹתָם* given to him on Sinai. Now, do these texts, in themselves indicate the existence or pre-existence of a heavenly sanctuary? The answer depends on the meaning of *תְּבִנֹתָם*. There are texts in which the word refers to an object or drawing fashioned on the form of something else already existing or imagined to exist, the graven images of Deuteronomy 4, for example. This sense will not sit well in our texts, in none of which is the *תְּבִנֹתָם* itself a copy of another thing, as far as we can tell. The sense which does fit our texts is that of a pattern, a sort of blueprint or model according to which some work is carried out, but not necessarily a full-blown prototype or archetype.²⁷

L.E. Froom has warned fellow Adventists as follows:

Earthly Types Not “Very Image” — Let us enlarge. There is a basic principle to be remembered regarding the sanctuary and its services — that is, as pertains to earthly types and the Heavenly Reality. Too many times have we sought to understand and interpret the heavenly Antitype in the light of the earthly types. But that is a fallacious procedure that leads to faulty and inadequate conclusions. We should, instead, seek to understand the earthly, accommodated semblances in the light of the heavenly realities. That will correct the “typical” limitations. We are ever to remember that the earthly is “not the very image of the heavenly” (Heb. 10:1).^{*} We must make allowance for this, and understand the reason why. This, it should be added, in no way depreciates or distorts the relationship or the Reality.

To illustrate: It took **five** different offerings, in the earthly Mosaic type, to compass and portray the various aspects of the **one** all-sufficient Sacrifice of Christ. Similarly, it took all the functionings of both common and High Priest, in type, to portray the one all-encompassing Priesthood of Christ.²⁸

We believe the *coup de grace* has been given to the traditional Adventist use of Heb. 8:5 by the theological chaos into which Ballenger fell when he pursued that use to the ultimate. Note again his theses presented on the day of his trial — they are a consistent carrying through of the then current Adventist use of Heb. 8:5 — and they end up in nonsense as a result.

I want to read to you now some of the misfits that I find in my attempts to place the first apartment work of the earthly sanctuary this side of the cross.

1. The earthly sanctuary, which was a shadow of the heavenly, located the ark, or throne of God, in the holy of holies, or second apartment, while the priest was ministering in the first apartment. The denominational view of the heavenly sanctuary places the ark or throne of God in the first apartment while the priest ministers in that apartment, in violation of the type.
2. The shadow placed a veil between the priest and the ark or throne of God while the priest ministered in the first apartment. The denominational view has the priest ministering in the heavenly sanctuary in the first apartment, with no veil separating him from the ark or throne of God, but with a veil behind both priest and throne, in violation of the type.
3. The type represents the priest as performing a long ministry in the first apartment of the sanctuary before the blood is shed that pays the penalty of sin. The denominational view teaches that the blood was shed which pays the penalty of sin long before the ministry began in the heavenly sanctuary, thus contradicting the type.
4. The type taught that the priest ministered for a long period in the first apartment, during which time there was accumulated upon him the sins of the people before the blood was shed which met the penalty of those sins which the priest was carrying. The denominational view locates the death of Christ before any ministry has been performed in the heavenly sanctuary whereby the sins of the world are transferred to him.

(We teach that no sins are pardoned except those that go into the sanctuary by the priestly work, and yet we have the sanctuary closed to the patriarchs for four thousand years, and that Christ began the work of carrying sins into the heavenly sanctuary at His ascension. This leaves four thousand years without any priest by which the sin was carried into the sanctuary.)

5. The shadow placed the death of the Lord's goat, whose blood met the penalty of the law in type, on the great day of atonement. The denominational view places the death of Christ, whose blood meets the penalty of the law, more than eighteen hundred years before the great day of atonement is supposed to begin.
6. The shadow represents the high priest going from his ministry in the court where he obtained the blood, directly into the holy of holies on the day of atonement. (He did not stop in that first apartment) he obtained his blood, and then carried it straight through into the holy of holies.) The denominational view teaches that Christ went from His ministry in the first apartment, and not from the court, into the holy of holies, in 1844.
7. The type represents the priest as unloading forever, through the blood of the Lord's goat, the sins which had been accumulating upon him during the year by his ministry before the veil. (All the sins that had gone into the sanctuary during that one year and were charged to the priest, that penalty was met on the day of atonement in the holy of holies.) The denominational view represents Christ as loading Himself up again in the first apartment with the same sins which He had before borne at the cross and unloaded in His death.
8. The shadow sends the high priest directly through the first apartment into the holy of holies as soon as he has in his hands the blood of the Lord's goat, or the blood which

pays the penalty of sin. The denominational view stops our great High Priest in the first apartment when He has in His hands His own blood which pays the penalty of sin.

9. The shadow represents the high priest as going immediately with the blood, the warm blood, of the Lord's goat, into the holy of holies, and sprinkling that blood upon the mercy seat before the veil. The denominational view teaches that our great High Priest did not sprinkle His blood on the mercy seat before the veil for more than eighteen hundred years after it was shed.²⁹

Observe how Ballenger is perfectly logical (on the Adventist premise), but entirely wrong in many of his conclusions. The verdict of the writer of Hebrews is crystal clear. He says that the Old Testament sanctuary was "but a shadow of the good things to come instead of the true form of these realities."³⁰ Every shadow — we repeat, every — is a distortion. Too often we have erred by trying to make the heavenly the shadow or reflection of the earthly, rather than vice versa. This the apostle never did — instead he frequently changes the Old Testament picture in order to match the fulfilment of Calvary. (Close study of Heb. 9 shows in verses 13-21 repeated deviations from the Old Testament type and a replacement in details by references to "sprinkled" "blood" of "goats" upon "people" in order to show the efficacy of Calvary, the true Day of Atonement sprinkling that has atoned for the sins of the whole world. In the Old Testament record the blood was not "sprinkled" at the time of ratification of the covenant, neither was it the blood of "goats." In fact, the red heifer cleansing did not include a sprinkling of persons with the blood of goats and bulls, despite verse 13. Hebrews is intent on our seeing the fulfilment of the real Day of Atonement at the cross and all else is adjusted to that end. His approach must be ours. We offer typical quotations from commentaries on the inadequacies of the type and its, in some respects, antithetical nature. See appendix, "Quotations Regarding the Antithetical Nature of the Sanctuary Type.")

DID CHRIST ENTER THE MOST HOLY AT HIS ASCENSION MERELY TO DEDICATE THE HEAVENLY SANCTUARY?

The stress in this question is on the word "merely." We believe with all our hearts that Christ's death on Calvary did dedicate the heavenly sanctuary. Heb. 10:20 by its use of *enekainizō* indicates this.

It is very important not to separate chapters nine and ten of our letter. Chapter nine had spoken of the ratification of the first covenant as recorded in Ex. 24. Verses 15, 16, intimated that Christ by His death confirmed or ratified the new covenant. Verse 21 referred to the anointing of the typical sanctuary which dedicated it, and then moved into the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary, thus linking the initial sanctuary ceremonial with the climactic one at the end of its first year of operation. The "cleansing" of verse 23 in chapter 9 is shown to have its value "on our behalf," verse 24. For us He suffered, verse 26. His suffering put away our sins, verse 26.

In chapter ten, having shown the inadequacy of all the types as regards final disposition of sin, the apostle repeats his key point of the ninth chapter. See verses 11-18 particularly. We have been perfected and sanctified by His once for all offering, and His being seated as king above indicates the finished work. Thus 10:19-22 constitute a grand climax as they invite us to enter through the curtain into a holy place that has been dedicated by that atonement which washed away our sins.

Note the comments of Bruce and Robinson on the verb *enekainizō*.

Greek “ἐνεκαίνισεν”, “he consecrated or dedicated.” “The death of Christ is seen as the new *Eneenia* or Dedication,” says J.A.T. Robinson, adding that two ideas appear to be combined here, the Cross marking the dedication both of the new covenant — for “even the first covenant hath not been dedicated (ἐωκεκαίνισται) without blood” (9:18) — and of the new temple (cf. the technical term “ἐνκαίνια” in John 10:22); “the whole argument of chapters 9 and 10 leads to the climax that Jesus has now ‘opened’ the new sanctuary in the temple of his body” (*Twelve New Testament Studies* [London, 1962], 172).³¹

Is there any evidence that Christ’s entrance to dedicate the heavenly sanctuary was followed by His withdrawal from the Most Holy to work elsewhere? There is none.

These verses (25-28) may be paraphrased thus: Christ has entered into the heavenly sanctuary to appear in the presence of God for us, and **to abide there**, herein differing from the Levitical high priest, who went into the most holy place, and came out, and went in again, repeating the process year by year, and making many appearances before God, with the blood of fresh sacrifices. Christ presents Himself before God once for all, remaining in the celestial sanctuary, and not going out and coming in again and again. It must be so; any other state of things would involve an absurdity. If Christ were to go in and come out, go in and come out, again and again, that would imply His dying over and over again; for the object of the repeated self-presentations in the presence of God on the part of the Jewish high priest was to offer the blood of new victims: but as Christ’s sacrifice was Himself, each new self-presentation would in His case imply a previous repetition of His passion. He must often on that supposition have suffered death since the foundation of the world. But such an idea is absurd.³²

See also A.B. Davidson’s *Hebrews*, 198.199.

Any attempt to have Christ enter the Most Holy and then withdraw to the holy place for service denies the “once for all-ness” of His entrance into heaven. To have Him on this side of the veil denies the whole emphasis of Hebrews. To represent Him as engaged in that done by the lower priests who only rarely were concerned with blood in the first apartment is to degrade Him and to turn Hebrews on its head. The burden of the sacred writer is to say that Christ has dealt with the sins of the world effectually, once for all time. He certainly is not saying that the central objective of Calvary was to make possible a heavenly ceremony of dedication, though the latter did mark and acknowledge the finished work of our Melchizedekan priest. Read again Heb. 10:12, 14, 17-18, and perceive the notes of finality and triumph which sprang, not from a beginning only, but from a glorious conclusion.

SUMMARY

Because some of the arguments of the author of Hebrews may seem intricate, and thus necessarily our own comments thereon, we wish to summarize the chief points that have been made so far in this chapter.

1. The theme of Hebrews is the “betterness” of the Christian way, a way, which because of the shed blood of Christ, leads all who have accepted its cleansing power to boldly enter into the very presence of God where our Forerunner entered over twenty centuries ago.
2. This “presence of God” was symbolized by the earthly Most Holy Place.

3. Hebrews does not teach that the heavenly antitypes match the types in every particular. On the contrary, Hebrews is at pains to point out the inadequacy of the sanctuary types, and at every point contrasts them with the reality. Thus the atonement by Christ is not made to conform to the variegated pattern of the type, but the apostle conforms the latter to the former.
4. For example, Hebrews does not teach the existence of a special holy place ministry in the heavenly sanctuary. It denies such repeatedly by affirming Christ's presence in "the Most Holy" since His ascension.
5. The first apartment, according to Hebrews, was a parable of the Levitical system of shadows and testified to their inadequacy and temporary nature.
6. The first apartment, sealed off from the second, except on the Day of Atonement, testified that the times of reformation, the days of the Messiah, had not yet come. So long as the first apartment had a standing, the heaven of heavens had not been entered by our great High Priest.
7. This very point of the inaccessibility of the presence of God, as testified to by the first apartment, is repeatedly contrasted with the accessibility to God now available through Calvary.
8. What the high priest did once a year in entering the Most Holy, Christ did by His death and ascension.
9. The atonement was not deferred until our Priest's heavenly entrance, but took place at the time of the blood-shedding. Hebrews avoids speaking of a sprinkling upon the mercy seat of heaven, and instead chooses types of the cleansing of the people by blood, and the cleansing of the outside altar by blood. It was after He had by Himself purged our sins that Christ entered heaven and sat down. Heb. 1:3.
10. The allusions to the red heifer ceremonial, the ratifying of the Sinaitic covenant, the dedication of the earthly tabernacle, are made by the author in order to point up the efficacy of the Calvary offering which fulfilled the Day of Atonement type.
11. The cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary is said to have been accomplished "once for all" by the sufferings of Christ.
12. The significance of the recurring annual Day of Atonement is said to be its testimony to the ineffectiveness of the Levitical services, and the need of a new and better way to God.
13. Our High Priest is more like Melchizedek than Aaron. He is not "moving" and "doing" in the sanctuary, trying to accomplish our redemption. He is, as King, seated at the right hand of God, "having obtained eternal redemption for us."
14. *Ta hagia*, which can be translated, "the holy places," or "the holy place," or "sanctuary," etc., can be applied to the whole sanctuary, or to the first apartment, or to the second apartment. Only the context makes the correct translation possible. In Hebrews, most usages of the term apply to a single apartment — the second.
15. The cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary was also its dedication, and therefore pointed to an event at the commencement of the Christian era primarily, not its close.

16. This is shown by the parallelism between 9:7-8, 21-23, and 10:19-22.
17. Hebrews does not speak of a High Priest still bearing sin, but of One who made an end of sin, and who now suffers no more. 9:26-28.
18. Hebrews never refers to Dan. 8:14, but it does give the only Biblical interpretation of Lev. 16, as regards a didactic detailed expression.
19. The Greek phrase for “within the veil” (*esōteron tou katapetasmatos*) is a technical one signifying the second apartment. Every occurrence of it in the LXX (the source most often used by Hebrews) thus applies it. “Within the veil” finds meaning in the Old Testament also, not only by its context, but by its contrast with “outside the veil,” and “beyond the veil,” which always signify that which is away from the inner veil.
20. Most Adventist scholars who have studied Hebrews without bias have reached these conclusions — the same conclusions other Bible scholars have taught for centuries.

Let it not be thought that the conclusions set forth in this chapter are novel or original. They are neither. Among both non-Adventist and Adventist scholars who have studied Hebrews without sectarian bias these conclusions are commonplace. For example, in the handwriting of Dr. R. Loasby, long-time SDA Seminary professor and exegete, we find these words:

(Comment on Heb. 9:4ff) This surely fore-shadowed the non-existence in heaven of a holy place in any sanctuary. ...

And in his typed notes alongside we read:

Access to the first apartment was allowed only to the priests. The first apartment was thus a hindrance of approach to God, hence its elimination was desirable. The layman must be offered priestly rights; wherein all members of the redemptive fellowship have immediate access to God in the place of all — heaven.

The Holy Place was the scene of man’s approach to God; but the Holy of Holies was a type of the presence of Jesus in the heavens. Any approximation of the first sanctuary and its services cannot be taken into heaven. Cf. verse 9.³³

A more recent Bible teacher wrote the following in 1979:

This idea of contrast is indeed central, not only to this section of Hebrews, but also to the overall development of the book in general, and to the proper understanding of the heavenly sanctuary in particular. Whatever else we understand the type-antitype, or symbol-reality figures to mean, we must understand that the antitype or heavenly reality is not really like the type or symbol — it is surpassingly superlative. Very often this idea of contrast between the earthly and heavenly is blunted by the literalistic hermeneutic we bring to bear upon our interpretation of the heavenly. But Ellen White cautioned against being too literalistic in our comparisons.

The heavenly temple, the abiding-place of the King of kings, where “a thousand thousands minister unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stand before him,” that temple filled with the glory of the eternal throne, where seraphim its shining guardians, veil their faces in adoration — no earthly structure could represent its vastness and its glory.³⁴

But the idea of contrast must be underscored. In 8:6, after the author has just described certain activities of the earthly priests, and has referred to the way in which the physical design of the earthly tabernacle was given to Moses "... according to the pattern which was shown you on the mountain," he immediately adds, "But as it is (*νυνὶ δέ*) Christ has obtained a ministry which is as much more excellent than the old as the covenant he mediates is better. ..." In other words, when the author gives his description of the earthly priesthood and functions in 8:3-5, he is not thereby emphasizing its similarity to the heavenly, but its difference — namely, its inferiority. Only in this way does the *νυνὶ δέ* of verse 6 make sense.

In this regard, it should be noted that the word "*κρείττων*" meaning "better," "more prominent," "higher in rank" is used 19 times in the New Testament, and 13 of those times it is in the book of Hebrews.³⁵

It seems clear that one simple definition of "*τα ἅγια*" is not possible, and any expositor is obligated to consider carefully the contextual setting and theological intent of each usage.

Of the 10 times the word is used throughout Hebrews (8:2; 9:1-3, 8, 12, 24, 25; 10:19; 13:11), in only 3 passages (8:2; 9:1, 2) is it unquestionably **not** the Most Holy place. In all 7 of the remaining passages, a case can be made for understanding the term as meaning the Most Holy place.³⁶

If we follow strictly the earthly scheme of things, this last phrase is a problem, because then the first tent (*πρώτης σκηνῆς*) would refer to the Holy Place and it would have to cease to exist when the way into the Most Holy was revealed. Furthermore, verse 9 suggests that the entire thought of the preceding verse is a "parable for the present time." Thus, with an additional element of, not simply type, but of parable we see that "*ἁγίων*" in 9:8 refers not solely to the earthly Most Holy place, but to the heavenly Most Holy. Cody interprets it this way:

The first tent becomes the old, earthly tent in its entirety, including both the Holy and the Holy of Holies, and the second tent, the "better and more perfect tent" of verse 11, becomes the celestial sanctuary. The hinge on which the author's perspective turns is the notion of the divine presence and celestial glory symbolized by the historical second tent, along with that of the inaccessibility of that second tent under the Old Dispensation — "as long as the first tent was still standing" (verse 8). This first tent, in the sense of the whole tent of the Old Dispensation, is a "parable" representing the order prevailing in the temporal present "*παραβολὴ εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἐνεστηκότα* verse 9), contrasted with the new order prevailing in the "time of correction" (verse 10).³⁷

In 8:12, Christ is the High Priest enthroned in the "sanctuary" or "true tent" which the Lord "pitched" not man. In 9:11, Christ is again the High Priest, and He is in some relationship to a "more perfect tent" that is "not made with hands." The similarity of the two tents seems apparent.

In Heb. 8:2 our author declares that Christ our High Priest is now "in heaven," where He ministers "in the sanctuary which is the true tent," and in Heb. 9:11-12 that He entered into the Heavenly holy of holies through His entry into "the greater and more perfect tent." If there is a conformity with the imagery of the wilderness

tabernacle, Christ is envisaged as entering the true tent (of heaven) which contains the true sanctuary (of God's presence). But as the curtain which divided the tent into two chambers has now been abolished, it is easy to see how in the true order of things **tent** and **sanctuary** can be treated as synonymous terms.³⁸

There is broad consensus that the veil described in 10:20 refers to the veil of the earthly type that separated the Holy from the Most Holy place, and also separated all people and Priests from God.³⁹

According to 9:24, 25, Christ has entered the Holy of Holies, which is at the same time "heaven itself." It is difficult to find in Hebrews a clear description of Christ's heavenly locale. What is stressed is Christ's achievement as High Priest, and His subsequent ability to enter "within the veil" (6:19; 10:20). It is understandable that Procksch should say, "The holiest of holies is an anti-type of heaven as the dwelling-place of God which Jesus has entered by his death and where he now represents Christians as Priest ...". Similarly, it is hard to deny that

... Our author's perspective does not include the concept of a holy place above, as distinct from the holy of holies, precisely because, now that the curtain between the two has been abolished and the way opened up by him for all into the heavenly holy of holies which is the sanctuary of God's presence, the distinction no longer exists.⁴⁰

Also,

The writer of Hebrews thinks in terms of cultic conceptual forms. He represents a realism which is contrary to ordinary thinking. The true reality for him is the heavenly and not the earthly. Therefore, his statements about the heavenly sanctuary and Christ's ministry in heaven are not meant symbolically (figuratively). We would misunderstand the writer of our letter were we to assume that he imagined the eternal reality of God in analogy with the cultic reality as it found expression in the Old Covenant. The contrary is true: the earthly sanctuary and the cult practices in it are, according to the Letter of Hebrews, but the imperfect and shadowy image of the heavenly sanctuary and the heavenly ministry. The earthly is but a "parable" of that which truly is.⁴¹

Seminary students are studying the topic of Heb. 9, and documentation is available to show that some are reaching the conclusions set forth in this chapter.

ADVENTISM'S REBUTTALS

A survey of our early apologetic literature on the sanctuary shows an awareness of the problems in at least a superficial way. Whether it be Branson's *"Reply to Canright"*, or Watson's *"The Atoning Work of Christ"*, or the earlier *"More Excellent Ministry"* by Andross, or even Andreasen's works on *"Hebrews"* and *"The Sanctuary Service"*, the issues we have just studied come up for consideration.

However, we doubt if any responsible SDA scholar today would defend the typical arguments of the above writers and their kin. The latter group try to avoid the force of Heb. 6:19 by speaking of the manner in which the LXX varies in its use of *katapetasma*, by referring to "the second veil" in Heb. 9:3, and similar arguments. All without exception fail to see that the Greek term is a technical formula taken from Lev. 16, and only so used by the LXX on which Hebrews leans so heavily.

Similarly, the arguments concerning Heb. 9 invariably refer to the plural nature of *ta hagia* and ignore the fact that in the vast majority of cases that plural form has an application to a single apartment. Likewise the Day of Atonement context is ignored. The articles by A.P. Salom and W. Johnsson are welcome exceptions to this, and so is the *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*.

Again, usage of Heb. 8:5 by our apologists is similarly unimaginative and inaccurate. They seem to be quoting their predecessors without stopping to ask whether Hebrews also uses typology for purposes of antithesis, and whether this is particularly the case as regards the usage made of the first apartment.

All sorts of incongruities confront us in our usual literature on the sanctuary. C.H. Watson, on page 149 of his book, speaks of “two occasions when Christ bore the sins of the people in His own person, first on the cross of Calvary ... and again at the close of His priestly ministry. ...” Does this mean that Christ takes the responsibility of the punishment for sin after Calvary? Is He again forsaken of God at the end of time? And if our Lord bore our sins into the second apartment, as well as being ready to bear them out, does He suffer three times? Let us remember that “bearing sin” in Scripture terminology has to do with responsibility and punishment. But Christ suffered “once for all,” and will never suffer again. See Heb. 9:26-28.

When Watson confronts Heb. 6:19, the usual escapes are sought. The first apartment becomes the scene of the throne of God, leaving the second apparently vacant for nearly two thousand years. This despite the fact that Adventists have always considered the cherubim over the ark and the Shekinah glory as emblems of the presence of the Almighty. Even grant a moveable throne, as Brother Watson requires, does that mean that the Most Holy is so small that the throne, if moveable, must seek another room? And if the accounting of sins is done in the second apartment after 1844, how did they get there, when according to Adventist orthodoxy they were originally deposited in the first. If till 1844 God dwelt in the first apartment, pray what was the need of the second? Does He need something that is there in order to turn to a work of judgment? Why could not the ark have been ever in the first apartment?

Brother Watson denies an atonement completed on the cross, and teaches that atonement is only made by the priest after the confession of sins by the penitent. Thus we are taught to look forward rather than back for the solution of the sin problem. Says our author:

The teaching of the New Testament is that atonement is made for the sinner in the priestly ministry of Christ after consciousness of his need has been awakened, and when, in that consciousness, he seeks such atonement through the blood of the atoning sacrifice.⁴²

How contrary this is to the New Testament which invites men to accept a reconciliation already accomplished. See 2 Cor. 5:18-20; 1 John 4:10; Rom. 5:6-11; 2 Cor. 5:14. If our brother is correct, then Christ has made atonement again and again and again — millions of times as penitents sought His Face.

Recent apologetic statements are more sophisticated, and are more noteworthy for what they do not say than what they do say. Gerhard Hasel’s “*Christ’s Atoning Ministry in Heaven*” is comprehensive and exhaustive.⁴³ He has a beautiful presentation of our Lord’s heavenly session with clear statements regarding its antecedents and nature. Less impressive to some is the section on “The Sphere of Christ’s Heavenly Ministry” which has as a major aim the

proving of two apartments in the heavenly sanctuary. What Moses saw was a “model” and the “shadow” reflects the physical reality. It is claimed that Revelation sets forth two apartments. (Most commentators refer to the absence of a veil in the heavenly sanctuary because since the cross the two apartments have become one, there being now no separation from the presence of God.)

Dr. Hasel quotes sundry German scholars in support of a bipartite sanctuary. Not all have read these scholars as saying just that. Professor G. Thiessen, for example, who is quoted, has more to say than the conclusions that “there is certainly, in heaven, as on earth, a two-part tabernacle.” He tells us that the topic of the sanctuary is more difficult than that of the New Jerusalem already presented by him. His suggestion is that there are two approaches, one of which leads to the conclusion of a two-part tabernacle in heaven. His second option has to do with the symbolism being temporal rather than spatial. What is most significant is the lack of proffered evidence for the first position.

What Thiessen actually says on page 105 of his *“Untersuchungen zum Hebraerbrieff”* is that “Christ has gone through the heavenly tent and entered the Holy of Holies.” In other words, Thiessen sees the heavens themselves through which Christ passed at His ascension en route to the presence of the Father as the antitype of the first apartment. He has no conception of a separate ministry from that of the Holy of Holies. This view of Thiessen’s springs from his understanding of “the greater and more perfect tent” (9:11) as the heavenly prelude to the “Holy Place” (9:12). Quotations from German or other authors regarding a bipartite sanctuary in heaven are not talking of two phases of ministry above, nor denying Christ’s entrance into the equivalent of the Most Holy Place at His ascension. They merely evoke Heb. 9:11 as indicating that the heavenly passageway to the presence of God was the supernal equivalent of earth’s first apartment. Such a view is a far cry from the traditional Adventist position, and cannot legitimately be used in support of it.

Furthermore, when Dr. Hasel states that “As in the Greek Old Testament so in this letter ‘tent’ always designates the whole sanctuary” (p. 21), we find it difficult to follow him for more than one reason. Heb. 9:1-8 applies the term “tent” repeatedly for a single apartment, not the whole sanctuary. And in 8:2 the tent is the equivalent of the sanctuary into which our High Priest has entered. This *ta hagia*, if consistent with most other usages, applies to the Most Holy Place, and therefore, so does “tent” at this place. To say as the same page says, that the “expression in 9:8” “refers to a heavenly sanctuary with two divisions” goes beyond the evidence, especially in view of the same term being used for the second apartment only, as in 9:25, etc.

Dr. Hasel makes the “cleansing” of 9:23 something yet future, but the text applies it as something already accomplished by our great High Priest. Other matters could be discussed in connection with what seems to us otherwise a truly excellent article, but we will reserve some points for the chapter on Daniel. What must be stressed, however, is the reserve with which Dr. Hasel has operated. Key problems such as Heb. 6:19 and 10:19 are not discussed, nor the reason for the frequent references to the Day of Atonement from the first chapter to the last in Hebrews, and the appropriateness of that motif in view of Christ’s ninefold presentation as High Priest. The article “*Ta hagia* in the Epistle to the Hebrews,”⁴⁴ like the Hasel article, is a “must” for all researchers. Salom’s research has no parallel in our literature, and again, like Hasel’s, is valuable both for what it says and what it does not say.

A.P. Salom suggests that “there is considerable confusion of expression (if not of thought) among translators and commentators in their handling of this word” (p. 59). He proceeds to

give a graph of the usage by ten versions, ranking them in the order of their consistency of translation. Goodspeed is found most consistent, and Phillips least so. Knox and the NEB rank alongside Goodspeed for consistency, but Moffatt and Wuest range with Phillips at the other end of the spectrum.

Significant comments along the way by Dr. Salom include the following. Commentators have found it “necessary to explain that ‘Holy Place’ in some instances does not refer to Holy Place, but to the Holy of Holies!” “... the *auctor ad Hebraeos* leaned ... heavily upon the LXX ...” “It could be argued that, inasmuch as all the uses of *ta hagia* from Heb. 9:8 on are found in a Day of Atonement setting, a connection must be made between these six uses (at least) and the seven uses of this same word in Lev. 16. It is true that these latter references are to the inner compartment of the sanctuary.” (But, as Salom proceeds to say, each of the uses in Leviticus is singular, while in Hebrews they are plural with one exception.) “... the unique function of the high priest was concerned with the inner compartment of the sanctuary” (p. 66). Regarding Heb. 9:8, “the sanctuary here described is the heavenly sanctuary of which the inner compartment of the earthly sanctuary is symbolic” (p. 68). “The outer compartment represents the customary limits of access to God in the experience of Israel. Westcott’s comment is pertinent, ‘the outer sanctuary’ i.e. compartment, was the representative symbol of the whole Tabernacle as the place of service” (p. 68). As for Heb. 9:12, it is “the characteristic service of the Day of Atonement here referred to. ...” (p. 68). Similarly 9:24 applies to the Day of Atonement, and the verse following. Again in 13:11, “in view of chapter 9 particularly,” the author has the Day of Atonement again in focus, that is “the inner compartment of the sanctuary.”

A.P. Salom is miles ahead of all our traditional expositions of Heb. 9, i.e. those published between 1844 and 1950. He clearly sees that the inner compartment of the sanctuary is very much in focus in Hebrews, particularly from 9:8 on. It is true he recommends that the general term “sanctuary” should be used for *ta hagia* throughout, inasmuch as the LXX by the term means the sanctuary as a whole. We think there may be another possibility to consider — namely that in the days of the LXX translation the Christian meaning of the two apartments would not have been clear, and their translation was both natural and appropriate, whereas this might not be the case in our era since the cross. Secondly, we wonder whether A.P. Salom takes into account the fact that both translators and commentators often mean by “sanctuary” just the inner apartment. We cannot agree that “in Hebrews ... this expression refers basically to the sanctuary in general.”⁴⁵ It must not be assumed that the term “sanctuary” necessarily, or even basically or chiefly, meant to translators a bipartite structure. The term itself signifies merely a holy place and has no inherent content regarding a plurality of rooms. Thus the KJV calls the first apartment “the sanctuary” in Heb. 9:2 and uses the same term for the second apartment in Lev. 16:33. Translators were well aware that *ta hagia* in Hebrews chiefly signified the second apartment. There is no place where it can be proven to apply to the whole Mosaic tabernacle or a heavenly bipartite antitype. The fact that the veil had been torn down by God meant that the heavenly sanctuary knew no divisions, and that henceforth the term “sanctuary” once usable for a bipartite structure now applies to the single “throne room” of heaven.

The most significant articles on these topics, those by Dr. W. Johnsson, we leave till last for discussion. They represent the strongest case that can be made in defence of traditional concepts.

W. JOHNSON'S "CULTIC LANGUAGE OF HEBREWS" AND "THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT ALLUSIONS IN THE BOOK OF HEBREWS"

Because Dr. Johnson's yet unpublished articles will be made available to the committee studying the present document, I must with considerable diffidence discuss these. This reluctance exists because, (1) it does not appear seemly that friend should counter friend, and, (2) there is so much in both papers with which I wholeheartedly agree. Nevertheless, I am encouraged by the dictum of Dr. Heppenstall, which I am sure is shared by Drs. Johnson, Hasel and Salom: "People who disagree with me do not thereby become enemies."

We know of nothing written by way of Adventist apologetic that comes as close to the real issues as these papers soon to be printed. Written with the usual Johnsonian finesse, they display an awareness of the issues which is almost unique in Adventist literature.

Dr. Johnson sets forth eight passages from Hebrews which may have application to the Day of Atonement. Very conservatively, he says that three of these are undeniable. It is not usual for Adventist literature to go so far, except for Dr. Salom's paper in *AUSS*, the *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, and the earlier commentary by Andreasen (which sees the Day of Atonement in at least seven places in Hebrews).

The first paper warns against that popular exegesis of Hebrews which empties heaven of its realities. Such exegesis frequently makes the heavenly sanctuary a metaphor for the whole universe, and the priesthood of Christ but a metaphorical of the Christian's experience, and the cleansing of the sanctuary likewise. We wholeheartedly agree with Johnson's warnings against such interpretations. (Dr. Johnson's main protest is not so much against the perception of figurative usage in Hebrews, but against extreme allegorizing in that form which denies such heavenly realities as the sanctuary and the priesthood of Christ. Or so it seems to this reader of his paper.)

Dr. Johnson considers that those who interpret Heb. 9:6-9 as teaching that the separate sanctuary apartments were symbolic of the two ages (the Levitical and the Christian) belong to the group of interpreters against which he warns. They are dissipating the heavenly realities by engaging in metaphorical applications. We do, however, have problems with this conclusion for the following reasons:

1. Many who affirm that the two sanctuary apartments typified the two ages still held to the reality of a priestly ministry in heaven above. (See our quotations from commentators in the appendix.) It is not correct to say that those who held this position thereby deny a real heaven, or a real priesthood of Christ above.
2. Dr. Johnson denies the metaphorical approach, but also warns against the literalistic approach, and instead he endorses literalizing.

Now, the final word. If, as seems clear, a realistic, literal interpretation of the cultic language of Hebrews is called for by the evidence of the text, how literalistic should we be? For example, when we read of the "blood" of Christ, are we to understand His actual blood being offered in the heavenly sanctuary? We are led, therefore, to see three possible ways of interpreting Hebrews; 1) *metaphorical* or spiritual — faulty, as we have tried to show in this paper; 2) *literalistic*, in which each term has hard value: in terms of the heavenly sanctuary, the earthly would be a miniature in all respects; and 3) *literalizing*, in which the reality of the heavenly

sanctuary and ministry would be maintained as safeguarding the objectivity of the work of Christ, but precise details of that sanctuary would not be clear to us.

While a few Adventist students of Hebrews may hold to the metaphorical view, the majority surely belong in the second or third groupings. Does Hebrews help us to resolve the question of 2) or 3) above? Not decisively, in my judgment. While the argument does not necessarily exclude the possibility that the heavenly sanctuary is a glorified version of the earthly, we should note that a) the heavenly is the real, the true, so we should see the earthly in light of the heavenly, rather than vice versa; b) at 9:24, we read merely of “heaven” — surely a very general sort of description; c) the lack of interest in drawing of lines of comparison from the earthly to the heavenly is shown by the terse words at 9:5; and d) the emphasis in 9:1-10:18 falls on the **work** Christ accomplishes — there seems to be no interest in giving details as to surroundings. Possibly, then, while we may affirm the **reality** of the heavenly sanctuary, in Hebrews we have comparatively little hard data about its appearance.⁴⁶

Thus Dr. Johnsson affirms the reality of the heavenly things, rather their literality whereby “the earthly would be a miniature in all respects.”

We are not sure that there is a clear line between what he condemns and what he affirms. Can one reject the literalistic, affirm literalizing, and deny metaphorical use? Does not Dr. Johnsson look upon the references to the blood of Christ as metaphorical? (See his page 18.) Is not the “sitting down” of Christ a metaphor? And the altar we are said to have (13:10) — is this not metaphorical? When “tent” is used of the heavenly sanctuary, is not this a figure of speech? Or is there a tent in heaven? And is not the “cleansing” of the heavenly things something other than what the primary meaning of the word suggests? That is, must we not accept that some expressions are metaphorical, though believing that they point to realities above?

On pages 13 and 14 the significance of Heb. 9:6-9 is raised. We read:

The “σκηνή ἡ πρώτη” (9:2): The term in context is clearly for the purpose of making a distinction between the first and second apartments of the earthly sanctuary. The brief account of the furnishings of each makes this point. The issue is: Are we to read allegorical significance into these two apartments, so that they have separate referents, “ἡ πρώτη σκηνή” signifying the first sanctuary/age/covenant and the “ἡ δευτέρα σκηνή” signifying the heavenly sanctuary/new age/new covenant? If this is the intent of the passage, it has surely been well disguised. We note: i) how the discussion of the two apartments ends abruptly with “περὶ ὧν οὐκ ἔστιν νῦν λέγειν κατὰ μέρος” “We will not say more about this now.” That is, we are discouraged from looking into the details of these two apartments for hidden significances; ii) 9:6-10 follows on immediately with a description of the services of the earthly sanctuary, **not** in a way supportive of the allegorizing view. The second apartment is not set forth as the place of unhindered access — indeed, the high priest could enter it but once a year and “not without blood” (9:7). In other words, the entire passage 9:1-10 hangs together as a description of the old sanctuary and its services. *In toto*, the old cultus was inadequate in two points: the limited access and the lack of finality in its offerings (shown by its failure to “perfect” the “συνείδωσιν” of the worshiper — see 9:9). iii) the subsequent argument, 9:11-10:18 shows how Christ’s death and heavenly sanctuary ministry accomplishes all that the old cultus could not. It both breaks down all barriers

between God and man and provides an all-sufficient, final Sacrifice, so that no more reminder of sins is necessary. In this long argumentation, while we do find occasional contrasting of the old cultus with the new, we do **not** find the contrast made in terms of the two apartments of the earthly sanctuary.

Thus, the entire earthly sanctuary, and not just its first apartment, was a parable of the old era (τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἐνεστέκῳτα) which fulfils God's purposes "μεχρι καιροῦ διορθώσεως."⁴⁷

The article affirms that if the intent of the passage is to show that the first apartment pointed to the first age and covenant, and the second apartment to the second era and new covenant, then such an "intent" "has surely been well disguised." This is supported by reference to the apostle's words: "We will not say more about this now." But a survey of the literature shows that a great majority of commentators (Bible-believing commentators) have read the verses as teaching what Dr. Johnsson says has surely been well hidden. Secondly, the apostle's words, "We will not say more about this now," apply not to the fact of the division of the tabernacle into two apartments, but to the furnishings. He says, after listing the lampstand, the table, the shewbread, the altar, ark, golden urn of manna, the rod which budded, the tables of the law, and the cherubim ... "of these things we cannot now speak in detail."

Having so declared, the apostle proceeds to contrast the two apartments. His very point is that fact of contrast. Into the first apartment go priests, but into the second the high priest. In the first apartment blood was only rarely used, but into the second there could be no entrance without blood. The use of the first apartment was daily, that of the second but once a year. Note, that of this matter of the apartments, the apostle **does** now speak in detail, though not at all concerned with the furniture. Furthermore, he affirms that this matter of the divided tabernacle was the Holy Spirit's way of affirming that the way into the *tōn hagiōn* was not yet made manifest. Again, he adds that the unhindered access was not possible so long "as the outer tent is still standing." Also, he affirms that this hindering of entrance into the presence of God by the first apartment "is symbolic," and is symbolic *eis ton kairon enestekota* — for the time present.

We agree that some have suggested that by "first tabernacle" in verse 8 something different is meant to the "first tabernacle" of verses 2 and 6. Such a divergence so quickly is not the most likely, and many commentators and translators have strongly demurred. But as earlier said, we believe that here the apostle, as in other instances in Hebrews, is playing on words. With the *Interpreter's Bible* and others, we think the evidence is clear that he is saying that the first apartment was symbolic of the whole earthly sanctuary during the Jewish age. Whether we take the "first tabernacle" as meaning first apartment, or first entire sanctuary, the meaning is not changed as to the point at issue. The crucial matter is that the first apartment testified to the fact that not yet in Jewish times was there unhindered access to God. And what the first apartment was to the second so the whole Jewish sanctuary is to the heavenly — thus the first apartment symbolizes the whole Jewish sanctuary during that age, and the second apartment the Christian era and its heavenly sanctuary.

We also agree that there is no unanimity on *eis ton kairon enestekota* some applying it as the KJV to the "time then present" — that is, the age when the Jewish tabernacle occupied the scene, and others apply the words to the Christian age. But we would point out that the essential meaning is not thereby in jeopardy. If the latter meaning is taken, then the apostle is simply saying that until the coming of the Christian age, the typical system acted as a symbolic structure pointing to the times of reformation to dawn with the Messiah.

We would stress that despite the nuances of this passage, its central meaning is undeniable: the divided sanctuary taught that only with the coming of Christ would the reality symbolized by the second apartment come into its own. Until then, the hindered access indicated by the restricted first apartment ministry would characterize the representatives of God's people.

That this **is** the intent of the apostle is confirmed by such passages as 6:19 and 10:19, both of which clearly affirm that Christ has entered the Most Holy "within the veil" and that now we can follow our Forerunner — and that "boldly," unlike the ancient high priests.

As earlier noted, the plural "holies" is chiefly used in Hebrews for the Most Holy. We consider that 9:2 is the only exception. (It should be observed that the usual article does not appear in this instance. The term here is specific only as regards quality [see B.G. Westcott], not geography.) Thus the plural form (including 9:2) has a singular meaning. Therefore 9:8 is indeed contrasting the Most Holy Place with the holy place — it is saying that the way into the Most Holy came with Christ, and that therefore the outer apartment no longer has a standing. Its work is done. Verses 12 and 25 could hardly be clearer in affirming that interpretation. These verses say that what the high priest did once a year with the bulls and goats, that Christ has done through Calvary.

Finally, where does Hebrews breathe a suggestion that the heavenly sanctuary has a first apartment, or first apartment ministry? Nowhere. To have such a limitation in heaven would certainly not comport with the "better" motif of the book, and denies the emphasis on unhindered access so clearly sounded by the apostle. See 10:19-22.

Dr. Johnsson rightly sums up the verdict of the apostle on the old cultus:

The second apartment is not set forth as the place of unhindered access — indeed, the high priest could enter it but once a year and "not without blood" (9:7). In other words, the entire passage 9:1-10 hangs together as a description of the old sanctuary and its services. *In toto*, the cultus was inadequate in two points: the limited access and the lack of finality in its offerings (shown by its failure to "perfect" the *συνειδεσθαι* of the worshipper — see 9:9). iii) the subsequent argument, 9:11-10:18 shows how Christ's death and heavenly sanctuary ministry accomplishes all that the old cultus could not. It both breaks down all barriers between God and man and provides an all-sufficient, final Sacrifice, so that no more reminder of sins is necessary. In this long argumentation, while we do find occasional contrasting of the old cultus with the new, we do not find the contrast made in terms of the two apartments of the earthly sanctuary.⁴⁸

Note what is being said by this quotation. Hindrance of access was set forth by the old system (through the divided tabernacle). It was the second apartment only which stood for true access. The whole Old Testament system was inadequate as regards access and finality, but Christ's death and heavenly sanctuary ministry does what the old could not do. It has broken down all barriers.

We can only say a hearty Amen to these points. But surely they only endorse the suggestions above — that the first apartment indicated hindered access, and its place would cease when unhindered access came. That the barrier of the veil would cease to be when Christ came is surely unconsciously intended by Dr. Johnsson when he says Christ's death broke down all barriers between God and man. And to remove the barrier of the veil is to remove any separate first apartment.

When Dr. Johnsson says “we do not find the contrast made in terms of the two apartments of the earthly sanctuary,” we think that Heb. 9:6-9 is clearly making just that contrast, and that the later neglect of the first apartment altogether, and the repeated allusions to Christ’s entrance into the Most Holy confirm the statement that the division of the sanctuary into two apartments was the Holy Spirit’s way of indicating that entrance into the heavenly Most Holy was impossible so long as the first apartment (and the entire sanctuary it stood for) functioned.

We fully agree with the statement that “the entire earthly sanctuary was a parable of the old era” but would wish to add what we think the text is clearly saying — that the first apartment which indicated a restricted and hindered access to the presence of God was also the representation of the entire Jewish system.

Dr. Johnsson discusses whether the veil of Heb. 10:19 is a metaphor for the flesh of Christ, and he says nothing here that others have not endorsed. On the other hand, we must add also, that he says nothing here that others have not challenged. Commentators and translators have chosen the meaning he rejects which at least suggests it is an option. And many indeed have affirmed the allegorical intention of the apostle which Dr. Johnsson’s paper rejects.

The chief difficulty suggested by Dr. Johnsson is that if we take 10:19 allegorically “what will we do with the earlier references to the veil?” The answer surely is that any author has freedom to vary his use of a symbol. Ellen G. White, for example, assures us that the true tabernacle of Heb. 8:2 is the Christian church, yet in *Great Controversy*, as is well-known, the true tabernacle is the sanctuary above. Many, such as A.B. Bruce, see in 10:19 “a daring poetic touch.” The author of Hebrews reveals abilities which surely need not be hampered by niceties where any great objective is in mind. Churchill’s words are appropriate. “This is the type of nonsense up with which I will not put.”

Nevertheless, Dr. Johnsson may well be right. But the issue is so fiercely contested that neither he nor I would wish to put much importance on a personal conclusion. I recommend readers to what has seemed to me another outstanding study on the topic.⁴⁹ For the present we offer a reference from the author of that article:

The problem was for the present writer solved as long ago as 1888 when F. Gardiner wrote:

In other words, while by the exact force of the words and the precisely literal construction both genitives must be taken locally, yet really there was a gliding of the thought from one position to the other, so that while the “διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος” is to be taken locally, the following genitive, “τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ” is to be understood instrumentally, so that the real thought of the writer is precisely that which it is impossible to allow to the exact grammatical force of his expression.

The grammatical grounds for taking “τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ” as an appositional explicative to “καταπετάσματος” are coercive, as are also the reasons for the interpretation that the death of Christ is meant by the comparison. Why then do we find from time to time scholars balk at this conclusion? Mainly because the “daring, poetical touch” is for modern minds often found too daring.⁵⁰

Let us now consider Dr. Johnsson's second article. As friend to friend I venture some difficulties I find with it, while rejoicing in its great advance in several ways upon all other Adventist literature to date.

Because we have earlier dealt with Ballenger and "within the veil" we turn to the main theme of the paper — the specific reference to the Day of Atonement in Hebrews.

Our main problem has to do with what Dr. Johnsson calls "possible allusions" to the Day of Atonement. We think there is abundant evidence for adding certain of these allusions to his "unambiguous" group, and as for others in the listing, it seems to us they at least belong as "probable" rather than "possible" categories. We will now turn to particular instances.

Hebrews 7:26, 27

Such a high priest meets our need — one who is holy, blameless, pure, set apart from sinners, exalted above the heavens. Unlike the other high priests, he does not need to offer sacrifices day after day, first for his own sins, and then for the sins of the people. He sacrificed for their sins once for all when he offered himself. (Heb. 7:26, 27 NIV)

A vast number of commentators, we think the majority, have recognized this passage as a Day of Atonement allusion, not just because of the reference to the High Priest, and not just because of the need of the earthly high priest to offer sacrifice for himself — but because the text says he needed so to offer **first** — a definite allusion to the order of offerings on but one day of the year — the Day of Atonement. The high priest could not offer the sin offering for the congregation on that day until himself cultically clean through a prior offering.

Dr. Johnsson says that the inclusion of "daily" destroys the passage as a Day of Atonement allusion. We cannot take him seriously, for if such is the case it destroys the text from making sense at all, inasmuch as it was never true that the high priest offered for himself daily. As commentators in abundance have pointed out, what we have here is either a conflation of the year's activities inasmuch as the Day of Atonement summed up all previous offerings, or "daily" should be read in connection with our High Priest's work above at this time. That is, our High Priest does not need to offer sacrifices daily. The former is the more likely meaning.

Taking into account the fact that the LXX only uses "sins" (plural) cultically in connection with the Day of Atonement, we must concur with Young who writes: "It must be admitted that Heb. 5:3 and 7:27 only fit the Day of Atonement."⁵¹

Hebrews 4:16

Let us then approach the throne of grace with confidence, so that we may receive mercy and find grace to help us in our time of need. (Heb. 4:16 NIV)

Young's remarks on this verse are of value for the present discussion:

Older commentators often found in the words "*ὁ θρόνος τῆς χάριτος*" an allusion to the *כפרת* of the priestly tabernacle.

There are good reasons for thinking such a connection with the *כפרת* was not so far distant. Though Old Testament scholars are not agreed whether the ark as such was a throne or not, there is some agreement that as far as the Priestly writer was concerned the *כפרת* fulfilled such a function. Strack-Billerbeck give many examples from Rabbinic sources of the *כפרת* as the place of the divine presence and revelation. Though

“throne of grace” is unexampled as a title for the כִּסֵּא such a description by Hebrews of the place where the Shekinah glory was thought to reside is very appropriate.

Further the context gives us some confidence in such an understanding “ὁ θρόνος τῆς χάριτος” for the basis of the exhortation to confidently approach this throne is the fact that Christians have a sympathetic high priest who has passed through the heavens. Many have recognized, and rightly, that “ἀρχιερέα μέγαν διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανούς” is based on the high priest’s entrance into the holiest on the Day of Atonement. This being the case the admonition to draw near with confidence to the throne of grace is given a powerful basis in the picture of a sympathetic high priest present at the right hand of the grace-dispensing God.⁵²

Hebrews 9:8

The Holy Spirit was showing by this that the way into the Most Holy Place had not yet been disclosed as long as the first tabernacle was still standing. (Heb. 9:8 NIV)

This translation is representative of several and is based on the fact that the plural form is used in most instances in Hebrews for the second apartment. See, for example, 9:12, 25. The fact that the divisions of the sanctuary symbolized that the way into the true Holies was not yet made manifest shows conclusively that the author believed that way to be in his time fully revealed. 6:19 and 10:19 affirm that now our High Priest has entered the Most Holy Place “within the veil.”

Says Young on this passage:

πρῶτος does not refer to time (which it would have to in order to apply to the whole sanctuary) but to position — foretent. The argument develops from the actual facts of the earthly sanctuary, of which, if one conceives of the inner veil as the back veil of the first compartment rather than the front of the holiest, physically it is true to say as long as the first stood the entrance into the second was blocked.

Our author is concerned with more than this mere physical encumbrance, however, for this is a parable of the present time (ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐνεστηκώς = לְעֵלְמִים in which are ordained rites for outward purification, which are incapable of removing sin. The first tent symbolically is “the place of cultic performances which are not only insufficient for salvation, but also conceal the true way into the inner sanctuary.”⁵³

We must not lose sight of the fact that in Heb. 9:6-9 the very point which is central, which has attracted the special attention of the author, is the hindering veil — the limitation on access taught and enacted by the first apartment. Thus the apartment then prohibited was the symbol of the heavenly sanctuary now available through our Forerunner. It was the Day of Atonement which underlined the restricted access mentioned in 9:8.

Verses 11-14 must be read along with 6-9, and the emphatic position of *eisenchomai* observed. The entrance the high priest of old could only obtain briefly through sacrificial blood on one day was Christ’s once for all time after Calvary. Johnsson is right in saying, “This would make the entire period since Calvary as the Day of Atonement” (p. 12), a position taken by Ellen G. White in *Acts of the Apostles* 33; *Desire of Ages* 756; *Signs of the Times*, April 19, 1905, etc.

We agree with Dr. Johnsson regarding Heb. 9:5; 9:13; and 9:27, 28, though the latter falls in the “probable” category. Heb. 13:10, 11, at its weakest, must also belong among the probables according to most commentators.

Why has Dr. Johnsson not included Heb. 6:19 and 10:19 among the Day of Atonement allusions? “Within the veil” is a technical formula based on that passage which is repeated in Lev. 16 in several places. For a high priest to enter within the veil could be no other than a Day of Atonement reference. As Dr. Johnsson says in pages 7 and 8, “This expression, which is found in Heb. 6:19, occurs in the LXX only at Ex. 26:33; Lev. 16:2, 12, 15, and refers in each case to the inner veil.”

We suggest therefore that Day of Atonement allusions are more widespread in Hebrews than Dr. Johnsson has granted. This is doubly the case when we remember that Christ is referred to as high priest nine times in Hebrews, and the only distinctive work of the high priest was that of the Day of Atonement. As Dr. Johnsson has reminded us, the blood is central to this book — **but blood was not commonly used in the first apartment, yet was central to the ceremonial of *Yom Kippur*.**

Now we are in a position to consider the “bottom line” of the Johnsson paper. He alludes to those who hold (like this present writer) the principle of double fulfilment for the Day of Atonement, and mentions the apparent support of Ellen G. White for this position, but then adds “I must demur.” We are grateful for the frank, honest, and accurate presentation of the case from which he demurs, but must now ask the strength of the grounds of his disagreement.

Pages 16-18 of his paper set forth these grounds with clarity. Page 17 gives a comprehensive outline of the “complex of references to the cultus” in Hebrews. Twelve references are given. But these references are not all, as is suggested, separate from the Day of Atonement. We have already commented on 7:27. But the case is similar with 9:12, 13, 18-21. Perhaps Dr. Johnsson should recall his earlier comment on 9:25 that “the translation as ‘Holy Place’ is especially faulty, since the context points clearly to a Day of Atonement allusion (high priest ... yearly ... blood; cf. 9:7).” The case is almost identical in 9:12 except that “once for all” is used as the antitype of the “yearly.” We think the translation is not necessarily at fault, inasmuch as Lev. 16 repeatedly uses “holy place” for the second apartment. See verse 2.

We have already agreed that Heb. 9:13 is not a clear Day of Atonement allusion, nevertheless it is a possible or probable one. There is no Old Testament instance where the blood of goats and bulls was linked with the ashes of a heifer to cleanse defiled persons. Almost certainly the apostle is applying the blood of the Day of Atonement goats and bulls as cleansing the people, as well as the water from the red heifer. Repeatedly in this chapter the apostle goes beyond the Old Testament sources in order to show that the blood of the Day of Atonement had cleansing and ratifying power. While Ex. 24 makes no reference to the blood of goats in connection with the ratification of the Old Covenant, the author of Hebrews introduces such, for goats were characteristic of the annual expiation. Again, he departs from the historical account about the blood being applied to the altar, for he wishes Calvary to be the single application of blood that seals the everlasting covenant, rather than suggest the aspersion of Lev. 16:15, 19, which followed the entrance into the Most Holy and the egress. Neither do we read in Ex. 24 about the blood being “sprinkled.” There it is “thrown.” “Sprinkling” was chiefly connected with the Day of Atonement, and thus these references to the efficacy of blood forever interweave by their reference to “goats,” “sprinkling,” and the cleansing of the sanctuary vessels, reminiscences of *Yom Kippur*.

Heb. 9:18-21 is linked to the Day of Atonement in verses 23-28 by a statement of principle in verse 22, and then by *gar* (for). Never is the Day of Atonement absent from the mind of the apostle.

We quote Dr. Johnsson once more:

The apotelesmatic interpretation ... rightly recognizes the motif (the Day of Atonement) but needs to see it in the larger cultic context of the argument of Hebrews. I have argued in my dissertation that the leitmotif of the sacrificial argument of Hebrews, 8:1-10:18, is *better blood*. ... This leitmotif of blood is not to be subsumed or superseded; it gathers up all talk of sacrifice, offering the Day of Atonement; it alone can bring cleansing from the basic human problem of defilement which Hebrews sets forth.⁵⁴

Well said. None could say it better. But we would add one small point with which we venture to hope Dr. Johnsson will agree. The theme is indeed the better blood, but that theme would be more comprehensively stated if we said — the better blood **that by forensic cleansing brings access**. Thus only the Day of Atonement references with their emphasis on access through the better blood can fully round out the theme of Hebrews.

The theme of access permeates the whole letter. In Heb. 3 and 4 Christians are admonished to “enter” the rest of God. They are told that the true Canaan remains to be entered by all who have faith, and who cease from dependence on their own works. Not circumcision, but unbelief, kept literal Israel from “entering in.” See 3:19. But we, by faith, can “with confidence draw near to the throne of grace” (4:16). That is, we Christians have access. Then chapter 5, by beginning with *gar* (for), tells us why we have access. Because we have a high priest who has offered sacrifice for sins. This high priest is of the order of Melchizedek, and not that of Levi and Aaron. He has finished His work and has sat down, unlike the sacerdotal drudges of Old Testament times. He has found access to the throne by cleansing our sins with His blood. He is our Forerunner and our Representative. We have legally already entered with Him, and may do so experientially.

Later chapters enlarge these thoughts. Our High Priest “is able for all time to save those who draw near to God through him ...” (7:25). Our sins are no longer the barrier to access, for we have through Christ the better promises about forgiveness, the promises of that covenant sealed with the blood of our Priest. See chapter 8. Then chapter 9 *par excellence* speaks of access through the blood and this is equated with cleansing through the blood. Next, both are linked in 10 where it is repeatedly affirmed that now through the blood of Christ penitents have no more burden of unforgiven sin, but can as sanctified high priests themselves, with hearts sprinkled clean and bodies washed, have boldness to enter within the veil. See 10:19-22. Only as it is seen that the shedding of the better blood on Calvary, the antitypical Day of Atonement, procured access to God for all penitents — only as that is seen will Hebrews be fully understood, and the gospel fully proclaimed.

We believe Leon Morris was correct when he wrote:

The Day of Atonement is of great importance for an understanding of the thought of the Epistle to the Hebrews. There the actions of the High Priest on the Day of Atonement are regarded as the supreme example of his ministry, and since much of this Epistle is concerned with the High Priestly work of Christ It follows that an understanding of what the Day of Atonement signified to men of the first century is important if we would follow what the atoning work of Christ signified to this writer.⁵⁵

Morris also observes the special relationship between the theme of access, and the use of blood on the Day of Atonement, and it is his conviction that Hebrews reflects this relationship.

... on this day only in the year, the High Priest was permitted to enter into the chamber which typified the very presence of God. This is emphasized in the introduction to the day's happenings in Lev. 16 where it is access and not atonement which is stressed. "Speak unto Aaron thy brother, that he come not at all times into the holy place within the veil, before the mercy seat which is upon the ark; that he die not. ... Herewith shall Aaron come into the holy place" is the introduction to the chapter. In other words the chapter does not say (as is often assumed) "This is the way sins shall be forgiven," but, "This is the way the High Priest shall come into the presence."⁵⁶

Quite in the manner of Lev. 16, the writer to the Hebrews introduces his section on the Day of Atonement by referring to access. After speaking of the tabernacle furnishings, and pointing out that the High Priest alone might enter the Holy of Holies, and he only once a year, he proceeds "the Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holy place hath not yet been made manifest, while as the first tabernacle is yet standing; which is a parable for the time now present" (Heb. 9:8f).

This access is purchased at the price of blood which must be carefully manipulated according to the regulations, for the entrance into the Holy of Holies was an adventure whose outcome could not be foreseen, and thus every precaution must be taken. The use of blood ranks high in the list of precautions, and thus the writer to the Hebrews notes its use, both in the case of the Day of Atonement (9:7), and of the work of Christ (9:12).

The thought of access leads our author to contrast the best that could be done according to the Levitical and Rabbinic rites, with that obtained by Christ.⁵⁷

Therefore, let us "have confidence to enter the Most Holy Place by the blood of Jesus" (Heb. 10:19). This was an appropriate admonition in AD 31 again when Hebrews was written, and remains so but with greater urgency since 1844.

CONCLUSION

Only in Hebrews 9 do we find the New Testament's interpretation of the first apartment ministry, the Day of Atonement, and the nature and timing of the cleansing of the sanctuary. See 9:6-8; 9:7, 12, 24, 25; (1:3; 4:16; 5:3; 6:19; 7:27; 10:1-22; 13:10, 11 should be compared with the verses of chapter 9); 9:23-25 (cf. 1:3; 9:13, 19; 10:22) respectively.

Perspectives from contemporary cultures should have helped us to grasp the meaning of the first apartment. The holy places of Israel were not unique to Israel. In most systems of religion there existed a holy centre which could not be invaded except at the risk of life, and usually this sacredness was indicated by hindrances of approach such as Israel's first apartment. See chapter one of Mircea Eliade's *"Images and Symbols"*; chapter 10 of her *"Patterns in Comparative Religion"*; chapter 57 of G. Van de Leeuw's *"Religion in Essence and Manifestation"*; chapter 3 of Othmar Keel's *"The Symbolism of the Biblical World"*, etc. This is not to suggest for one moment that Israel copied uninspired sources, but we would underline what has long been known that God often used recognized systems or symbols for His "new wine" of truth in special revelation. All who have compared the code of

Hammurabi with that of Moses, and the Canaanite literary forms with the Psalms are aware of this principle.

Heb. 9 clearly affirms that the purpose of the sealed-off inner sanctuary was to show that the religion of Israel in pre-Christian times was temporary and inadequate — a mere shadow intended to dissolve when the substance came at “the time of reformation.” The passages that speak of Christ’s going beyond the second veil at His ascension underline this very markedly, and the absence of the slightest whisper about a first apartment in heaven gives added confirmation to its earthly temporary pre-cross significance. While Revelation uses the images of the furnishings in the first apartment, we never read of a veil in heaven — neither could we ever have dreamed of the existence of any such thing but for our presuppositions. Matt. 27:51 dramatically told of the end of the veil for all time in all spiritual reality.

Every attempt to avoid the force of “within the veil” has been a failure. So much so, that many since 1905 have given up the attempt, and the majority of our scholars who have given any attention to the topic admit the technical meaning of the phrase and its origin in Lev. 16 for the Day of Atonement. When the four references to “without the veil” (Ex. 26:35; 27:21; 40:22; Lev. 4:3) are read it is found they all apply to the first apartment. Also in four places we have “before the veil.” See Ex. 30:6; 40:26 and Lev. 4:6,17. Again the reference is to the first apartment. As for the curtain at the entrance to the tabernacle, the Hebrew distinguishes it from the second veil by another term. It is a “door” or “hanging” — not **the** veil. In harmony with all this is the obvious significance of the ark and mercy seat, Cherubim and Shekinah as the emblems of the throne of God to which Christ ascended. Over a dozen times the New Testament locates Christ at that throne, “at the right hand of God.” See Mark 16:19; Acts 2:33; 7:55; Rom. 8:34; Eph. 1:20; Col. 3:1; Heb. 1:3; 8:1; 10:12; 12:2; 1 Pet. 3:22. The idea of an empty Most Holy Place during most of the Christian era is quite untenable.

The references to “the holiest of all” (*ta hagia*) apply to Christ’s position in the Most Holy since His ascension. All our threadbare arguments on the Greek have been erroneous, as now admitted by our own *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* and contemporary scholars. Andreasen’s arguments on pages 325 to 328 of his commentary on Hebrews is sadly inadequate. Yet this same Andreasen does refer to the Day of Atonement in at least seven passages of Hebrews as he exegeted. As for “within the veil” he does not seem aware of its technical nature and leaves the matter quite open. Yet Andreasen is miles ahead of former apologists such as Andross, Watson, and Branson. The more recent scholarly articles by Hasel, Salom, and Johnsson, are very carefully done, and contain much that is helpful. But Hasel avoids such issues as “within the veil,” and so do Salom and Johnsson. If touched upon, they are only dealt with in a cursory fashion without depth. Hasel does not attend at all to the recurring Day of Atonement references in Hebrews, but Salom and Johnsson do. The last two named, however, acknowledge the possible application of most of such references but do not dwell upon their significance. What was the high point of the whole sanctuary ritual according to both Leviticus and Hebrews becomes minimal to Adventist reviewers.

When we come to the actual “cleansing of the sanctuary” we experience great disappointment at the manner in which all Adventist writers have dealt with Heb. 9:23. Not perceiving that Ellen G. White’s use of the term was apotelesmatic (as is the case also of her use of Rev. 6:12, 13; Mal. 3:2; Matt. 25:1-13; Rev. 11:19; and Lev. 16) we who have followed her have felt duty bound to give the same interpretation as serious exegesis. Take for example the argumentation of our late revered brother W.E. Read. He represents our traditional position at its best when he writes:

If the earthly sanctuary was cleansed, and it was ordered after the pattern of things in the heavens, by analogy we would expect a cleansing of the sanctuary in heaven. One thing we should bear in mind is that sin has affected more than this world. Did not Satan's rebellion begin in heaven? ... Furthermore, men have sinned and their records are kept in heaven. ...

Let us now return to the thought of the cleansing of the sanctuary in heaven which was made possible by Christ's death on the cross. ... We are not alone in believing that a cleansing of "the heavenly things" is called for by this text.

It should be noted that the "heavenly things" to be cleansed certain refer to the sanctuary, for the same expression is used in Heb. 8:5 as the antitype of the "Pattern of things" in the earthly sanctuary.⁵⁸

Between these quotations Brother Read has recourse to *Great Controversy* 417, 418, and *The Spirit of Prophecy* 4:262, 263. The significant factor is that Brother Read applies the cleansing of Heb. 9:23 as future in Paul's day. Thus his "to be cleansed." Dr. Hasel does similarly in his fine monograph. Indeed, we have all done it, times without number. But it is not exegesis, that is, it is not correct exegesis. The apostle in 9:23 is talking of something done by Christ's death, finished already at the time of which he was speaking. There is no hint that the event would not begin for another 1800 years. Is it not fair to inquire: Where are the learned monographs from our ranks giving detailed exegesis to Heb. 9:23? They do not exist, for those who have tried, discovered what the text was actually saying, and gave up the project.

Adventists have not been wrong in emphasizing our Lord's heavenly ministry as our High Priest. It is a much neglected theme in Christendom despite the emphasis upon it in both Hebrews and the Apocalypse. We have not been wrong in seeing in "the cleansing of the sanctuary" an eschatological event. But we have erred in not seeing that Hebrews is plain and clear that the cross itself was eschatological and that the time of the end came then. "Once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself" (9:26).

The author could quote from Habakkuk: "For yet a little while, and the coming one shall come and shall not tarry" (10:37). Compare also his reference to his own time as "these last days" in 1:1.

The apostolic penman like his other brethren who wrote for God expected the contemporary church to take the gospel to the world. He knew from the promise of Matt. 24:14 that the only thing holding up the Second Advent was the global proclamation concerning the cross. What now awaits to be consummated, could have been consummated then.

In 1844 Adventists were brought to the same place. Confronted by the sanctuary through Dan. 8:14, and the inspired visions of Ellen G. White, we were intended to see the significance of the ark, the mercy seat, the sprinkled blood, and our Melchizedek Priest-King by the throne. We were meant to grasp the very truths that inspired the soul of the author of Hebrews — the truths summed up in Heb. 8, 9, 10. Hiram Edson was not wrong in thinking heaven was directing our attention to these Scriptures. In the sanctuary the great truths of the gospel are enshrined — substitution, representation, imputation — all evoked by man's rebellion against the eternal law — the testimony of God's will and nature enshrined forever in the Most Holy Place. Instead, we repeated the error of the early church which within less than a century after the death of the apostles had lost the gospel, and the Sabbath which symbolized both that gospel and the rest it brought through Christ's finished work.

We, like the Reformers in the 17th century settled down to arguing about doctrines, and in carving meticulously the spokes of the Christian message we lost the hub of the cross. No wonder our wagons have travelled slowly and with many an accident.

When once more the glory of the good news dawns upon us, and we perceive that all He did we have been counted as doing — the perfect life, the atoning death, the triumphant resurrection — all put to our account, so that we are ever “accepted in the beloved,” “seated in heavenly place,” “the sons of God,” “without condemnation,” ever the recipients of unmerited continuous justification — then Seventh-day Adventists will do to their world what the apostles began to do for theirs. Riots and revivals like those of Acts will ensue till the climax is reached in Antichrist’s last fling as predicted in Rev. 13. When all men judge themselves by their own reaction to the everlasting gospel of Rev. 16:6, then our High Priest will reaffirm their own decision, and cease His intercession. Then that pre-Advent judgment will be manifested by resurrection or translation to life everlasting, or a thousand years later resurrection to damnation. But all whose names are in the Lamb’s Book of Life have no fear of judgment because “as he is so are we in this world” — as precious, righteous, as accepted — and saved for evermore. They are found written in the book, and Michael stands up to deliver them from their wretched mortality, and causes them to shine as the brightness of the stars for ever and ever.

The sacrificial work has been performed, and the High Priest no longer “standeth ministering.” The words “sat down” add to the priestly imagery that of kingly state. — F.W. Moulton.

Now think what this means. It means this: that there is no miracle that God was unwilling to do to procure the salvation of man, for what miracle can be compared to the Incarnation of Christ? There is no sacrifice which God is unwilling to make to procure the salvation of the world, for what sacrifice can be compared to the cross of Calvary? But when it comes to the proclamation of that Gospel, God is willing to sit down and wait; willing to sit down all these centuries, because God is not willing to do your work and my work. Here is the awful responsibility which rests upon us. —E.A. Stuart.⁵⁹

REGARDING DR. HASEL’S “SOME OBSERVATIONS ON HEBREWS 9 IN VIEW OF DR. FORD’S INTERPRETATION”

It seems to the present writer that this article by Dr. Hasel has not been prepared with his usual care and thoroughness. Most of the points raised are already answered by my sanctuary manuscript as a comprehensive reading will show.

For example, on page one of Dr. Hasel’s statement he refers to my quotation from B.F. Westcott (see Appendix 5) affirming that the ritual of the Day of Atonement was present to the author of Hebrews “throughout this section of the Epistle.” I had affirmed that Westcott had at least Heb. 9 in mind, but Dr. Hasel suggests that he may only mean Heb. 9:7 — a single verse!

But if one looks at Westcott’s volume, he finds on page 1 that from 8:1 to 10:18 is assigned in Westcott’s outline to “The Fulfilment of Christ’s Priestly Work.” For chapter nine in this outline Westcott gives the summary: “The Old Service and the New: The Atonement of the Law and the Atonement of Christ.”

A glance at the contents table of Westcott shows that after commenting at length on each chapter he adds a series of notes on that chapter. To this his “Additional Note on 9:7” belongs, to which Dr. Hasel refers, and it deals with the Day of Atonement, as does the following one which is also mentioned by Dr. Hasel on his first and second pages. Note the conclusion of Westcott’s **second** note: “**the sacrifices which were provided** for removing the legal impurities which impaired the validity of the Covenant through contact with death (9:13), or in the common conduct of life, on **the Day of Atonement** (5:3; 7:27ff; 9:7f),” [emphasis ours]. Westcott is still dealing with *Yom Kippur*. And observe that in the references he includes he points back to chapters five and seven for the other elements which make up the “much broader base” mentioned by Dr. Hasel, but gives Heb. 9 for his reference to the Day of Atonement. We refer the reader to Westcott’s other notes on this chapter and his commentary. For Dr. Hasel to suggest that Westcott by “section of the Epistle” might only have meant as little as one verse, namely 9:7, is a strange conclusion in view of Westcott’s outline of the epistle with headings, and his comments on chapter nine.

On page three of Dr. Hasel’s article he says:

The meaning of Most Holy place for the plural *ta hagia* is preferred by Dr. Ford because “no doubt this springs from the use of ‘holy place’ repeatedly in Lev. 16 for the inner room” (p. 135). The fact is, however, that in the Septuagint of Lev. 16 we do not find even once the plural *ta hagia*. The LXX employs consistently the singular (Lev. 16:2, 3, 16, 17, 20, 23, 33). Thus the dependency on the Septuagint of Lev. 16 is not evident at all.⁶⁰

It will be observed that Dr. Hasel gave the source for my comment as page 135. Here is the comment as there found in context:

Surveying the generality of commentators, one finds that most of them believe that the meaning for *ta hagia* in at least seven instances of the ten is the Most Holy Place. Others contend for nine out of ten. We know of none that see the term as fitting the first apartment in any case other than 9:2. Those who have not chosen to interpret the term as applying to the Most Holy more than seven times, think of it as signifying the tabernacle as a whole in the remaining instances (except for 9:2 where it can only mean the first apartment). Heb. 8:2 and 13:11 are the cases which have sometimes qualified for meaning the entire sanctuary. One needs to exercise great care wherever one sees this latter term in English translation, for often, by sanctuary the inner apartment is intended and not the bipartite structure. No doubt this springs from the use of “holy place” repeatedly in Lev. 16 for the inner room.

Let the reader observe that I am not talking about the author of Hebrews primarily in the sentence preceding that quoted by Dr. Hasel. I am referring to English translations which use the word “sanctuary.” The whole paragraph is discussing how most scholars have understood *ta hagia*. So the argument from the LXX is quite irrelevant. My reference to “holy place” in Lev. 16 is referring to the Hebrew original, not the Greek translation. The Hebrew uses the singular repeatedly throughout the chapter for the room “within the veil” which the high priest entered but once a year. Our main point in the section quoted is that English scholars often by sanctuary mean the inner apartment. This restriction to but one room rather than the whole bipartite structure is not at all strange. The RSV and KJV do this in Lev. 16:33 for the second apartment while the KJV uses it also in Heb. 9:2 for the first.

As for Dr. Hasel’s argument that the LXX uses the plural almost solely for the whole sanctuary, that is quite understandable when we remember that only when the cross event

shattered the veil did the two apartments fuse into one as clearly taught in Heb. 9:6-8; 10:19-20. The first apartment has no separate identity in the heavenly antitype. All barriers to access to God have been removed by Christ.

I find myself in agreement with Dr. Hasel (page 5) that philological grounds should not be depended upon to prove the point at issue. My chapter clearly states that context is the decisive factor. See page 136.

Most of the other arguments in the paper are really answered in my own chapter. For example, the possibility suggested by F.F. Bruce (page 6) is allowed for in my own statement. See pages 150-151.

Those non-Adventist scholars who wish to see “the heavenly sanctuary ... also divide into two parts” (Hasel, p. 8, citing TDNT) often see the heavens through which Christ passed *en route* to the Most Holy (*ta hagia*) as the antitype of the first apartment. It is not the case that such believe in an actual place of office with two divisions. For example, Thiessen cited by Dr. Hasel as believing in a bipartite sanctuary in heaven has no conception of two heavenly ministries in separate apartments. See the original source referred to in Dr. Hasel’s “Ministry” article (insertion, Jan. 1976). Thiessen declares “Christ has gone through the heavenly tent and entered the Holy of holies” (*Untersuchungen zum Hebraerbrief* [1969], 105). There is no thought by such authors of Christ pursuing a first apartment ministry in heaven before a later second apartment work. All references to such writers actually misrepresent their meaning. *TDNT*, while seeing a heavenly antechamber, distinguishes it from “the true sanctuary, the holy of holies” (7:377). [Emphasis ours.]

On page twelve, Dr. Hasel quotes Ex. 24:8 to support a blood sprinkling ceremony other than the Day of Atonement. We would point out that it is a different word altogether than that used for “sprinkling” in the Day of Atonement record, and the RSV uses “threw” rather than “sprinkle.” We refer the reader to our discussion of Heb. 9 for the points raised by Dr. Hasel. (See section, Summary of Argument from Hebrews in Chapter 2.)

As regards “within the veil,” we would point out that all lengthy discussions of the use of *katapetasma* are largely beyond the point. It is the phrase which is important, and as shown in my chapter on Hebrews, it is a technical term borrowed from the Day of Atonement ritual. See the appendix by N.H. Young. For Dr. Hasel to say that “Scholarly opinion is divided as to the identity of the ‘veil’ that was rent at the crucifixion of Christ” (page 14) is astonishing. Simple people who know neither Hebrew nor Greek, but who recognize the allusions to the Gospel story in Heb. 10:19, 20, have no such difficulty.

Page seventeen of the Hasel article reminds us that God’s presence is not bound to the Most Holy Place. We agree wholeheartedly. Elijah stood “before the Lord,” and Scripture affirms His presence in every place. But the issue is — does the symbolism of the throne, (the ark and mercy seat and cherubim) point to the centre of God’s activity for men or not? Ellen G. White had no doubts on the matter. See *8T* 284; *GC* 414; *PP* 349; *DA* 212; *SP* 1:274, 398. And did Christ enter into that centre on man’s behalf? Hebrews 6:19, 20; 9:8, 12, 24, 25; 10:19, 20 affirm that the truth is even so.

ENDNOTES FOR CHAPTER TWO

- ¹ The story was part of a manuscript of some 230 pages, most of which was theoretical in nature, and unable to stand the scrutiny of James White, Uriah Smith, J.N. Andrews, and Loughborough. They refused to print it in the Review, though willing to use the biographical portion which was comparatively slight. Edson demanded that all or nothing be used, so it proved to be nothing. As a result, Hiram ceased to attend church. But there is no reason to doubt the essence of the account, provided we do not follow the error of many claiming that a vision was vouchsafed him. Edson never claimed that. See *"The Life and Work of Hiram Edson"* by James Rosco Nix, Heritage Room, Andrews University. This work, written in the early seventies, is the most comprehensive and accurate account of Edson that we have. For an E.G. White allusion see *CWE* 155.
- ² So our SDA Bible Encyclopaedia claims. See its articles on the sanctuary and the investigative judgment, particularly p. 1279, column 2.
- ³ A.C. Purdy, "Hebrews," *Interpreter's Bible*, ed. G. Buttrick (New York, 1955), 11:684. The evidence for this summary is obvious from a study of the text itself. Here again, a commentator has value only in enabling us to see what is already there in Scripture, though we have not previously observed it.
- ⁴ See appendix, 'Quotations on the D. A. in Hebrews.'
- ⁵ *The New Testament in Twenty-six Versions*, 1077
- ⁶ *Op. cit.*, 11:686. This view has been taught in essence by SDA Bible teachers including R. Loasby, R. Cottrell, J. Cox, D. Neufeld, S. Kubo, N.H. Young, etc. Because Adventist presses have only put out two commentaries on Hebrews—one being a "patched-up" version of an unacceptable original, and the other one noteworthy for its avoiding of contrary evidence—there is little draw from as regards our own exegetical literature. Only when we ourselves have prepared a definitive work in this area will some be tempted to feel that they can disdain the sources offered us by previous diligent and capable Christian scholars. While it is an error to depend upon commentators or uncritically absorb their conclusions, it is as great an error to think that theology alone of the sciences does not stand upon the shoulders of all who have gone before. Ellen G. White gratefully incorporated hundreds of lines from such exegetes as Farrar, Conybeare and Howson, Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown.
- ⁷ See appendix, "Quotations Regarding Heb. 9:6-9." These statements represent the conclusions of prominent SDA New Testament scholars. See our previous footnote on the matter of using commentaries.
- ⁸ See S. Gayford, *"Sacrifice and Priesthood"* (London, 1924), 72f.
- ⁹ N.H. Young, *"The Impact of the Jewish Day of Atonement Upon the Thought of the New Testament,"* unpublished PhD thesis (Manchester, 1973), 218.
- ¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 225.
- ¹¹ William G. Johnsson, *"The Significance of the Day of Atonement Allusions in the Book of Hebrews,"* unpublished manuscript (1979), 19-20.
- ¹² E. Riehm, *"Lehrbegriff"*, 562; E. Lohse, *"Martyrer"*, 167ff. Cited by N.H. Young, *Op.cit.* 218.
- ¹³ See H.W. Montefiore, *"Hebrews"* (London, 1964), 94, and compare Lev. 16:16, 21, 30, 34. By "only" we mean as regards the cultic passages.
- ¹⁴ N.H. Young, 158-161.
- ¹⁵ Delitzsch, 1:320.
- ¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 321.
- ¹⁷ Thomas Hewitt, *"Tyndale New Testament Commentary on Hebrews"* (Grand Rapids, 1966), 152-153.
- ¹⁸ O. Michel, *"Hebraerbrieff"*, 281f. Cited by N.H. Young, 204-205.
- ¹⁹ F.F. Bruce, *"Hebrews"* (Grand Rapids, 1964), 86.
- ²⁰ Marcus Dods, "Hebrews," *"The Expositor's Greek New Testament"* (EGT), 4:21.
- ²¹ P.E. Hughes, *"Hebrews"* (Grand Rapids, 1977), 281.
- ²² *Ibid.*, 309.
- ²³ F.F. Bruce, 161 fn.
- ²⁴ A.P. Salom, *"Ta hagia in Hebrews,"* AUSS (1967), 5:62. Compare our comment regarding the New Testament use of the plural form for a singular meaning. See page 112.
- ²⁵ E. Earle Ellis, *"How the New Testament Uses the Old"* (Exeter, 1977), 211.212.
- ²⁶ C.B. Moll, "Hebrews," *Lange's Commentary* (New York, 1906) 8:142.
- ²⁷ Aelred Cody, *"Heavenly Sanctuary and Liturgy in the Epistle to the Hebrews"* (St. Meinrad, 1962), 16.
- ²⁸ L.E. Froom message, "Sanctuary Triumphant: Theme of Daniel the Prophet's Progressive Build-up," 20, 21; GC Archives. "Variant renderings are: "Only a dim outline of the benefits Christ would bring" (Phillips), "only a dim foretaste of the good things Christ would do for us" (Taylor); "not a perfect representation of the realities" (Weymouth).

-
- ²⁹ A.F. Ballenger, “*The Nine Theses*,” before examining ministers at the General Conference at Washington, D.C., May 21, 1905, 1.3.
- ³⁰ Hebrews 10:1.
- ³¹ F.F. Bruce, “*Hebrews*,” NINTC (London, 1964), 245.
- ³² A.B. Bruce, “*Hebrews*” (Edinburgh, 1899), 367-368.
- ³³ Notebook on Hebrews 9 in Heritage Room, Andrews University.
- ³⁴ Bill Richardson, “*The Heavenly Temple*,” Andrews University Theological Seminary term paper, 1979, 8.9. citing E.G. White, PP 357.
- ³⁵ *Ibid.*, 9.
- ³⁶ *Ibid.*, 11.
- ³⁷ *Ibid.*, 12.13. Citing Cody, “*Heavenly Sanctuary*”, 147.
- ³⁸ *Ibid.*, 15. Citing Philip Hughes, “The Meaning of ‘The True Tent’ and ‘The Greater and More Perfect Tent,’” “*Bibliotheca Sacra*,” 130 (1973), 314.
- ³⁹ *Ibid.*, 17.
- ⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 19. Citing Hughes, “*Bibliotheca Sacra*”, 313.
- ⁴¹ Johannes Schneider, “*The Letter to the Hebrews*” (Grand Rapids, 1957), 41.
- ⁴² C.H. Watson, “*The Atoning Work of Christ*” (Washington, 1934), 113-114.
- ⁴³ “*Ministry*” insertion, January, 1976.
- ⁴⁴ AUSS 5,1967.
- ⁴⁵ *Op. cit.*, 65.
- ⁴⁶ W.G. Johnsson, “*The Interpretation of the Cultic Language of Hebrews*,” paper presented to the Biblical Research Institute, PUC, Angwin, CA, Jan. 1-2, 1978, 18.19.
- ⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 13.14.
- ⁴⁸ *Loc. cit.*
- ⁴⁹ N.H. Young, “*τοῦτ’ ἐστὶν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ*”, NTSt (Oct. 1973), 20:100-104.
- ⁵⁰ N.H. Young, “The Impact of the Jewish Day of Atonement Upon the Thought of the New Testament,” unpublished PhD thesis (Manchester, 1973), 188-189.
- ⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 204.
- ⁵² *Ibid.*, 165-166.
- ⁵³ *Ibid.*, 169-170.
- ⁵⁴ W.G. Johnsson, 18.
- ⁵⁵ Leon Morris, “The Day of Atonement and the Work of Christ,” *The Reformed Theological Review*, (1955), 14:11.
- ⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 12.
- ⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 16.
- ⁵⁸ W.E. Read, “Review and Herald”, Nov. 15, 1962, 2, 3.
- ⁵⁹ W.R. Inge and H.L. Goudge, “Hebrews,” “*The Study Bible*”, ed. J. Sterling (New York, n.d.), 96.
- ⁶⁰ G.F. Hasel, “Some Observations on Hebrews 9 in View of Dr. Ford’s Interpretation” (1980), 3.

CHAPTER THREE

Daniel And The Day Of Atonement

OUTLINE OF CHAPTER THREE

Daniel and the Day of Atonement	Page
The Current Situation.....	181
Non Seventh-Day Adventist Scholars And Apocalyptic	182
Traditional Prophetic Dating And The Investigative Judgment	186
Does Divine Sponsorship Guarantee Infallibility?	189
Chronological Problems, Including The Year-Day Principle	190
Is The Year-Day Principle Compatible With A First Century End Of The World?	191
The Intelligibility Of Prophecy: Is It History Written In Advance?	201
Chronological Problems Continued	204
The Basic Pillars For The Year-Day Principle	212
Dan. 9 And The Year-Day Principle.....	215
The 1260-Year Period, Etc.....	221
Were Adventists Wrong Concerning Daniel 8:14?	227
The Contextual Problem For The Traditional Interpretation	228
The Linguistic Problem For The Traditional Interpretation.....	229
The Relationship Between The Contextual And The Linguistic Evidence	230
The Judgment Focuses On Unbelievers, Not Believers.....	232
Daniel 8:14, The Day Of Atonement, And The Judgment.....	234
The Judgment Of Daniel 7	242
The Little Horn, The Saints, And The Sanctuary In Daniel 8	245
Daniel 8:14 And Antiochus Epiphanes	247
The Little Horn—Its Meaning For Ancient Israel	248
Antiochus Epiphanes And Daniel 11	252
The Daniel 8:14 Context And The “Daily” Controversy.....	259
Daniel 8:14—The High Point Of Daniel’s Symbolism	260
Daniel, The Day Of Atonement, And 9:24	260
The Meaning Of “Kippur”	262
Relationships Between Daniel 8 And Daniel 11	264
Judgment—The Theme Of Daniel.....	267
Daniel 8:14 As Interpreted By Scripture Itself.....	270
Summary (See Also Appendix 17)	273
The Divine Purpose In The 1844 Movement And The Sda Church.....	274
Endnotes For Chapter Three.....	279

Appendices particularly relevant to this chapter:

- 12 Studies in the Book of Daniel (R. Cottrell)
- 13 Parallels between Dan. 8 and 9
- 14 Should a Question Be Answered?
- 15 Importance of Antiochus Epiphanes
- 16 The Connection Between Dan. 8:14 and Dan. 12:13
- 17 Summary on Dan. 8:14 and 1844
- 18 The Daniel Committee of 1937-1952 and the Chronological Problems of the 2300 Days
- 19 Extracts From Dr. R. Cottrell's Presentation at Loma Linda, February, 1980
- 20 The Conditional Nature of the Time of the Advent
- 21 The Year-Day Principle
- 22 Daniel 8 Its Relationship to the Kingdom of God
- 23 Daniel 9:24-27 Recognized as Containing Jubilee and Day of Atonement Allusions
- 24 The Historical Development of the Doctrine of the I.J.

Special Note: The writer has not attempted to do again what he has already attempted in his Daniel commentary (SPA), exegesis of the basic verses. He refers readers to that source for that purpose. Here, in the limited time and space available, he has chiefly dwelt on the problems which make some aspects of the traditional exposition untenable. No doubt more than one tentative solution will be forthcoming from others, but no progress can be made in that direction until the problems are clearly seen.

THE CURRENT SITUATION

In 1978, the missionary book of the year was *The Power and the Glory*, (R&H) by Raymond H. Woolsey. It is a summary of our prophetic faith and includes eight small pages on Dan. 8 and 9. While the usual argument about blood from the daily sacrifices going continually into the first apartment is used, the “judgment” verses are interpreted as pointing not only to a cleansing of the sins of the saints, but also as divine vindication and a declaring of the “little horn” to be guilty. See pages 40, 45, 41. On Dan. 9 we are told that “weeks of years” is a better translation, for the “angel was actually saying that seventy seven-year periods, or 490 years, would be allotted to Daniel’s people, the Jews” (page 42).

Thus this easy-to-read little volume in its brief summary of the vital sanctuary doctrine offers an amalgam of nineteenth and twentieth century Adventist positions. It is admitted that the original of Dan. 8:14 means “justified” or “vindicated” rather than cleansed; the actual prophetic statement of ch. 9 uses years rather than days; and the judgment of Dan. 7 at least includes the wicked.

The current equivalent volume, Dick Winn’s *God’s Way to a New You* (PPPA, 1979), also discusses Dan. 8:14, and like the above volume, is eminently readable. But it makes no reference to the investigative judgment. Instead, Dan. 8:14 is interpreted in terms of the Hebrew concept of restoration. The contrast between the two books is instructive. But neither book deals with the grave problems in exegesis that our traditional interpretation faces. Despite the wide variety of new literature through our presses every year, for a whole generation we have produced nothing of depth on the sanctuary doctrine except Heppenstall’s *Our High Priest* — exceptional also because of its departure from the usual Adventist presentation at several key points.

With every passing year, evangelists find it harder to convince people that the time of the end began in the seventeen hundreds, and the judgment in the mid-nineteenth century. Even neophytes in religion are hard to convince that the omniscient God takes so long ferreting out the evidence about His creatures, especially when Scripture so clearly affirms that He reads the thoughts and intents of each soul, and that every heart is open to Him with whom we have to do.

Meanwhile, on the outside, critics at every opportunity refer to our investigative judgment teaching as a face-saving device (hardly flattering, though at least conceded to be the *greatest* of all historical devices of that ilk) which is stale, flat, and unprofitable. On the inside, our scholars talk to each other more often than to administrators, and sometimes concur with the opposition.

It would, however, be wrong to conclude that nobody cared, and nobody worried about our perpetuating a teaching that for many holds grave problems. One prominent man amongst us, as already told, cared so much as to send out a questionnaire to our leading theologians, linguists, and writers. The questionnaire went to university and college departments, administrative centres, and editorial chairs. We wish to allude once more to the results of that questionnaire. It is not necessary to draw from the documents of the Daniel committee. The information has been given in meetings at both our universities and is available on tape.

Those who replied to the questionnaire — and all requested, did reply — included E.E. Heppenstall, Earle Hilgert, S.H. Horn, A.G. Maxwell, W.F. Specht, E.R. Thiele, R. Hammill, D. Neufeld, T.H. Jemison, R.E. Loasby, O. Christensen, S. Kubo, W.G.C. Murdoch, P.E. Heubach, and others well-known to us. In response to the inquiry “What linguistic basis is

there for translating *nitsdaq* as ‘cleansed?’ twenty-one out of the twenty-seven had nothing to offer, five had next to nothing, and one surmised that there may have existed an unknown Aramaic original. As to the query regarding linguistic or contextual reasons for applying Dan. 8:14 to the antitypical day of atonement and the investigative judgment, all twenty-seven affirmed the nonexistence of any linguistic or contextual reasons for applying Dan. 8:14 to the antitypical day of atonement and the investigative judgment, all twenty-seven affirmed the non-existence of any linguistic or contextual basis.

Such conclusions offered by the cream of our scholarship assert in effect that our traditional teaching on Dan. 8:14 is indefensible. Yet today our traditional teaching is reiterated by laity and ministers in Bible studies, in print by our publishing houses, in schools by our teachers, from the public platform by our evangelists. Despite our awareness of problems discussed by our best scholars over five years, today we go merrily on regardless. But all theological problems neglected, like personal health problems, have a habit of springing back like a whiplash. A neglected hole in a ship’s timbers can mean the loss of the whole company.

When the results of this questionnaire were discussed on the Daniel committee, the same current tapes tell us that our scholars were much divided over the issues, with a majority wishing to ignore the problems, and as a temporary measure, at least provide something to give reassurance to our own people. Others admitted the problems frankly, and declared that the Scripture did not countenance the Adventist interpretation, but we could strongly support our case from the Spirit of Prophecy. And there the matter rested — and almost died. Perhaps it did die — certain it is that there is a very active ghost that refuses to-be confined to coffin quarters even in holy places.

NON SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST SCHOLARS AND APOCALYPTIC

But exegesis is not dead. While we seem to have become more and more shy about attending-to the themes of Daniel and Revelation, and have relied chiefly on the outdated commentary produced in after-hours a century ago, non-Adventist scholars have turned to eschatology with a vengeance.

Exegesis has been more active in the twentieth century in the area of Biblical apocalyptic than in all previous centuries combined. Prestigious, learned journals such as *Interpretation* and *Journal of Theology and Church* have devoted whole issues to the topic, and books have swarmed like bees. While it was in the year 1844 that the word “eschatology” entered literature as a strange Cinderella, there have been times this century when that theme has seemed to reign as queen. Some German scholars have affirmed that “apocalyptic is the mother of New Testament theology,”¹ and others concede that though Jesus Himself was not an apocalyptic, “the views of the apocalyptic tradition are everywhere the presuppositions of what He said and did.”²

An American scholar has expressed the attitude of many post-WW2 theologians when he wrote: “To determine our Lord’s attitude towards the subject of apocalyptic is one of the really urgent tasks at the present time confronting Bible scholars.”³ Others frankly acknowledge that such themes as the Son of Man, the kingdom of God, the judgment, the resurrection, Antichrist, the Second Advent — all so prominent in the teachings of Jesus, not only belong to apocalyptic, but are derived from the teachings of a book long derided by many Old Testament scholars — Daniel. Says Karl Helm:

At least in its main features Jesus accepts the vision of the future of the world given by Daniel. For He solemnly adopts the principal part in the final act of the cosmic drama

seen in the book of Daniel ... The “Kingdom of Heaven” also, which He had announced in His first call to repentance, is the eternal Empire that according to Daniel is to follow the terrestrial empires. For the import of this solemn declaration by Jesus it is immaterial whether the author of Daniel lived about 600 BC under Jehoiakim in the Babylonian exile, as he says himself, or whether the book was written in the first half of the second century BC.⁴

Since the invention of the atomic and hydrogen bombs, the study of ethics has ceased to be of chief interest for certain sociological and philosophical scholars alone, and has become recognized as vital for human survival. But has ethics any supra-human support? That is the inevitable question. And does Scripture have anything specific to say about the future? That inquiry is almost as inevitable. Thus the new attention to apocalyptic.

The tables have been turned drastically this century from last. Most reputable scholars of our early Adventist years saw in millennialism a topic for scorn. The philosophy of progress controlled most theological discussions on eschatology. In the nineteenth century, post-millennialism far outstripped her poor sisters — premillennialism and amillennialism. But it is so no more. Few exegetes today espouse the once popular tenets of post-millennialism.

One hotly debated issue this century has been whether the Olivet discourse was indeed uttered by Jesus. The question is important because it is widely recognized that that discourse is a *peshet* on the apocalyptic portions of Daniel. Theologians outside our church who were contemporary with such men as A.G. Daniells, W.E. Prescott, W.C. White, etc., pictured Jesus as a nineteenth century Western intellectual who could not possibly have believed in such chimeras as the end of the world. Since the thorough investigation by G.R. Beasley-Murray of all the significant literature on the topic (see *Jesus and the Future*), inventions such as the “little apocalypse” theory, coined to explain the origin of Mark 13, have fallen out of favour. The recently revised *Peake’s Commentary* says on page 814 that “the attempt to remove the eschatological element from the teaching of Jesus is without justification.” Such acknowledgements from scholars of all countries could be multiplied.

This new attitude to Jesus, and the recognition of His respect for the apocalyptic prophecies of Daniel is accompanied by a similar reversal of attitude in at least some areas of Danielic studies. Let us illustrate.

The major attack upon the Adventist interpretation of Dan. 8 has been the criticism that the little horn there sketched applies only to Antiochus Epiphanes and that therefore Dan. 8 does not go beyond a second century BC perspective. In recent years, however, there has been a willingness to acknowledge that all the visions of Daniel have their climax in the kingdom of God. It is doubtful whether there is any scholar of note who would not agree that Christ’s references to the “kingdom of heaven” stem from His intimate knowledge of the prophecies of Daniel and their kingdom climaxes. H.H. Rowley, in his article on Daniel in the *Dictionary of the Bible* edited by himself and F.C. Grant, declares: “The visions and their interpretations all culminate in the final establishment of the Kingdom of God” (page 200). The Frenchman, Lagrange, says the same in his volume, *Le Judaïsme avant Jesus-Christ* (page 62-69). The German scholar Gerhard von Rad tells us that in Daniel there is “A much more precise delineation of the Kingdom of God,”⁵ than anything known hitherto. John Bright speaks in a similar vein in his *The Kingdom of God*.⁶

A ten-year doctoral study entitled, *No Stone on Another* by Lloyd Gaston, suggests that the little horn of Dan. 8 is reflective of the description of Lucifer in Isa. 14. Gaston says:

The ~~abomination~~ in Daniel seems much worse than that of 1 Maccabees 1:54, ... We must beware of reading Daniel too much in the light of what actually happened according to 1 Maccabees. In particular, the cleansing measures which satisfied the Maccabees would surely not have satisfied Daniel ... it is significant that there is in Daniel no mention of a hoped-for rebuilding or rededication of the temple. In Daniel 2 a great stone ~~not~~ made with hands" shatters the fourth kingdom and becomes a ~~kingdom~~ that shall never be destroyed" (2:44). In 7:14, 27 it is again a kingdom which is given to the people of the saints of the Most High, when the fourth kingdom is destroyed. Accordingly, it may very well be that we should interpret 9:24, ~~To~~ anoint a Holy of holies" in accordance with the usage of the Dead Sea Scrolls, to refer to a community. **The strange statement of 8:14 "the Sanctuary will be justified" will then refer to "the many" who are "justified" by the wise (12:3).**⁷

In another place Gaston adds, ~~We~~ have already suggested that the Sanctuary of Dan. 8:14 and 9:24 should be interpreted figuratively in terms of the holy community."⁸ The recently translated (1979) commentary on Daniel by Andre Lacocque takes the same position. We quote him.

~~In~~ that case, the expression 'Holy of Holies' not only designates the restored Temple, but also the faithful priesthood around whom is gathered the community of Israel." J. de Menasce turns up his nose at any timidity on this point: 1 Chron. 23:13 concerns ~~the~~ priestly consecration of Aaron and his sons."

We believe J. de Menasce is correct. We see confirmation of this in the very structure of the text and in the identification constantly established by Daniel since chapter 7 between the Temple and the People. We saw the most recent instance of this in verses 20-21. It is again the doctrine from chapter 7 which is determinative. ... There can be no dichotomy between the two aspects of a single reality. When the Temple in Jerusalem is purified — anointed by an ultimate anointing — the People-sanctuary will at the same instant be restored to its perfect priesthood.⁹

Another writer who sees beyond the limited Antiochus Epiphanes interpretation is Berth Gartner. We read in *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament* a reference to the prophecy of Dan. 8, the little horn, and the cleansing of the sanctuary in the last days.

... we find in Daniel a combination of ~~the~~ saints of the Most High" and the idea of the ~~new~~ temple" which is to be established in the last days. On the subject of the evil to come it is said that one of the ~~horns~~ of the ~~he~~-goat" shall ... defile the temple ... but **the good to come also stands related to the temple; atonement shall be made for the evils of the people and eternal righteousness shall be established**, ~~to~~ seal both vision and prophet, and to anoint a Most Holy place." ... This vision of the future has sometimes been interpreted in special categories, the implication being that ~~the~~ saints" make up a new temple, a spiritual temple. It is the kingdom of ~~the~~ saints" which is called an anointed sanctuary upon which rests the presence of God (7:13, 14). ... It is important to note that the concept of the ~~anointed~~ sanctuary" is connected with the ideas of the Son of Man and the ~~Saints~~ of the Most High."¹⁰

This writer certainly sees Dan. 8:14 in connection with a final atonement which ushers in the kingdom of God. It is also significant that this writer links with Dan. 8:14, Dan. 7 and its passage on the judgment and the Son of Man.

Adventists have not always capitalized as they should have done on the fact that in the corresponding sequences of the visions in chapters 7 and 8 of Daniel, while the former chapter culminates its portrayal by the scene of the judgment and the coming of the Son of Man, the following chapter at its climax promises that ~~the~~ sanctuary shall be cleansed.” Thus we have the following parallel which shows that the sanctuary’s cleansing is identical with the judgment.

Babylon:(lion)	Belshazzar of Babylon (8:1)
Medo-Persia:.....(bear)	Medo-Persia:(ram)
Greece:(leopard)	Greece:(he-goat)
Rome – pagan and papal: .(beast with ten horns and little horn)	Rome – pagan and papal: .(little horn)
Judgment scene	Cleansing or vindication of the sanctuary

We are familiar with the fact that the word translated ~~cleansed~~” might be better translated ~~vindicated~~” or ~~justified~~.” Ellen G. White frequently used the latter terms when speaking of the closing work of God in heaven and earth, and thus gave evidence of her insight into the fullness of meaning present in the Hebrew original of Dan. 8:14. See, for example, *COL* 178,179; *DA* 26,763-764; *PP* 68; *GC* 504,671; *SDABC* 7:986.

In the last half century particularly, many non-Adventist scholars have written a great deal on the topic of ~~the~~ Son of Man,” stressing the fact that this prophetic symbol is a figure representing vindication or justification, and therefore points to the same event as Dan. 8:14. C.F.D. Moule says, for example, concerning the expression, ~~The~~ Son of Man: This vindication-theme attaches to it more readily than any distinctively redemptive associations.”¹¹ And Gaston reminds us that ~~The~~ concept of the Son of Man in Daniel is very close to that of the Kingdom of God.”¹² Another well-known New Testament scholar, Matthew Black, speaking about the meaning of the Son of Man in the teachings of Jesus says: ~~The~~ old biblical Son of man apocalyptic has not therefore, been foisted upon the teachings of Jesus through the tradition; it represents the substance of His teaching about the coming Judgment.”¹³ Dan. 8:14 with its reference to cleansing (justification and vindication) thus parallels the reference to the judgment in Dan. 7 which pictures the Son of Man, and the great majority of modern commentators now admit that this last figure indeed points to a work of vindication by divine judgment.

For over a century, Adventist evangelists and Bible workers have laboured hard to prove to those people with whom they were studying that Dan. 7:13, 14; 8:14; 9:24 were to be connected in order to understand God’s last message, and what heaven would teach us regarding the judgment. It is now possible to point to statements by Bible scholars of England, France, Germany, and America, not of our faith, who likewise link these three passages. For example, Feuillet says, ~~The~~ three oracles of 7:13, 14; 8:14 and 9:24 are mutually complementary and contribute to explaining the same reality.”¹⁴ (Translation from the French).

Another line of study concerning Daniel which is of particular interest to Seventh-day Adventists has to do with the theme of the book as recognized by non-Adventist scholars. Commentator after commentator has employed the word ~~vindication~~” in interpreting this book of prophecy.¹⁵ The theme of vindication has been recognized as permeating both the narratives and the visions of Daniel. Only in one verse of the book is the actual word ~~vindication~~” found, and that is in Dan. 8:14. It is interesting also that the word here appears

in a unique form out of the hundreds of the uses of this root in the Old Testament. Furthermore, this verse which strikes the keynote of the book by its reference to “vindication” is also the climactic point of the symbolism of the book.

Commentators have been far from unanimous as to where a natural division in this book occurs. For example, is chapter 7 to be seen as belonging to the first section of the book or the second? In Dan. 8:14 we have a distinct literary dividing point, for this verse terminates the use of visionary symbols requiring interpretation. Hereafter, all is explanation. In the following verses we hear an admonition from heaven for Gabriel to make Daniel to understand the vision. After a threefold reference to the need for understanding we have an explanation given of the symbols of chapter 8 except for the climax of that presentation in verse 14. And the rest of the book is devoted to explaining in greater detail the vision of chapter 8. S.B. Frost, when commenting upon Dan. 8:14 says, —...in the third vision the imagery is laid aside. ... the fourth vision, the last and longest of them all, drops the symbolism entirely. ... He was not prophesying when the rededication as such was going to take place, but ... *the eschaton*.”¹⁶ Thus Frost declares Dan. 8:14 to be the point at which symbolic imagery is laid aside, and eschatological in import, having to do with heaven’s last work for man.

When we thus read from scholars not of our faith that Dan. 8:14 points to the atonement whereby the saints of God are vindicated, and that this same vindication is pictured in Dan. 7:9-13, and that the literary dividing point of the book and the thematic heart are both found in Dan. 8:14, we should not therefore assume that such writers view the Scriptures entirely as we do. In most instances these commentators are what we would call liberal and do not even consider that the book of Daniel was written in the 6th century BC. These facts, however, make it the more significant that in attempting to honestly interpret the text they should reach similar conclusions in some respects to ourselves.

We have given just a sample of the evidence from recent non-Adventist scholars that **many such have come to recognize from the Biblical text itself that Dan. 8:14 should not be limited to the days of Antiochus Epiphanes but rather points to the vindication in the judgment of God’s loyal people.** Writers such as Gaston, Feuillet, Gartner, Lacocque and others would paraphrase “then shall the sanctuary be cleansed” as “then shall the holy community be declared righteous by the judgment of God.” In this connection we should remember that Ellen G. White viewed the worshippers in the heavenly sanctuary and those of the church-temple of earth as one. Thus she could not only describe believers as God’s tabernacle or sanctuary in this world, but also stressed that this earthly temple constituted the courts of the heavenly, and that together the two made a single reality.¹⁷

Having shown that the essence of Adventist teaching on Dan. 8:14 now finds strong support among non-Adventist scholars, we wish in contrast to point out that our traditional presentation of that essence has been marred by non-essential dogmatism on doubtful matters.

TRADITIONAL PROPHETIC DATING AND THE INVESTIGATIVE JUDGMENT

The great saving truths of the Christian faith never depend upon inferential reasoning from a single text. That God is our Creator, that Christ died for our sins that we might be forgiven, that salvation is through faith, that faith always bears fruit in obedience, that Christ will return to earth, that now He intercedes for us on high — all such truths rest on substantial immovable foundations of Holy Writ. Should certain texts on any of these topics be

ambiguous, it matters not, for there are plenty of others which are not ambiguous. Pillars of the faith are firmly established, they do not rest on fluid, uncertain, equivocal interpretations.

When, however, we come to our traditional sanctuary interpretation of 1844 and the investigative judgment, such is by no means the case. It is dependent, not upon plain didactic statements from Scripture, but upon a prolonged series of assumptions and inferences — most of which are highly debatable. We set forth dogmatic conclusions where honesty should compel us to confess that the evidence is either ambiguous or contrary to our claims.

For example, consider our perilous dependence upon the following assumptions, many of which are interlocking in such a way that if one falls, so do the others.

1. That Dan. 8:4 speaks of 2300 **days**. (While Dan. 12 repeatedly uses the Hebrews word for days, it is not to be found in 8:14. Instead we have the ambiguous ~~evening-morning~~” which most apply to the evening and morning burnt offerings. Thus instead of 2300 days, **if** these exegetes are correct, only 1150 days are in view.)
2. That these 2300 ~~days~~” equal 2300 years. (Though it is quite impossible to prove that the year-day principle is a Biblical datum, and even if we could, days are not mentioned in either 8:14 or 9:24, so there is no basis to apply the principle in these instances.)
3. That these 2300 years begin centuries before the ~~little horn~~” began his attack on the sanctuary. (Though in the context, the 2300 has been understood by many as applying to the length of time the little horn is trampling the sanctuary underfoot and suspending its daily offerings.)
4. That the 2300 years begin at the same time as the seventy weeks. (Though there is no scripture to say so. The Hebrew *chathak* means ~~cut~~” or ~~decree~~,” and there is no way of proving that the cutting off of the 490 from 2300 is intended.)
5. That it is possible to be certain of the exact year that the seventy weeks begin. (Though exegetes have been agreed on this point. Is the decree like that of 9:23, a heavenly one from God, or one from an earthly king?)
6. That the decree of Artaxerxes recorded in Ezra 7 has to do with the restoring and building of Jerusalem? (Though there is nothing in Ezra 7 that says this. The context says that this decree, like those of Cyrus and Darius, had to do with the temple. The magistrates were to enforce the temple laws. See Ezra 6:14 which places this decree among the temple decrees.)
7. That the decree of Ezra 7 ~~went forth~~” in 457 BC when Ezra had arrived in Jerusalem and set to work. (Though Ezra never says this, and the decree had been announced at least six months earlier. There is nothing in Daniel to say that this decree should be dated from the time of its implementation rather than its enunciation.)
8. That we can show 408 to be the time when the restoration of the city was completed. (Admitted even by Adventist scholars to be an impossible task.)
9. That we can show that AD 27 was the date of Christ’s baptism. (A similarly difficult feat.)

10. That AD 31 was the date of the crucifixion. (Almost all scholars hold to other years, not this one. Evidence from Grace Amadon's researches, often used by Seventh-day Adventists, is based on doubtful assumptions, as admitted by our own commentary.)
11. That AD 34 was the date of the gospel going to the Gentiles. (Though there is no way of proving that AD 34 was the time of the stoning of Stephen, and Acts 13:46 presents the turning to the Gentiles at a much later date.)
12. That the 2300 days end with the beginning of the antitypical Day of Atonement. (Though the Day of Atonement revolved around the sacrifice for sin, an event we believe took place about eighteen centuries earlier. The divesting of his glorious robes by the high priest prefigured the incarnation of Christ which did not take place in 1844. The book of Hebrews clearly applies the Day of Atonement in antitype to Christ's priestly offering of Himself on Calvary, though the Christian era is included as we wait for our High Priest to come out.)
13. That until this date was reached, Christ was doing that work prefigured by the first apartment outside the veil. (Though Hebrews tells us that the work of that apartment symbolized the ineffectual offerings of the Levitical era when men had restricted access to God, and experienced outward ceremonial cleansing rather than perfection of the conscience.)
14. That the work symbolized by the second apartment of the sanctuary was not to begin till over 1800 years after the cross. (Though Heb. 9:8, 12, 24, 25; 10:19, 20; 6:19, 20 says Christ entered ~~within~~ "within the veil" at His ascension.) The sprinkling of the blood on the mercy seat took place immediately after its shedding.
15. That the sanctuary of Dan. 8:14 means the sanctuary in heaven. (Though the context is about the sanctuary on earth.)
16. That ~~cleansed~~ "is an accurate translation in Dan. 8:14. (Though this is certainly not the case.)
17. That the sanctuary on the Day of Atonement was cleansed from defilement occasioned by the confession of sin and ministration of blood. (Though Nu. 19:13, etc., indicate that the sanctuary was defiled when a person sinned, regardless of whether confession was made. In most cases, blood never went into the sanctuary.)
18. That the cleansing of the sanctuary in 8:14 has to do with the sins of the professed believers in Christ. (Though the context has to do with a defilement accomplished by Antichrist, not the host of God's people who are suffering, not sinning, in the context.)
19. That this cleansing of 8:14 is also found in Dan. 7 in its judgment scene, and that the latter also has to do with investigation of the sins of the saints. (Though again in Dan. 7, as in 8, it is a wicked power which is the focus of the judgment.)
20. That Rev. 14:7 has to do with the same investigative judgment of the sins of the saints. (Though John never uses the word *krisis* other than in a negative sense – for unbelievers, and though the very next verse tells us that it is Babylon which endures the judgment, as the later chapters of Revelation also testify.)
21. That verses like Acts 3:19 point to the investigative judgment. (None of such verses studied in context yield any such conclusion.)

22. That much depends upon Oct. 22, 1844, as the beginning of the antitypical Day of Atonement. (Though Oct. 22, 1844 was not the day observed by contemporary Jews, even the majority of Karaites. Neither is there evidence that the baptism of Christ, or the stoning of Stephen took place on the Day of Atonement, which would have been necessary if the 49 years, the 434, 490, and 2300 years are each precise in terminus. In contrast, observe that Ellen G. White could write: “I saw that God was in the proclamation of the time in 1843. ... Ministers were convinced of the correctness of the positions taken on the prophetic periods” (SG 232). Observe she is talking about the 1843 terminus, not Oct. 22, 1844. Furthermore she is speaking of periods ending then, not just one period. Miller had over a dozen, including the 6000 years, the seven times, the 1335 days, etc.)

In contrast to this traditional precision and convoluted series of assumptions, the chapter in our own *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, “Interpretation of Daniel,” shows that such precision is contrary to the whole history of prophetic exegesis of the prophetic periods of Daniel. Furthermore, when our own *Bible Dictionary* refers to Dan. 8:14 in its articles on Antichrist and the little horn, it makes no reference to an investigative judgment, but speaks of Dan. 8:14 as pointing to judgment upon the little horn and restoration of true worship.

Consider the following from the Whedon commentary on Dan. 9:

No prophecy of Scripture is more difficult to explain than this. Anyone who thinks it easy proves thereby that he does not understand it. The more confident the explanation the less likely is it to be of any value. Like all apocalyptic calculations, these have doubtless been left enigmatical on purpose — if not, the aim of the writer has been sadly defeated, for scarcely two scholars of the old school or of the new school can agree as to the meaning of these mathematical combinations. (*Daniel*, 290)

It should also be pointed out that some other long-cherished dates of supposed prophetic fulfilment have proved erroneous — those used for Rev. 11:9; 9:15; Dan. 12:11, 12. Others, such as 538 and 1798, were questioned by leaders amongst us long ago, such as W.W. Prescott. (See *SDABC* note at close of commentary on Dan. 7.)

DOES DIVINE SPONSORSHIP GUARANTEE INFALLIBILITY?

Why then should some Adventist scholars have grave reservations regarding our traditional exposition of Dan. 8:14? We answer: Not because we have applied the verse eschatologically, not because we see in it a heavenly court vindicating the saints, not because of our relating the passage to Dan. 7:9-13 and 9:24-27 — all this and more, non-Adventist scholars of the highest order have also done. Our embarrassment rather comes because of extra trappings which are impossible to exegetically defend, including our denial of some concepts plainly present in the periscope. We turn now to these, but with the assurance that our central concern is still the subject of the Day of Atonement in Daniel.

May we suggest first that some words spoken by E.G. White at Minneapolis almost a century ago are most pertinent for our present concerns. She declared:

—That which God gives His servants to speak today would not perhaps have been present truth twenty years ago, but it is God’s message for this time.¹⁸

Great truths are rarely virgin born. Whether it is the great Reformation movement, the Wesleyan revival, or the surgings of the Spirit in the days of Whitefield and Jonathan Edwards, etc., truth has never been unmixed with error. We are poor fallen creatures who cannot live either in complete darkness or complete light. Jesus said long ago, “I have many

things to say unto you, but you cannot bear them now.” Even when Truth incarnate came to our world, He was wrapped in swaddling clothes, and all truth has been so wrapped ever since. Such swaddling clothes need to be released like the cerements of Lazarus, when the hour comes for resurrection activity. This hour is dawning for the Adventist church.

Ellen White herself indicates this principle when she speaks of the hand of God being over the error of William Miller. We need to ask whether even our own movement, like John the Baptist of old, has had but a partial understanding of its God-given message? Has God had His hand over some errors in our early positions until we were able to bear further light?

It is certain that all our pioneers understood the shut door of the first apartment in 1844 to mean the rejection of ~~the~~ whole wicked world.” Even in 1853 we find James White writing in the *Review*: “While the great work of saving men closed with the 2300 days, a few are now coming to Christ ...”¹⁹

Ellen G. White shared such convictions also, though nothing in her visions plainly taught such ideas. We were stumbling along towards the light in those troubled days with one disappointment after another.²⁰

It took another several years after the last of the Sabbath conferences where the landmarks were presented, before we laid down another landmark — namely that the world was ripe for evangelism and not rejected of God.

About six years after that advance, we were still struggling to explain the significance of 1844, and the doctrine of the investigative judgment was born, approximately thirteen years after the event supposed to have marked its opening. We were certainly right in seeing the doctrine of judgment in Dan. 8:14, but were we just as right in affirming that this judgment was only one for professed Christians, and that it was a new procedure whereby God had decided to turn to records for guidance on how to treat those who called upon His name? Were we soundly based when we concluded that in 1844 Christ began a new form of ministry which had to be pursued to the bitter end for more than fourteen decades before His living saints could see His face? Did we do the right thing in severing Dan. 8:14 from its context about the damage to the sanctuary being done by the wicked little horn? Were our linguistic conclusions sound when we followed the KJV rendering “cleansed,” faulty though it was, and saw in it the basis for identifying the promise of 8:14 as the antitype of Lev. 16? These are questions which the denomination cannot hope to dodge, for our opponents will press them more and more. As those who love truth more than life, should we not be sure ourselves of our answers in an area so central? Are we now sufficiently mature to be able to agree with Ellen G. White that what was adequate for truth for a people many years ago may not be adequate now? With these inquiries as background we turn to the year-day principle, and similar matters.

CHRONOLOGICAL PROBLEMS, INCLUDING THE YEAR-DAY PRINCIPLE

Big doors swing on little hinges, we have often been reminded. It is true in all doctrinal structures. Some of Adventism’s distinctive teachings rest upon the genuineness of the year-day principle. Though one would never guess this from our literature — for the principle is ever assumed rather than proved. Take away the year-day principle and what would happen to 1798, Aug. 11, 1840, and Oct. 22, 1844?

Let it first be made clear that Adventists did not invent the year-day method of exegeting apocalyptic chronological prophecies. Theirs was an inheritance from centuries back. Jews not long after Christ taught that in prophetic symbolism a day represented a year, and by the time the Reformation was established so was this hermeneutical dictum.

But there are problems we should frankly acknowledge. This present writer believes that it was in the providence of God that the year-day principle was espoused after the Advent hope of the early church had faded away. Prophecy had been so written that what could have quickly been fulfilled would also match the march of centuries if God's people tarried in the discharge of their task. But now our prophetic termini are far back in the past — and nothing has happened since. It is time to look again at the evidence.

Where is the proof for the year-day principle? Num. 14:34 and Eze. 4:6 and Dan. 9:24-27 are usually volunteered, but these certainly do not yield what is demanded of them.

(None of these passages state it as a rule for all symbolic prophecy that a day signifies a year. Num. 14:34 is not symbolic prophecy, and it speaks of **years** in the future — not days. In Eze. 4:6 the years are in the past, and actual days ahead are contemplated. Dan. 9:24, as with Dan. 8, does not use the word ~~day~~. The Hebrew term translated ~~weeks~~ is actually ~~sevens~~, and is not related to days at all. See next page.) To that we will turn shortly. **But first, of much greater importance is the whole weight of New Testament testimony that God's ideal plan was that Jesus should have returned in the first century AD, not long after His ascension to heaven. This is clearly taught from Matthew to Revelation and recognized by the vast majority of New Testament scholars.** The fact helps us to understand why Hebrews could apply the Day of Atonement to Christ's ascension ~~within the veil~~ and promise that soon He would emerge to bless those who outside in the earthly courtyard were eagerly looking for Him. See Heb. 9:26-28. (See Westcott and other commentators who so apply Heb. 9:27, 28.)

This thought should not be revolutionary. Ellen G. White says it clearly in *Prophets and Kings* 703-704. What we are now doing to warn the world in order that the eternal kingdom might be set up was originally the task of Israel after the return from Babylon, and should have been fulfilled by the end of the seventy weeks of years. Our own *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* is also emphatic that the end of all things should have come in the first century. (See *SDABC* 7:729.) But the real evidence is within Scripture itself.

IS THE YEAR-DAY PRINCIPLE COMPATIBLE WITH A FIRST CENTURY END OF THE WORLD?

Consider the following passages:

Truly, I say to you, this generation will not pass away till all these things take place. (Matt. 24:34 RSV)

When they persecute you in one town, flee to the next; for truly, I say to you, you will not have gone through all the towns of Israel, before the Son of man comes. (Matt. 10:23 RSV)

Truly, I say to you, there are some standing here who will not taste death before they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom. (Matt. 16:28 RSV)

The saying spread abroad among the brethren that this disciple was not to die; yet Jesus did not say to him that he was not to die, but, ~~—~~“If it is my will that he remain until I come, what is that to you?” (John 21:23 RSV)

Repent therefore, and turn again, that your sins may be blotted out, that times of refreshing may come from the presence of the Lord, and that he may send the Christ. ... (Acts 3:19, 20 RSV)

Besides this you know what hour it is, how it is full time now for you to wake from sleep. For salvation is nearer to us now than when we first believed; the night is far gone, the day is at hand. Let us then cast off the works of darkness and put on the armour of light. (Rom. 13:11, 12 RSV)

I mean, brethren, the appointed time has grown very short; from now on, let those who have wives live as though they had none, and those who mourn as though they were not mourning, and those who rejoice as though they were not rejoicing, and those who buy as though they had no goods, and those who deal with the world as though they had no dealings with it. For the form of this world is passing away. (1 Cor. 7:29-31 RSV)

Now these things happened to them as a warning, but they were written down for our instruction, upon whom the end of the ages has come. (1 Cor. 10:11 RSV)

In many and various ways God spoke of old to our fathers by the prophets; but in these last days ... (Heb. 1:1 RSV)

For then he would have had to suffer repeatedly since the foundation of the world. But as it is, he has appeared once for all at the end of the age to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. (Heb. 9:26 RSV)

Children, it is the last hour; and as you have heard that antichrist is coming, so now many antichrists have come; therefore we know that it is the last hour. (1 John 2:18 RSV)

Come now, you rich, weep and howl for the miseries that are coming upon you. Your riches have rotted and your garments are moth-eaten. Your gold and silver have rusted, and their rust will be evidence against you and will eat your flesh like fire. You have laid up treasure for the last days. You also be patient. Establish your hearts, for the coming of the Lord is at hand. Do not grumble, brethren, against one another, that you may not be judged; behold, the Judge is standing at the doors. (James 5:1-3, 8, 9 RSV)

The revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave him to show to her servants what must soon take place; and he made it known by sending his angel to his servant John. ... Blessed is he who reads aloud the words of the prophecy, and blessed are those who hear, and who keep what is written therein; for the time is near. (Rev. 1:1, 3 RSV)

Let us give special attention to Matt. 24:34. The blacksmith's sign: "All sorts of twistings and turnings done here" is appropriate to the exegesis usually applied to this text. But **the evidence is overwhelming that Christ was saying He planned to return to that very generation He was addressing.**

The decisive fact is that the expression "this generation" occurs fourteen times in the gospels, and always refers to Christ's contemporaries. The context itself is clear enough. The siege of Jerusalem spoken of in verse 15 launches a terrible time of trouble — see verse 21. It is quite impossible to legitimately separate the great tribulation from the attack on Jerusalem. Next, we read verse 29 which assures us that immediately after the terrible days of Jerusalem's suffering there would be signs in the heavens climaxed by Christ's own appearance in the clouds of heaven.

When we turn to what was probably the original version of the Olivet discourse — Mark 13 — the case is at least as strong. The description of verses 24-27 is today overwhelmingly taken as applying to the end of the age and the Parousia. The verses stand in strong contrast to the merely terrestrial phenomena of verse 7 forward. The convulsion of the heavens appears to be a fitting accompaniment of the manifestation of the Son of Man to the world which has rejected Him. Vincent Taylor writes, “In the light of 5f (wars, earthquakes, famines) and 26 (the coming of the Son of Man with clouds), it seems probable that objective phenomena are meant.”²¹ The “gathering of Israel” is frequently pictured in the Old Testament as an event of the end-time. See Isa. 60:4ff, Micah 4:1-7, etc. There does not seem to have been any plainer language Christ could have used to convey the message of the Son of Man’s literal coming than verse 26. We must ask those who apply this verse and its context metaphorically — just how **could** Christ have made the point of His return, if words as clear as these are capable of another meaning? We would also inquire whether the New Testament teaching on the resurrection and the age to come is not evaporated by such exegesis. While it is true that the fall of Jerusalem helped the young church to attain independence, it remains to be doubted whether those Christians persecuted after AD 70 considered themselves to be in the age of glory.

Each and all of the statements preceding and succeeding the picture of the Son of Man coming in the clouds, bear witness to significance of this central description. The great tribulation, described as occurring just before the convulsion of the heavens, is linked with “the time of the end” in its Old Testament source. See Dan. 12:1-4. Verse 32, by its reference to *hē hēmera ekeinē* pinpoints the event of the great day of Yahweh so often referred to in the prophets,²² while the parables of the fig tree and the master of the house, which bracket the reference to *hē hēmera ekeinē* echo the need for alertness in view of its proximity.²³

The case is similarly overwhelming for the interpretation of verses 14-19 as local and historical. V.G. Simkhovitch long ago lunged at the heart of the matter when he asked, “If it refers to the end of the world, what difference does it make whether that end is to come in the winter or in the summer?”²⁴ And C.H. Dodd in similar vein affirmed that the description in these verses fits precisely a condition of besiegement.²⁵

Unless these verses have reference to the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, Christ has not truly replied to the inquiry from His disciples which provoked the discourse. Furthermore, the setting of this passage in Mark’s Gospel is particularly important as scholars recognize. Christ had warned the church leaders of His day that they were shortly to witness the judgment of God.²⁶ The temple had been declared abandoned.²⁷ It is then that we have the announcement to the disciples regarding the dissolution of the sacred building. Because Mark has given Christ’s prophecy with this context, it is an immediate presumption that the discourse discusses the very issue which raised it, and in the manner of the prophets rather than that of the apocalyptists. Chapter 11 to 15 each refer to the temple, and such an extended description of its fate as 13:14-19 might have been expected.

What should be said of the view that the discourse includes both the crisis of AD 70 and the greater crisis at the end of the world, yet separates them one from the other? (Scholars who have taken this view include W. Beyschlag, F. Godet, E.F.K. Muller, A.B. Bruce, B. Rigaux, C. Cranfield, and G.E. Ladd.)

Not all who see both the end of Jerusalem and the end of the age in this same chapter, interpret it along identical lines. Lagrange and Rigaux, for example, differ considerably. The

former considers the arrangement of Mark 13 to be the work of the Evangelist as he blended two discourses of Christ, one concerning the ruin of the temple, and the other the Second Advent. Not so Regaux, who holds that the two perspectives were indissolubly united by Christ in the single presentation. Cranfield's position is similar to Rigaux's. He says: —Neither an exclusively historical nor an exclusively eschatological interpretation is satisfactory, ... we must allow for a double reference, for a mingling of historical and eschatological."²⁸

From a faith standpoint such viewpoints may seem acceptable, but exegetically they are hardly tolerable. Some commentators, for example, point to the twofold question of Matt. 24:3. But when one takes into consideration the accounts of the same inquiry found in Mark and Luke, it is evident that the disciples had in view a single event only, of which the fall of Jerusalem was a significant part. (Matthew probably distinguished the two events because, at the time he wrote, the first had already transpired.) Note the parallelism in Mark 13:4.

pote - ti/to semeion
tauta- tauta panta
estai - melle sunteleisthai

In effect, the question of the disciples is, —When will this take place, and what will be the sign of it?"

The most obvious difficulty for commentators of this school, particularly those who view the discourse as separating the two crises, is finding the precise point of division between the two. Some select verse 24, but it is obviously tied to the preceding verse. Others prefer verse 20, despite its obvious link with verse 19. Still others fix upon verse 21, but only by ignoring *tote* in this same verse, which links the statement to the preceding and following passages. The majority settle for verse 19 despite the fact that *hai hamerai ekainai* connects the verse to the previous description.

It must ever be kept in mind that verse 24 which introduces the Parousia is riveted just as closely to the tribulation heralded by the coming of the *bdelugma* against Jerusalem, and without any hint of a separating chasm of centuries.

Mark 13:30 must be understood as belonging to a similar genre as Jonah's —Yet forty days and Nineveh shall be overthrown." Here was the fiat of the Almighty to Nineveh. Hardly could a prediction be more definite as to what and when. The whole book of Jonah revolves around it. Yet the forty days passed, and according to the narrator, Nineveh still pointed its proud towers to the heavens. Jonah was certainly angry, but he was not surprised. He seems rather to have anticipated it. —I knew that thou art a gracious God, and merciful, slow to anger, and abounding in steadfast love, and repentant of evil."

Jonah was familiar with the principles expressed in later days by Jeremiah and Ezekiel:

—If at any time I declare concerning a nation or a kingdom, that I will pluck up and break down and destroy it, and if that nation, concerning which I have spoken, turns from its evil, I will repent of the evil that I intended to do to it. And if at any time I declare concerning a nation or a kingdom that I will build and plant it, and if it does evil in my sight, not listening to my voice, then I will repent of the good which I had intended to do to it." (Jer. 18:7-10 RSV)

—Yet you say, The way of the Lord is not just. Hear now, O house of Israel: Is my way not just? Is it not your ways that are not just? When a righteous man turns away from his righteousness and commits iniquity, he shall die for it; for the iniquity which he has committed he shall die. Again, when a wicked man turns away from the wickedness he has committed and does what is lawful and right, he shall save his life.” (Eze. 18:25-27 RSV)

Another Old Testament example is that of Isaiah’s words to Hezekiah, —Thus says the Lord: Set your house in order; for you shall die, and you shall not recover” (Isa. 38:1). Hezekiah did not die. He did recover, and lived another fifteen years.

The New Testament also yields us several examples of this principle. Consider the following case:

As they had been long without food, Paul then came forward among them and said, —Men, you should have listened to me, and should not have set sail from Crete and incurred this injury and loss. I now bid you take heart; for there will be no loss of life among you, but only of the ship. For this very night there stood by me an angel of the God to whom I belong and whom I worship, and he said, Do not be afraid, Paul; you must stand before Caesar; and lo, God has granted you all those who sail with you.’ So take heart, men, for I have faith in God that it will be exactly as I have been told. But we shall have to run on some island.” When the fourteenth night had come, as we were drifting across the sea of Adria, about midnight the sailors suspected that they were nearing land. So they sounded and found twenty fathoms; a little farther on they sounded again and found fifteen fathoms. And fearing that we might run on the rocks, they let out four anchors from the stern, and prayed for day to come. And as the sailors were seeking to escape from the ship, and had lowered the boat into the sea, under the pretence of laying out anchors from the bow, Paul said to the centurion and the soldiers, —Unless these men stay in the ship, you cannot be saved.” (Acts 27:21-31 RSV)

The point in this story, of course, is that Paul did not act as though the divine prediction was an absolute pronouncement. He seemed rather to believe that the reckless wickedness of a dozen men could change the divine purpose toward the remaining three score.

We have another example in Acts 21:10-14 RSV:

While we were staying for some days, a prophet named Agabus came down from Judea. And coming to us he took Paul’s girdle and bound his own feet and hands, and said, —Thus says the Holy Spirit, So shall the Jews at Jerusalem bind the man who owns this girdle and deliver him into the hands of the Gentiles.’ —When we heard this, we and the people there begged him not to go up to Jerusalem. Then Paul answered, —What are you doing, weeping and breaking my heart? For I am ready not only to be imprisoned but even to die at Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus.” And when he would not be persuaded, we ceased and said, —The will of the Lord be done.”

In this instance, Paul’s Christian friends did not regard the prophecy as of inevitable fulfilment. Instead they treated it as a kindly warning whereby the disaster might be averted. This is the Christian and Jewish view of prophecy, in contrast of that of the Oriental fatalists.

The parable of the unmerciful servant in Matt. 18 has often occasioned difficulty. How could the master of the house (representing God, see verse 35), forgive his slave the debt of ten thousand talents and yet later change his mind toward him? But no problem exists, as we take

the preceding examples into account. The Biblical view of prophecy is that a forecast is not necessarily a prediction to be fulfilled at all hazards. Rather, a prediction of disaster is a hint in order that proper steps might be taken to avert the evil. Similarly a prediction of blessing is an encouragement, that there might be perseverance in a right course. This view of the conditional nature of prophecy was not devised to meet the problem of Mark 13:30. It has long been held and applied to many sections of the Scripture. Some modern exegetes have seen its relevance for the present issue. Possibly C.F.D. Moule had this in mind when he commented on Mark 13:30 as follows: —... he might have been absolutely right if he had said what verses 30-31 say; for there is a sense in which great prophets see so clearly and expect so eagerly ... what might happen if only men responded. ...” (*The Gospel According to Mark* [Cambridge, 1965], 103). See particularly the discussion in Gatton’s *No Stone on Another*, 425f; and J. Hempel’s *Die Mehrdeutigkeit der Geschichte ala Problem der prophetischen Theologie* (Gottingen, 1936), 41.

R.A. Knox speaks similarly:

By a rather free interpretation of the language used you can just maintain that our Lord spoke **only** about the destruction of Jerusalem, and tacitly refused information about the Second Coming. By supposing that the Evangelists here, as elsewhere, include one or two sayings which really belonged to a different context, you can save the accuracy of the prediction, but at the same time you rob it of all certainty. Is it possible to preserve the unity of the passage, and at the same time to interpret its phrases in their natural sense? Only on the supposition that this was a conditional prophecy (cf Jonah 3:4 and 10) and that the condition of it, namely the conversion of the Jews remained and still remains unfulfilled (cf Rom. 11:22 and notes on 2 Thess. 2:6). In this way we can see the picture as a continuous whole, and at the same time understand why the fulfilment of it has only been partial.²⁹

G.B. Caird has something to say along the same lines:

Jesus clearly indicated that in its final manifestation the Day was known only to God, not because God had fixed a date which He guarded as a close secret, but because the coming of the Day was contingent upon the full realization of the purposes of God. ...³⁰

The Jew was able to take in his stride paradoxes which have perplexed Gentiles ancient and modern. Where we should make a guarded statement, the Semitic mind prefers to throw together two extreme statements and allow the one to qualify the other. The prophets repeatedly declare God’s irrevocable judgment on human sin, and almost in the same breath call on men to repent before it is too late.³¹

Caird also quotes from J. Paterson: —Many things were foretold precisely that they might not come to pass.³² In this connection, the words of A.L. Moore are also worth consideration. He says: —Only the motif of grace withholds that which properly belongs to the complex of eschatological events which ended with the Ascension and Exaltation.³³

An unusually frank commentator was Herman Olshausen. It seemed his habit to acknowledge difficulties, and to confess the inadequacy of current explanations. Concerning Mark 13:30 he wrote: —...we do not hesitate to adopt ... the simple interpretation — and the only one consistent with the text — that Jesus did intend to represent His coming as contemporaneous with the destruction of Jerusalem, and the overthrow of the Jewish polity.³⁴ His editor did not agree with him, and saw fit to indicate this by a footnote. But the same Olshausen took pains to introduce his exegetical comments on Matt. 24 by a preparatory note regarding the

contingent nature of prophecy. His measured statements afford a reasoned philosophy for his own approach — a philosophy which he felt was drawn from Scripture itself. See appendix, —*Studies in the Book of Daniel* (R. Cottrell).”

It is certain that Christ and His contemporaries were well aware of contingent promises recorded by Moses and the prophets. Had not Yahweh promised to take the captive Israelites direct from Egypt to Canaan — a distance requiring less than a fortnight’s journeying? And had not that same generation wandered outside Canaan for forty years and then failed of entrance? See Number 14:34 margin.

We submit that the exegesis of Mark 13:30 is only complete if we allow for the possibility that Christ, as a Hebrew of the Hebrews, may have used an absolute statement with less than an absolute meaning, in harmony with those Scriptures He so implicitly trusted. He believed that if the early church proved faithful to its missionary commission, and if the chastened Jewish nation repented, the end would transpire in that same age. It is this linking of the gospel proclamation to the world with the end of the age that provides the hint of the contingent element. Such proclamation would be dependent upon the wholehearted dedication of the church. An uncertain human element is involved.

Part of our problem is that one half of the denomination does not know what the other half is saying. Our own *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, as already shown, agrees with this position, and sets it forth at several points. The *Daniel* quarterly of 1967 teaches the same. More recently (April, 1979) Dr. Don Neufeld has written to the same effect in the *Review*. Richard Coffen points out that even among our pioneers there were some who recognized this principle:

Other Adventist authors have also stressed the conditionality of prophecy. J.N. Andrews in *The Sanctuary and Twenty-three Hundred Days*, second edition, pp. 5, 9, quotes Bliss’ *Commentary on the Apocalypse*, pp. 7, 8, which sets forth the principle of conditional prophecy. J.H. Waggoner in *Refutation of the Doctrine Called the Age to Come*, second edition, p. 92, refers to conditional prophecy. E.A. Sutherland in *Living Fountains or Broken Cisterns*, p. 81, suggests that had Israel been faithful, earth’s history would have been shortened by at least 2,000 years.

Martin Buber calls conditionality the ‘prophetic theologem’ of Hebrew prophecy, though Buber refuses to apply the contingency principle to apocalyptic literature (*Pointing the Way*, pp. 197, 198).

The deterministic element which scholars see in apocalyptic does not necessarily vitiate conditionality in the genre. For example, certain rabbis held both concepts in tension when explaining why Messiah had not come. —Rab said: “All the predetermined dates for redemption have passed, and the matter now depends only on repentance and good deeds.” (Sanhedrin 97b). —R. Samuel B. Nahami said in the name of R. Johnathan: Blasted be the bones of those who calculate the end Messiah’s advent. For they would say, since the predetermined time has arrived, and yet He has not come, He will never come. But even so, wait for Him, as it is written, *Though He tarry, wait for Him*. ... What delays His coming? — The attribute of Justice delays it [footnote: because of Israel’s unworthiness of it]” (Sanhedrin 97b).

Furthermore, numerous commentators point out that determinism is not as prevalent in the Revelation as in other apocalypses. —The book of Revelation is not a book to satisfy hungry curiosity. The extent to which it reveals **what will happen** is related structurally

to the revelation of **how** what will happen will happen to men according to their choices and loyalties in the present” (David W. Cain, *Religious Studies*, March 1972, 40).

—There are ... in the apc* exhortations and threats that do not harmonize perfectly with a purely deterministic or mechanistic conception of human history” (Pierre Prigent, *Theology Digest*, Spring 1975, 56).

—The deterministic element, though present in Revelation, never suggests man’s helplessness, nor does it threaten man’s freedom or responsibility. The letters to the seven churches show that John thinks that man’s decisions and responses in the world do shape history as well as personal destiny” (*The Broadman Bible Commentary* 12:245).³⁵

The evidence of Matt 24:34 (Mark 13:30) makes it plain that it was no part of God’s original plan for sin to endure for centuries after the cross. Prophecies such as Dan. 7:25; 8:14; Rev. 11:2; 12:16; 13:5, would have met fulfilment on a much smaller scale had the church quickly grasped the gospel and proclaimed it in its purity.

Let us turn to the evidence of the Apocalypse, as that book of Scripture has most to say about the Lord’s return.

The presupposition most common to interpreters and most devastating to their exegesis is that the New Testament in general, and Revelation in particular, assumes that a gap of many centuries must necessarily intervene between the two advents of Christ. This view minimizes the significance of the first advent and the cross, however unwittingly, and assumes that the major purpose of Revelation is to predict twenty centuries of political and ecclesiastical events. J.H. Newman, from whose soteriology we strongly differ, wrote much worthy of consideration. Consider the following on the matter under discussion.

Though time intervene between Christ’s first and second coming, it is not **recognized** (as I may say) in the Gospel scheme, but is, as it were, an accident. For so it was, that up to Christ’s coming in the flesh, the course of things ran straight towards the end, nearing it by every step; but now, under the Gospel, that course has (if I may so speak) altered its direction, as regards His second coming, and runs, not towards the end, but along it, and on the brink of it; and is at all times near that great event, which, did it run towards it, it would at once run into. Christ, then, is ever at our doors; as near eighteen hundred years ago as now, and not nearer now than then, and not nearer when He comes than now.³⁶

Anyone who reads the New Testament from the viewpoint just expressed will find a complete harmony in its chronological statements. Such a reader will discover that the New Testament writers viewed the first advent of Christ as the beginning of the end of the world. They did not deny the literalness of another coming of Christ but they viewed that event as an imminent completion of the End already begun.

The New Testament’s last book was written to spiritually arm and prepare first century Christians for the task of the universal spread of the gospel that the end of the world might be consummated in their day!

Let us notice some plain statements from Revelation.

* Apocalypse?

The revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave him to show his servants **what must soon take place**; and he made it known by sending his angel to his servant John. ... Blessed is he who reads aloud the words of the prophecy, and blessed are those who hear, and who keep what is written therein; **for the time is near**. (Rev. 1:1, 3)

But to the rest of you in Thyatira, who do not hold this teaching, who have not learned what some call the deep things of Satan, to you I say, I do not lay upon you any other burden; only hold fast what you have, **until I come**. (Rev. 2:24, 25)

Remember then what you received and heard; keep that, and repent. If you will not awake, I will come like a thief, and you will not know at what hour I will come upon you. ... Because you have kept my word of patient endurance, I will keep you from the hour of trial which is coming on the whole world, to try those who dwell upon the earth. **I am coming soon**; hold fast what you have, so that no one may seize your crown. ... Behold, I stand at the door and knock; if any one hears my voice and opens the door, I will come in to him and eat with him, and he with me. (Rev. 3:3, 10, 11, 20)

And behold, **I am coming soon**... And he said to me, ~~Do~~ not seal up the words of the prophecy of this book, for **the time is near** He who testifies to these things says, ~~Surely~~ **I am coming soon**." Amen. Come, Lord Jesus! (Rev. 22:7, 10, 20)

What is the meaning of these statements written in the first century) — ~~I~~am coming soon;" ~~the~~ time is near;" ~~what~~ must soon take place;" ~~if~~ you will not awake, I will come like a thief, and you will not know at what hour I will come upon you."

Many are the expedients which have been invented — not to explain these statements, but to explain them away. The most popular explanation is to say that the events foretold are to **begin** soon. A similar line is to suggest that the end will be sudden when it comes. Another is to affirm that it is merely the certainty of the issue that is foretold, rather than the time. Yet a fourth expedient is to assert that God is speaking from **His** perspective which is vastly different from our own. A more scholarly stratagem is to admit the difficulty and then negate it by assigning all such statements to a special prophetic, apocalyptic terminology, i.e. to say that it is the manner of prophets to always affirm that the end is near. This, of course, is true. But did they always thus affirm because of a prophetic ~~mind-set~~" or could they have intended at least some of their statements to be understood at face value?

Simcox would have us believe that the purpose of the ~~soon~~" statements ~~is~~ to assure us of God's practical readiness to fulfil His promises, rather than to define any limit of time for their actual fulfilment."³⁷ Swedenborg reasons in a circle as he writes, ~~The~~ Apocalypse was given in the first century, and seventeen centuries have now passed away; from which it is manifest that by shortly is signified that which corresponds, which is certainly." Lange makes ~~soon~~" to mean ~~in~~ swift succession," implying that the events to come will follow each other with great celerity.

Other commentators, either from honesty or prejudices of their own, have protested against such misinterpretation. Consider the following:

The subject-matter of this revelation comprises the events of the future — the near future. The argument that Gk. *en tachei* implies that the events will not take place soon, but will be completed speedily once they begin, cannot be sustained; it is not what the original readers of the work would have naturally understood.³⁸

We cannot, however, do justice to his very plain opening statement (cf. i.3; iv.1; xxii.10) by saying that he foresaw a long series of events covering centuries, which could be described as imminent because they were to **begin** shortly. Whatever earthly realities correspond to John's symbols, he expected them to be accomplished quickly **in their entirety**.³⁹

The fulfilment of what is announced in the Revelation is here placed in the immediate future. So also in other passages. According to v.3, and ch. xxii.10, the time is near. ~~—~~“Come quickly,” says the Lord in xxii.7, 12, 20, iii.11, ii 5, 16. These declarations are opposed to the view of those who would convert the entire book into a history of the time of the end, and confirms the view, which treats it as our companion through the whole course of history. Neither do those do it justice who remark with Bengel, ~~—~~“therefore did the fulfilment begin immediately after the date of the book.” Not merely was the beginning in general ascribed to the immediate future, but such a beginning as was to be the beginning of the end. ...

It is nothing but a shift to say, as numbers do here, that the measure of time we are to think of is not, the human, but the divine, with which a thousand years are as one day (Ps. xc.4, 2 Pet. ii.8). The remarks made respecting this in my Christology on Hos. ii.6, ~~—~~“yet once it is a little while, and I shake the heavens and the earth, and the sea and the earth, and the sea and the dry land,” are equally applicable here: ~~—~~“Whoever speaks to men, must speak according to the human mode of viewing things, or give notice if he does otherwise. It is for the purpose of consoling us, that the prophet declares the shortness of the time. But for such a purpose, that only was suitable which might appear short in the eyes of men. Only in mockery or by deception could the prophet have substituted that, which was short in the reckoning of God.” We have there shewn, that the shaking spoken of began to take effect in the immediate future. The axe was already laid to the root of the Persian kingdom (as in the time of John to that of the Roman), and its subsequent visible fall was only the manifestation of a much earlier latent one. De Wette's remark, that the shortness must not be taken too stringently, that it was used to encourage the suffering and warn the impenitent, represents the Seer's God and the Lord himself, who in Luke xviii.8 likewise promises a speedy deliverance to his faithful people, as acting like the worthless physician who feeds his patients with false hopes. That Luke xviii.7 can only be quoted in support of such a view on a wrong interpretation, is manifest. And in refutation of it, as also against the notion of its being the **divine** measurement of time that is to be understood, there is the circumstance that in the fundamental passage, Ezekiel xii., to which the expression in v. 3, ~~—~~“the time is near,” refers, the declaration ~~—~~“the days are near,” in v. 23, corresponds to ~~—~~“in your days, ye rebellious house, will I do it,” in v. 25. On the ~~—~~“what must shortly come to pass,” comp. iv.1, xxii.6.⁴⁰

ἐν τάχει designates neither figuratively the ~~—~~“certainty” of the future, nor the swiftness of the course of things, without reference to proximity or remoteness of time in which they were to occur ... by the *ἐγγυς*, v. 3, it is decided that the speedy coming of what is to happen is meant. ... The evasion that the *ἐν τάχει* is to be understood ~~—~~“according to the divine method of computation,” as in 2 Pet. iii.8, is contrary to the context.⁴¹

As regards the use of 2 Peter 3:8, ~~—~~“But do not ignore this one fact, beloved, that with the Lord one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day,” we point out that it is quite wrong to link this Scripture with the clear statements in Revelation about the soon end of all

things. Scripture never gives any examples of thus interpreting warnings about time. Such an approach is purely a human device for avoiding difficulty.

Secondly, the passage in its context is an affirmation that delay in judgment does not negate its certainty but rather indicates the long-suffering mercy of God. Peter is certainly not wishing to imply to his readers that God disregards all distinctions of time, or that He does not mean to be understood according to the human time expressions He uses. Indeed, Scriptural prophecy has frequently been very precise in its chronology. See Gen. 6:3; 15:13; 40:1; Num. 14:33; Jer. 30:11; 29:10.

Again, when we compare Rev. 1:3; 22:10 with Dan. 8:26 the meaning of the time reference is plain. Fulfilment is not to be distant but near. The entire book (thus bounded at both ends by “soon”) we are told has special meaning for the existing seven churches of Asia and has reference to their experience just ahead.

Rev. 17:10 is significant in this discussion. —... they are also seven kings, five of whom have fallen, one is, the other has yet to come, and when he comes he must remain only a little while.” The world power is on its last legs. But one more phase is to be manifested and it will exist only for a little time. Readers in the first century would have understood this verse exactly as it reads. We repeat — the evidence is overwhelming that the book of Revelation was written to nerve the church of that day to complete the gospel commission. Heaven intended that faithful believers of that generation might see Christ come in the clouds and be caught up to meet Him without passing through the portals of the tomb.

THE INTELLIGIBILITY OF PROPHECY: IS IT HISTORY WRITTEN IN ADVANCE?

Too often we have been guilty of treating prophecy like a Delphic oracle, or as the product of some fortune-teller. But the main purpose of prophecy is not intellectual but spiritual. —Knowledge puffs up but charity edifies.” God did not give the prophecies primarily that we might know the future, but that we might know Him and His gospel. This is obvious when we consider the obscurity of prophecy. Allis is right when he says:

The claim that prophecy is to be understood literally raises the question of the intelligibility of prophecy, and bears directly on the problem of the relationship of prophecy to history. If prophecy is to be taken literally, i.e. according to the letter, it would be natural to conclude that its literal meaning must be clear and obvious.

The usual view on this subject has been that prophecy is not intended to be fully understood before its fulfilment, that it is only when God —establishes the word of his servant and fulfils the counsel of his messengers,” that the meaning and import of their words becomes fully manifest. The reason for this is to be found, as Patrick Fairbairn has so admirably pointed out, in the fact that these disclosures of things to come are made known to men by One who has made man and knows his human frailty and how much knowledge of the future is for his good. Prophecy, in the words of Sir Isaac Newton, is not given to make men prophets, but as a witness to God when it is fulfilled. Prophecy is a wonderful combination of the clear and the obscure. Enough of God’s purpose is revealed to act powerfully upon the heart and conscience of those to whom the heavenly message is sent, but not enough to make fatalists of them, to paralyse human effort, or to coerce the human will; enough to prove the message to have been a true word from Him to whom alone the unknown future is fully known, but not enough to enable man to foresee with certainty when and how that purpose is to be realized.

If prophecy is written as simply and plainly as history, it should be quite as intelligible as history; and we should have no more difficulty in understanding the prophecies of Isaiah than the history recorded in the Books of the Kings. This view may seem to do great honour to the Bible by insisting that its interpretation is quite independent of the events of history. But it fails to do justice to the fact that God is quite as much the God of history as He is the God of prophecy, and that it is the historical fulfilment of a prophecy which proves that it came from God. This literal view of prophecy also makes its appeal to those who wish to exchange faith for sight, who wish to be able to read the future with clearness and to set up precise prophetic programs regarding things to come, programs which no one can conclusively disprove until the events of history have tested them. The refutation of this conception of the complete intelligibility of prophecy is to be found in the simple and inescapable fact, that it cannot be made to square with the phenomena of prophecy as they lie before us in Scripture, and in the no less obvious fact that those who insist most emphatically that prophecy is fully intelligible differ among themselves greatly at times as to its meaning. The fallacy in this claim will be clear when due weight is given to the following considerations.

The use of figurative language — symbols, parables, etc. — is far more characteristic of prophecy than of historical narration.

Not only is the language of prophecy often figurative and parabolic, it also differs from history in its frequent lack of precision and definiteness. While the record of history may be told in broad and general terms, it deals with recorded events and usually tells us with some definiteness when things happened. In the case of prophecy, periods and dates are only rarely defined precisely.⁴²

An example of the fact that prophecy is not just history written in advance is that prophetic promises are only ~~very~~ rarely fulfilled in the precise literal sense in which they were understood when they were first proclaimed.”⁴³

For example, Israel was promised the land of Canaan and accompanying rest. According to Jos. 21:43-45 the promise was fulfilled by the entrance of Israel into Palestine, but as Gerhard von Pad has indicated:

A disturbing inconsistency remained in the fact that Israel was obliged to share this land with the Canaanites (Judges 2:3, 21, 23). This rest bestowed by God is mentioned frequently in the Bible, but it is applied to temporary conditions and is not seen in the light of ultimate fulfilment, with the result that it continued to be regarded as an open promise and the author of the letter to the Hebrews was able to interpret it in a completely new sense (Heb. 3:7ff). It is the old promise, but, in the light of the event of Christ, it discloses entirely new aspects.⁴⁴

Other examples of this principle abound in both the major and minor prophets. The promises found in the last twenty-seven chapters of Isaiah, which were first given for those who should return from Babylon, are given a new application in the New Testament. Similarly, the restoration promises in Daniel, such as 8:14 and 9:24, 27, find a much larger cosmic fulfilment ultimately, infinitely transcending what Jews in the second century BC regarded as the fulfilment. See Rev. 21:1-3.

The fulfilment may be surprising not only in terms of content but also in terms of time. What seems almost immediate may turn out to be millennia off. We cite from several of the many commentators who have recognized this truth about prophecy.

Hebrew prophets from the earliest times in their predictions of great temporal deliverances have been wont to allude to ~~the~~ "days of Messiah." Those days were in view even when the assembling of the tribes of Israel in the promised land was spoken of (Gen. xlix). When Isaiah depicted the overthrow of Assyria, the coming Hero was predicted (Isa. vii). When the fall of Babylon was announced, the days of Messiah were announced to be at hand. When the deliverance of Israel by the hand of Cyrus was predicted, Messiah similarly was expected. The prophets foresaw that, although Israel's deliverance was to come from Persia, Persia would finally become its oppressor. The Greek power commenced with spreading a sheltering wing over the Jewish nation. Greece in its turn became also Israel's oppressor. Hence it is described in the language of Zechariah as raising up its mighty men against Israel (Zech. ix.13). Similarly, Daniel, in his last prophecy (ch. xii), represents Messiah rising up in the form of a warrior, ~~Michael~~ "the great prince," standing up for the children of His people. Finally, when the struggle with the last or fourth world-power is predicted, Messiah, the stone cut out of the mountain without human instrumentality, is pictured as dashing in pieces the great colossus of the four world-empires, and destroying His foes.⁴⁵

If the fact be borne in mind that Zechariah, in predicting the rebuilding of the Second Temple and its completion, spoke at the same time of the coming of the man who was the Branch, who, in a more glorious sense, would build the Temple of the Lord (Zech. vi.12, 13), it cannot be regarded as improbable that Daniel in this vision may have been led to think of Messiah as the Restorer of the sanctuary which had been polluted alike by Jews and Gentiles.

No satisfactory interpretation has been given of the 2300 days regarded as referring to Maccabean times. It is quite possible that those 2300 days may be a period of prophetic days or years which have still to run their course. Ancient Jewish interpreters have made the same suggestion. The combination in Gen. 1.5 of ~~evening~~, "morning" ~~light~~ and ~~day~~ with that in Zech. xiv.6, 7, where ~~day~~, "evening," ~~light~~ are spoken of, compared with ~~evening morning~~ in Dan. viii.14, and ~~the evening and the morning~~ and ~~many days~~ in verse 26, seems to show that Zechariah affords a hint of the real meaning of the passages in Daniel. If that be correct, it need not surprise us that we are not permitted to know the date of the commencement of the period? If the cleansing be future, it will take place in that day when Messiah, in the language of the Baptist, shall ~~thoroughly~~ cleanse his threshing-floor; and he will gather his wheat into the garner, but the chaff he will burn up with unquenchable fire" (Matt. iii.12).⁴⁶

John seems to suggest that the Messianic judgments would soon fall and the sway of Rome give place to the millennial reign.

Before passing judgment on this matter, it is necessary to recall that John's viewpoint in no way differs from that of his predecessors in the prophetic office. All the prophets looked for the overthrow of the oppressor nation of their day, followed by the establishment of the kingdom of God. Isaiah looked for the Messianic deliverance to follow on God's judgment of Assyria (see, e.g. Isa. 10, 11), Habakkuk on the destruction of Babylon (Hab. 2:2, 3). Jeremiah, Isaiah and Ezekiel all prophesied of the setting up of the kingdom after the return of the Jews under Cyrus (e.g. Jer. 29-31; Isa. 49, 51; Eze. 26). Haggai, writing after that return, foretold the advent of the kingdom following the completion of the Temple that was then in course of rebuilding (Hag. 2), while every vision of Daniel placed the end after the overthrow of Antiochus Epiphanes. Similarly in the NT the second coming of Christ appears to be expected in the not distant future

(e.g. Rom. 13:11f; 1 Cor. 7:29f; Heb. 10:37; Jas. 5:8; 1 Pet. 4:7; 1 Jn. 2:18; Rev. 1:3). Even our Lord places His teaching regarding His second advent side by side with His prophecies concerning the fall of Jerusalem (see Mark 13).⁴⁷

On this point one can make the appeal only to thorough and practised readers of the other prophetic parts of the O. Test., who must often have met with the like difficulty. It is easy to point to examples. Isa. ii. iv. is a comminatory prophecy against the Jews then living, i.e. the Jews of Isaiah's time. In 4:2-6 is (as I cannot well doubt) a Messianic passage, following immediately a description of the evils to be suffered by the rebellious Jews then living, and joined to that description even by a *in that day*, vs. 1, 2. But if any refuse to regard Isa. iv. as Messianic, how can they dispose of chap. viii. ix.? Surely the threatenings, and the execution of them, uttered in chap. viii., have respect to the Jews of Isaiah's time. Yet in making the transition from this period to the Messianic sequel in chap. 9:1-7, not a word is said as to the interim of more than seven centuries which actually elapsed. Here all are constrained to acknowledge a prediction truly Messianic; and yet the case is the same, as in the passage under consideration.

For the rest of Isaiah, chap. xi-lxvi, whether we assign it to the prophet whose name it bears, or to a later writer, makes no difference with the point before us. The continual intermingling and junction of the return from the Babylonish exile, and that from the exile of sin, shows that the writer has not taken the least pains to throw into his composition any distinctive notes of time. He has left this unrevealed; and so much so, that one is strongly moved, in view of his whole composition, to repeat the declaration of the Saviour: "The **times** and **seasons** hath the Father put in his own power," Acts 1:7.

The like result would follow a scrutiny of the other prophets.⁴⁸ Says Fairbairn rightly: "The prophetic writings ... give no countenance to the notion that the gift of prophecy was conferred merely for the purpose of announcing before-hand the coming events of Providence."⁴⁹ All this has bearing on our interpretation of Dan. 8 and 9. Anyone who has studied the multiple laborious attempts to dogmatize on the fine chronological points of Dan. 9:24-27, and who also has some awareness of the facts of ancient chronology, must agree with what Hengstenberg called "concealed definiteness."

CHRONOLOGICAL PROBLEMS CONTINUED

Auberlen is sympathetic to this truth.

The judicious words of Preiswerk, upon this question, claim our earnest attention (*loc. cit.*, 286): "We ought not, considering the uncertainty of ancient chronology, to lay much stress on calculating the exact year. For, though the calculation be very successful, yet so soon as another interpreter follows another chronological system, what has been so laboriously reared up, is apparently thrown down. But if we grant, from the outset, that ancient chronology is uncertain, and be content to point out a mere general coincidence of the prophetic with the historical time; if we show that possibly even a minute coincidence took place, and, at best, that no one can prove the contrary, we shall have done enough to prove the truth of the ancient prophecy, and our work cannot be overthrown by others." Let us consider likewise the remarks of Sack (*Apologetik*, 336), "It could not have been within the power of the ordinary reader of Scripture to be an accurate student of chronology; hence those who could know the *terminus a quo* only in a general way, as falling within the time of the commandments and permissions given by the Persian kings, could, consequently, know the time of the Messiah's appearance only in the same general but sufficiently accurate way; It was sufficient to strengthen their

faith, and to keep their expectation alive. And, though the means and results of learned chronological investigations are inaccessible to them, yet, from the simplest knowledge of history, they may arrive at a conviction that prophecy is fulfilled in Christ. ...

With regard to Daniel himself, the object was not accurately to fix to him individually the year of the Messiah's coming. As he lived several centuries before the event, this would have had no interest for him ...

Even for the people of Israel, to whom the message of Gabriel was sent, the calculation of the seventy weeks could not be clearly and plainly laid down. We know that it is an essential feature of prophecy to reveal and at the same time to veil the future: it does not purport to be a history, much less a chronology, of coming events; it does not put them as clearly before our eyes as the past; this would destroy man's ethical relation to the future. And for this reason, the present prophecy needed to be veiled in some obscurity, however clearly it might contain the intimation that 490 years would elapse from the permission to restore Jerusalem after the captivity to the time of the Messiah. It is its very clearness in the main, which renders necessary this obscurity. The fulfilment of the eternal decree of God must not be a mere arithmetical problem, which the profane understanding also may calculate by simple arithmetic, but a holy enigma, which shall stimulate to a faithful observation of the ways of God, to a diligent study of the history of His people. **—None of the wicked shall understand; but the wise shall understand**" (Dan. xii.10). in an instance like this, where the chronological limitations are clear and unmistakable, such a relative veiling of the truth could be accomplished only by concealing the starting-point, and, as we shall see, the terminal-point of the seventy weeks, in a certain obscurity, and by connecting it with facts which can be recognized in their full significance by the faithful student of Scripture alone. ...

The plurality of the edicts afforded some room for uncertainty, as is proved by different Christian expositors choosing different edicts as starting-points; and hence Hess (i., p. 196) remarks, **—It seems to me that we are not forced to understand the angel's words as referring only to one of these edicts, but that they refer to the whole period during which such edicts were given, revoked, and renewed.**" Here we remind the reader also of the remark of Sack, already quoted, that to strengthen faith and keep alive expectation, it was sufficient to have only a general conception of the time. And history makes it manifest that prophecy entirely fulfilled this object. For it is a well-known fact, that at the time of Christ, the expectation of the Messiah had spread extensively, not only among pious Israelites (Luke ii.25, 26, 28; xxiii.51), but also generally among Jews and Gentiles, as we learn from Josephus and the well-known passages of Seutonius and Tacitus.⁵⁰

For every student of prophecy the articles in our own *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* on Old and New Testament chronology are a **—must.**" They bring many surprises. Among other things they enlighten us regarding the impossibility of dogmatism on many dates which most do dogmatically affirm, including such points of time in the Dan. 9 prophecy as the crucifixion date. Both the terminations of the first seven-weeks period, and the entire seventy, are difficult to authenticate historically. There is no definite proof that the restoration of Jerusalem took seven weeks of years. Neither is AD 34 beyond dispute. Note Auberlen again:

It is more difficult to discover the reason for the separation of the first seven weeks. The text assigns them no peculiar character, but mentions them together with the sixty-two

weeks, as a time of restoration and of the rebuilding of Jerusalem. Hengstenberg takes ... that the angel meant seven weeks until the rebuilding of the city would be finished, and from that time till the Messiah, sixty-two weeks. He endeavours to prove from Herodotus and other profane writers, that Jerusalem was restored to be a large city after about forty-nine years, or, according to his chronology, in the year 406 BC. But apart from the precarious and unsatisfactory character of this mode of argument, such a solution of the question is impossible, on purely exegetical grounds, as has been clearly pointed out, for example, by Wieseler. ...

On the contrary, we must admit that the text contains no material reason for the first portion of seven weeks. They are, to speak generally, brought forward as the fundamental part of the period of restoration. If we wish to understand more about them, we must turn to the consideration of the inward significance of the number seven, ... The last week may give us a hint for understanding the reason of the especial prominence given to the first seven. As the seventieth week is separated from the rest as a period of revelation, so it may likewise be with the seven weeks. And this conjecture will derive confirmation, if we bear in mind the inward dignity of the number seven to which we have already directed attention in our remarks on the week of salvation.

The analysis of the seventy weeks is based on the principle of the number seven. They end with seven years; they begin with seven times seven. The number seven, it is well known, has a mystical and symbolical significance throughout Scripture, and especially throughout prophecy, which, however, in no way lessens its chronological value. ...

Lest it should seem, on account of these relations of numbers, that because the seven weeks contain the number seven multiplied by itself, whilst in the last week this number occurs only in its first power, therefore the final period of revelation under the Old Covenant is invested with a higher dignity than that of the New; the angel at once dispels such an illusion, first, by hastily passing over the seven weeks, while he enters into a minute description of the last week; and, secondly, by taking the seven weeks into conjunction with the sixty-two, as belonging to the time of distress, thus making the seventieth week, both by its prominent position and the minute picture of its events, stand out clear, in sublime and unrivalled dignity. On the other hand, we see the seven weeks plainly separated from the sixty-two weeks, in order to show the peculiar fundamental character of the time of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Malachi, as distinguished from the centuries that followed; to point out the difference between the last remnants of the revelation of the Old Testament and that period which enjoyed no revelations at all. ... We find here, at the same time, an indication of the typical relation between the first seven prophetic weeks and the last—between the preparatory salvation after the captivity and the full Messianic salvation—an indication which, it is well known, has been further developed by the prophets after the exile. But, as we remarked before, the **sixty-two weeks** intervene as a time without revelation, and full of trouble; for sixty-two is a number altogether without relation to the significant fundamental numbers, and thus designates, and at the same time in contrast to the two divine numbers by which it is enclosed — a period insignificant, and without divine revelation. The relation of the seven weeks, the sixty-two, and the one to each other, is like that of the evening red, the night, and the clear day — a day, it is true, to be succeeded for Israel by a far darker night. Yet even into the first night there falls a time of great affliction, the time of Antiochus Epiphanes.

What a marvellous and keenly penetrating glance do these words of the angel throw into the succeeding centuries! How wonderfully do they unveil the most decisive crisis of the development of the kingdom of God, even by the mere symbolism of numbers!⁵¹

Again, we must admit that the starting point of the prophecy of Dan. 9 does indeed possess the character of “concealed definiteness” to which Hengstenberg refers. When we read about “the going forth of the word to restore and build Jerusalem” are we intended to think of a word from God, or from a Persian monarch? Philologically the expression is ambiguous and we think purposely so. Note that Dan. 9:23 applies the same Hebrew expression to heaven’s sending forth of Gabriel. Ezra 6:14 indicates that the decree includes that of heaven and those of Persian monarchs. Taylor G. Bunch saw the forcefulness of these facts and wrote:

By the going forth of whose commandment would the seventy weeks begin? Since the Lord was guiding in the affairs of nations for the fulfilment of His own purpose, doubtless in a primary sense the Lord works through human agencies. Who was the servant or agent through whom this decree was given that would end the period of Israel’s captivity and begin the period of their last opportunity? ~~“The~~ **“The** commandment” indicates that the Lord recognizes but one decree regarding the restoration of the Jews to their homeland and the rebuilding of their city and temple. It is not **a** decree or **one of the** decrees, but **the** decree. It is the kingly decree inspired by the Lord to fulfil His word through Jeremiah concerning a prophetic time period that was about to end, and another that was about to begin.

This decree to restore and build Jerusalem was so important that it was foretold by divine revelation 161 years before it was issued and the king who should proclaim it named more than 100 years before he was born. Isa. 44:26-28; 45:1-5, 13. Here Cyrus is declared to be God’s “messenger” and “shepherd” who would perform His pleasure in restoration of Jerusalem.

The decree here described would include the freeing of the Jewish captives and the permission to return to their own land to rebuild Jerusalem and “the cities of Judah,” and the restoration of the temple and its services.

That this decree is all-inclusive so that it embraces the complete restoration of all that was destroyed and made desolate by the Babylonians is evident from this prophecy together with the record of the decree after it was proclaimed. See 2 Chron. 36:22, 23; Ezra 1:1-4. The temple was the chief part of the city of Jerusalem and its restoration was the most important part of the rebuilding program. It was God who “stirred up the spirit of Cyrus” to issue this decree for Him. ...

Three kings issued decrees regarding the restoration of Jerusalem and the temple and the worship and government of the Jews. The first was issued by Cyrus in 536 B.C.; the second by Darius Hystaspes in 519 [?] B.C.; the third by Artaxerxes Longimanus in 457 B.C. In fact, Artaxerxes issued another decree to Nehemiah in 444 B.C. This however was more of the granting of authority to carry into execution his former decree. It was only an enlargement of the decree issued by him in 457 and by Cyrus in 536. But God seems to recognize but one decree which He predicted more than 150 years before it was issued and which was proclaimed under the inspiration of His Spirit. Therefore, all subsequent decrees must be considered as only enlargements of the one decree and the giving of authority to carry out its provisions.⁵²

Not only is the date of 457 BC for the seventh year of Artaxerxes still a matter of considerable dispute, but even the manner of reckoning the 490 years — by inclusive or exclusive reckoning — is not entirely clear. Bible reckoning of periods is frequently that of inclusive reckoning. For examples, see *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* 2:136,137, and Bo Reicke's *The New Testament Era*, pages 8,194. The seventy years prophecy of Daniel's contemporary (for a time), Jeremiah, was fulfilled by conclusive reckoning from 605 to 536.

As for the October 22 date in 1844, even here we are assailed by historical uncertainty. W.W. Prescott recognized this, and on the occasion of the 1911 General Conference session he wrote to W.C. White as follows:

It is very difficult for me to see how the expression —from the going forth of the commandment,” can be made to mean from the time that Ezra commenced to build the city, at least six months after the commandment went forth.

Furthermore, in my investigation of this subject, I find much good argument for placing the baptism in 27, but either the spring or the summer of 27; and for placing the crucifixion either in A.D. 29 or 30; but I find no authority for making it as late as 31, except the marginal chronology of the Authorized Version of the Bible, which is Usher's chronology. This chronology has been accepted by our writers to establish the baptism in A.D. 27, but has been rejected so far as it relates to the crucifixion, which is placed by it in A.D. 33.

It seems to be abundantly evident from the scripture and history that the 2300 days commenced in the spring of B.C. 457; that the baptism was not later than the early part of A.D. 27; that the crucifixion was not later than the early part of A.D. 30; and that the 2300 days must end in the spring of 1844. This interpretation appears to me to be in harmony both with the scripture and history.

And this was the original interpretation of William Miller.⁵³

Even if we fix upon 457 B.C., there is certainly no way of demonstrating that we should date the decree as at Oct. 22 of that year. There are indications, on the contrary, which would seem to oppose such a selection. We must keep in mind that the Oct. 22 date has significance for the termini of all the parts of this prophecy, and not just the final terminus of 1844. Was Christ's baptism on Oct. 22 of AD 27? Would the Jews have been out by Jordan if it was the day of *Yom Kippur*, or would they have been at the temple awaiting the emergence of the high priest from the Most Holy Place? Was Stephen's death on Oct. 22 AD 34? Does anything in the context suggest a Day of Atonement setting? Or are there indications otherwise? (See appendix, —Parallels Between Daniel 8 and Daniel 9,” for a discussion of relationships between Dan. 8 and 9.)

Did the Karaite Jews all observe Oct. 22 as the Day of Atonement in 1844? The evidence is that most did not. We quote:

Calendar, Karaite

Question: Karaite and Rabbanite Jews observed *Yom Kippur* on different days. On what day of the year did they observe *Yom Kippur* in the year 1844?

Answer: With regard to the Rabbanite Jews, *Yom Kippur* fell on Monday, September 22, i.e. from nightfall on September 22 .to nightfall on September 23.

The question with regard to the Karaites' date is, however, somewhat complicated. If you will refer to Vol. 10:778-779, you will see that, although in general the Karaites adopted the Rabbanite calendar, they sometimes differed from the Rabbanites in fixing the day of the New Year, and therefore of *Yom Kippur*, which comes on the tenth day following. For instance, the Rabbanite calendar is so arranged that the New Year does not fall on Sunday, Wednesday, or Friday, whereas this provision is ignored by the Karaites. As you will see, although from the middle of the 19th century the Karaites introduced mathematical calculations, they also depended upon direct observation of the new moon. If, therefore, the new moon appeared before noon on Friday, September 13, the Karaites would have observed that day as the New Year and September 22 as *Yom Kippur*; if it appeared after nightfall on Saturday, September 14, they would have observed Sunday, September 15, as the New Year and September 24 as *Yom Kippur*, whereas in all the above eventualities the Rabbanites observed the New Year on September 14, since it was not allowed to fall on Friday (September 13) or Sunday (September 15).

I have, however, ascertained from the Committee of Karaite Jews in Israel that, in fact, in 1844 the Karaite new year coincided with that of the Rabbanites and that for both groups, therefore, *Yom Kippur* fell on September 23.⁵⁴

When the brother of George McCready Price made inquiry on this matter he received the following reply.

Rabbinat Israelite Caraime
Caire
(Other lettering, Arabic?)
Rue Khoronfish No. 50
30-3-39

Dear Mr. C. L. Price:

In answer to your letter dated 6th April, which I have received on the 26th April, 1939, I inform you that the sacred days of the Karaite are the same as those of the Rabbinical Jews, except that their dates may differ by one day before or after. This is due to the fact that the Karaite Jews take into account the seeing of the new moon, whereas the Rabbinical Jews reckon upon the birth of the new moon. The Karaite Jews, according to the Temod principle, never observe *Yom Kippur* on a Friday or a Sunday, nor the Passover on a Monday or a Wednesday. Another point of difference lies in the fact that the Karaite Jews observe *Pourim* on the 14th day of the twelfth month (*Azar*) whether the year is simple or leap-year, while the Rabbinical Jews, in the leap-year, observe *Pourim* in the fourteenth month (*Azar* the second), and this is why there is the difference of one month in *Pourim*, which never happens in the Passover.

In this connection I should remark that according to the Karaite Jews all the sacred days last one day, with the exception of the Passover, which lasts seven days. On the other hand, the Rabbinical Jews observe two days for each sacred day, eight days for both the Passover and *Secout*, and the first and the second day of every new moon, to settle their dates according to the Lunar Calendar.

As to the dates of the Passover and *Yom Kippur* they are the following:

According to the Karaite Jews, in the year 1843 the Yom Kippur is on Wednesday 4th of October, and just the same date according to the Rabbinical.

In the year 1844 it is on Monday 23rd September, for both the Karaite and Rabbinical.

In the year 1845 it is on Sunday 12th October according to Karaite, and on Saturday 11th October according to Rabbinical Jews, for it is a leap-year.

Wishing you the blessing of the great God,

Yours sincerely,

(Signed) Youssef Ibrahim Marzouk

[Located in Gathering Call Library, Riverside, California.]

But even if some Karaites did observe Oct. 22 as the Day of Atonement in 1844, can we be sure they knew what they were doing, and were doing it correctly? Notice the following comments from our own *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* once more.

As long as the Temple stood, however, the year was keyed to the barley harvest, and the months to the crescent moon. Since the first appearance of the crescent each month comes at a variable interval after the astronomical ~~new~~ moon” (called conjunction), and since we do not know the ancient system, if one then existed, we cannot today translate Biblical Jewish dates into our calendar with absolute certainty and must allow for a possible error of a day, and at times of a month.⁵⁵

Even if in all these areas we could satisfy ourselves regarding the traditional positions, the fact remains that Dan. 9:24-27 nowhere mentions days. The Hebrew *shabuim* merely means sevens — sevens of whatever the context indicates, and here years are indicated. Many modern translations, including the RSV, recognize this. Conservatives amongst ourselves, including W.E. Read, have gone on record in declaring that the year-day principle is not to be found here. See his comments on Dan. 9 in *Doctrinal Discussions*, 54f.

Neither are the 2300 days and the 490 years the only instances where precise reckoning of prophetic periods is difficult if not impossible. W.W. Prescott again and again protested against our reckoning of the 1200 years. In his suggestions for the revision of *Great Controversy* he wrote:

The 1260 years of papal supremacy are made to commence ~~with~~ the establishment of the papacy in A.D. 538,” and to terminate in 1798. It does not seem to be in harmony with history to say that the papacy was established at this time, and the whole question of the proper application of 1260 years needs reconsideration, and a new interpretation made. ...

It is here again stated that the 1260 years terminated in 1798. And the expression ~~In~~ those days,” found in the Text ~~In~~ those days, after that tribulation,” is made to refer to the 1260 days. On this basis the statement is made:

~~Between~~ these two dates [1773-1798], according to the words of Christ, the sun was to be darkened.”

This interpretation involves the necessity of explaining why all the other signs mentioned in Matt. 24 come outside this period, and this is a difficult matter to establish satisfactorily. It seems to me a much more consistent interpretation of this passage to regard the expression ~~In~~ those days, after that tribulation,” to refer to the indefinite

period beginning with the close of the period of tribulation and extending to the time of the second advent, thus taking in all those events mentioned in Matt. 24:29, 30.⁵⁶

We should also observe the warnings of our *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* on this matter.

The development of the great apostasy that culminated in the papacy was a gradual process that covered several centuries. The same is true of the decline of this power.

Leo I (the Great, d. 461) was the first bishop of Rome to proclaim that Peter had been the first pope, to assert the succession of the papacy from Peter, to claim primacy directly from Jesus Christ, and to succeed in applying these principles to papal administration of the affairs of the church. Leo I gave to the theory of papal power its final form, and made that power a reality. It was he who procured an edict from the emperor declaring that papal decisions have the force of law. With imperial support he set himself above the councils of the church, assuming the right to define doctrine and to dictate decisions. His success in persuading Attila not to enter Rome (452) and his attempt to stop Gaiseric (Genseric, 455) enhanced his prestige and that of the papacy. Leo the Great was definitely a temporal as well as a spiritual leader of his people.

The pontificate of Pope Gregory I (the Great, d. 604), first of the medieval prelates of the church, marks the transition from ancient to medieval times. Gregory boldly assumed the role, though not the title, of emperor in the West.

The pontificate of Innocent III (d. 1216) found the papacy at the height of its power, and during the next century it was at the very zenith of its glory. Claiming to be the vicar of Christ, Innocent III exercised all the prerogatives claimed by Gregory a century and more earlier.

The Reformation, commonly thought of as beginning in 1517, with the posting of the Ninety-five Theses, saw papal power driven from large areas of Northern Europe. ... For nearly three centuries the Church of Rome carried on a vigorous but gradually losing struggle against the forces battling for civil and religious freedom.

It is evident from this brief sketch that the rise of papal power was a gradual process covering many centuries. The same is true of its decline. The former process may be thought of as continuing from about A.D. 100 to 756; the latter, from about A.D. 1303 to 1870. The papacy was at the height of its power from the time of Gregory VII (1073-85) to that of Boniface VIII (1294-1303). It is thus clear that no dates can be given to mark a sharp transition from insignificance to supremacy, or from supremacy back to comparative weakness. As is true with all historical processes, the rise and fall of the papacy were both gradual developments.⁵⁷

As for Aug. 11, 1840, it has nothing whatever in its favour. As one studies the materials in our own GC Archives, one finds abundant evidence of the protracted discussions over this date through the years. But key scholars amongst us had settled the matter negatively by about the turn of the century. Litch was wrong chronologically, and exegetically, and historically. Nothing happened of significance on Aug. 11, 1840. The power which supposedly lost its independence waged war against Western powers more than once since that date. Even in the twentieth century a large number of Adventists have anticipated the event as future which Litch affirmed was past. Thus our similarly inaccurate interpretations of Dan. 11:45 and Rev. 16:12.

Litch's starting date was as wrong as his terminus. Scholars no longer accept Gibbon's error regarding 1299. But this was only one of a chain of errors including Litch's forgetting about the calendar change which affected the reckoning of ten days.

Litch himself repudiated the former prophecy and mode of interpretation, as his later writings make clear.⁵⁸

Of much greater importance than the historical issues here is the fact that the Greek of Rev. 9:15 is talking about a point of time, not a period. See all modern translations.

Similarly, the application of the year-day principle in Rev. 2:10 and 11:9 has never found hearty support by historians amongst us. The application made to the French Revolution is certainly incorrect as has long been known.

THE BASIC PILLARS FOR THE YEAR-DAY PRINCIPLE

Let us return now to the basic pillars of Num. 14:34 and Eze. 4:6. Certain facts stand out when these are read in context.

—But as for you, your dead bodies shall fall in this wilderness. And your children shall be shepherds in the wilderness forty years, and shall suffer for your faithlessness, until the last of your dead bodies lies in the wilderness. According to the number of the days in which you spied out the land, forty days, for every day a year, you shall bear your iniquity, forty years, and you shall know my displeasure. I, the Lord, have spoken; surely this will I do to all this wicked congregation that are gathered together against me: in this wilderness they shall come to a full end, and there they shall die.” (Num. 14:32-35 RSV)

—And you, O son of man, take a brick and lay it before you, and portray upon it a city, even Jerusalem; and put siegeworks against it, and build a siege wall against it, and cast up a mound against it, and plant battering rams against it round about. And take an iron plate, and place it as an iron wall between you and the city; and set your face toward it, and let it be in a state of siege, and press the siege against it. This is a sign for the house of Israel.

—Then lie upon your left side, and I will lay the punishment of the house of Israel upon you; for the number of the days that you lie upon it, you shall bear their punishment. For I assign to you a number of days, three hundred and ninety days, equal to the number of the years of their punishment; so long shall you bear the punishment of the house of Israel. And when you have completed these, you shall lie down a second time, but on your right side, and bear the punishment of the house of Judah; forty days I assign you, a day for each year. And you shall set your face toward the siege of Jerusalem, with your arm bared; and you shall prophesy against the city. And, behold, I will put cords upon you, so that you cannot turn from one side to the other, till you have completed the days of your siege.” (Eze. 4:1-8 RSV)

In neither instance is it declared that the Lord is setting forth a principle that is to govern all symbolic time prophecies. in Num. 14 it is only said that as the spies on their mission of unbelief had searched the land forty days, so that many years would the people wander in unbelief. **The prophetic part of the verse uses years for years.** They are literal, and not the symbol of anything else. If we were to apply the year-day principle to Num. 14:34 the result would be an anticipated fourteen-thousand-four-hundred years of wandering, not forty. But nobody makes that mistake, for the words are clear. So, in this instance, literal years answer

to literal days, and the prophecy is not to be taken symbolically and translated from years to days and then days to years, as we do with Dan. 7:25. There is no parallel here to our usage elsewhere, and neither is there a principle intended to govern passages elsewhere.

In Ezekiel's experience, the days he is told to lie on his side mean actual days and not years. What we have here is not a symbolic prophecy at all, but a symbolic action. If here a day stands for a year, then we would anticipate that Ezekiel would need to lie on his left side three-hundred-and-ninety years, and on his right side forty years! Nobody has ever applied the passage in that manner for obvious reasons. The prophet is clearly told that each day of his future activity is a symbol of a year in the past. Note, this is the reverse to the usual (SDA) application of the relationship between days and years for prophecies. The period ahead is smaller, not greater, for Ezekiel — real days ahead image real years in the past — not vice versa.

So in both these instances there is no possibility of misunderstanding the significance of the instruction, unless we add to what we have in Scripture, and imagine that the Lord is here making a statement that henceforth is to govern the interpretation of symbolic apocalyptic prophecies. Such an assumption is purely gratuitous.

It should be obvious to us that even in Daniel and Revelation we are not consistent. Seven ~~times~~ pass over Nebuchadnezzar, but we do not translate these ~~times~~ (same word as in Dan. 7:25) into days, and call them years, yet they also are in connection with a symbolic dream. Neither do we consider that the thousand years of Rev. 20 are to be turned into days, and then turned again into years. Such would give us a millennium of 360,000 years in length.

In Dan. 7:25 the Aramaic term *iddan* literally means ~~an~~ "appointed time or season," and does not necessarily denominate a year. For example, it is found in the following passages in Daniel:

The king answered, ~~I~~ know with certainty that you are trying to gain **time**, because you see that the word from me is sure that if you do not make the dream known to me, there is but one sentence for you. You have agreed to speak lying and corrupt words before me till the **times** change. Therefore tell me the dream, and I shall know that you can show me its interpretation." (Dan. 2:8-9 RSV)

He changes **times** and seasons;
 he removes kings and sets up kings;
 he gives wisdom to the wise
 and knowledge to those who have understanding. (Dan. 2:21 RSV)

Now if you are ready **when** you hear the sound of the horn, pipe, lyre, trigon, harp, bagpipe, and every kind of music, to fall down and worship the image which I have made, well and good; but if you do not worship, you shall immediately be cast into a burning fiery furnace; and who is the god that will deliver you out of my hands?" (Dan. 3:15 RSV)

Compare 3:5, which also uses *iddan*.

Let his mind be changed from a man's, and let a beast's mind be given to him; and let seven **times** pass over him. (Dan. 4:16 RSV)

And whereas the king saw a watcher, a holy one, coming down from heaven and saying, Hew down the tree and destroy it, but leave the stump of its roots in the earth, bound with a band of iron and bronze, in the tender grass of the field; and let him be wet with the dew of heaven; and let his lot be with the beasts of the field, till seven **times** pass over him;‘ ... that you shall be driven from among men, and your dwelling shall be with the beasts of the field; you shall be made to eat grass like an ox, and you shall be wet with the dew of heaven, and seven **times** shall pass over you, till you know that the Most High rules the kingdom of men, and gives it to whom he will.

And you shall be driven from among men, and your dwelling shall be with the beasts of the field; and you shall be made to eat grass like an ox; and seven **times** shall pass over you, until you have learned that the Most High rules the kingdom of men and gives it to whom he will.” (Dan. 4:23, 25, 32 RSV)

As for the rest of the beasts, their dominion was taken away, but their lives were prolonged for a season and a **time**. (Dan. 7:12 RSV)

He shall speak words against the Most High,
and shall wear out the saints of the Most High,
and shall think to change the times and the law;
and they shall be given into his hand
for a time, two times, and half a time. (Dan. 7:25 RSV)

In the majority of these instances, it is impossible to understand *iddan* as meaning a year. Neither have we tried to apply them on the year-day principle. When 7:12 affirms that the lives of the three beasts were prolonged for a time — neither a single year nor three-hundred-and-sixty years are intended. On what grounds then can we do otherwise in 7:25? Revelation turns the period into days, but to read this back into Daniel may be questionable exegesis in view of the way in which the New Testament often changes the original Old Testament meaning.

The Hebrew equivalent for the “times” of Dan. 7:25 is *moed*, found in 12:7. This term is translated in the KJV in the following ways:

appointed feast, appointed season, appointed sign, appointed time, assembly,
congregation (149 times), due season, feast, place of assembly, season, set feast, set
time, solemn assembly, solemn day, solemn feast, solemnity, synagogue, time, time
appointed, appointed, solemn.

Moed is never translated “year.” *Shanah* is the usual Hebrew term for the latter. *Iddan* (Aramaic) can mean year, but is never thus translated. Nor is year its usual meaning.

The case is similar in Rev. 9:15. The word for “hour” (*hōra*) has been used by us as a twenty-fourth part of a day, and as representing fifteen days according to the year-day principle. But the Greek word may or may not have a specific application to a fixed part of a day. Many times it only means “season” in a general sense. We have projected back upon the Eastern Bible writers the same time-consciousness that has plagued the West in very recent centuries. See the *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* on Rev. 17:12 for its discussion on the meaning of *hōra*.

But having said all this as evidence against the universal application of the year-day principle in apocalyptic prophecies, we insist that Scripture does at times use *yamim* (days) for years. This harmonizes well with the divine providence which has used the year-day principle to

sustain the hopes of many who longed for the coming of Christ. See our appendix for a defence of the traditional usage.

The following are some of the passages where translators use ~~years~~” though the original has ~~days~~.”

Ex. 13:10	this ordinance in his season from year to year ...
Num. 9:22	two days, or a month, or a year ...
Josh. 13:1	Now Joshua was old and stricken in years ...
Judges 11:40	daughters of Israel went yearly to lament ...
Judges 21:19	a feast of the Lord in Shiloh yearly ...
1 Sam. 1:3	this man went up out of his city yearly ...
1 Sam. 2:19	brought it to him from year to year ...
1 Sam. 2:19	with her husband to offer the yearly sacrifice ...
Amos 4:4	And bring ... your tithes after three years ...

It should be observed that these passages are of very dissimilar nature to those in Daniel and Revelation where we have traditionally employed the principle. That which was appropriate in past times is not appropriate now. The advance in Bible scholarship has led many genuine Christians to ~~shy~~” from Adventists because of our failure to acknowledge the fuller light on such biblical issues as this one.

DAN. 9 AND THE YEAR-DAY PRINCIPLE

Many who are reluctant to rely on Num. 14:34 and Eze. 4:6 for the year-day principle, look to Dan. 9:24 as a bastion for belief in this area. Things are said about the prophecy which are, sadly, not correct. For example, it is said that here days are used for years, whereas the Hebrew *yamim* (days) is not to be found, as is the case also in the time periods of Daniel 7 and 8.

It is claimed that believers from the first centuries of our era used the year-day principle to interpret this prophecy. This also is not true. Early Christians read the ~~weeks~~” as weeks of years, without taking the step of transposition assumed necessary by those who look on the time reference as symbolic. The year-day principle did not become widely accepted until about a thousand years later.

Thirdly, it is affirmed that the Hebrew term *shabuim* translated ~~weeks~~” means of necessity periods of seven days. This also is not correct. This plural form is never used for the seven day week, though its root is commonly so applied. The root merely means a period of seven somethings, and seven days is appropriate, though seven months or seven years would be equally valid if the context demanded such. When the plural for weeks of days is found in Scripture outside of Daniel, the feminine termination is present, whereas in Dan. 9:24 we have the masculine. While in Dan. 10:3 we read of three *shabuim* of days, the fact that the last two words are added testifies that the preceding term does not of necessity convey the meaning of ~~days~~.”

We have put together a melange of statements Xeroxed from lexicographers and commentators on the matter. The statement by the eminent Hebraist Tregelles should be closely studied.

is true that in Biblical Hebrew there is no explicit usage of the term *shabu'im* for "weeks" or "weeks of years."

G. Hasel (Ministry Insert, May, 1976)

DAN. 9:24: -Seventy weeks are determined ..."

As our *Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopaedia* tells us in its article on the year-day principle, we have medieval times to thank for its coinage. The early Church fathers read Dan. 9:24 as weeks of years without any thought of the year-day principle.

The Hebrew word for weeks literally means **sevens** or *hebdomads*. While the root is used for weeks of days, it has no philological connection with *yamim* (days) at all, and can as certainly mean a period of seven years. Note the following terms associated with seven and compare them with the term in Dan. 9:24.

9:24.			
שָׁבַע (constr. שָׁבַע GEN. 29, 27 28, where זֶה is a genit.; dual שָׁבָעִים; plur. שָׁבָעִים and שָׁבָעוֹת, on the other hand in the state constr. plur. only שָׁבָעוֹת, with suff. שָׁבָעוֹתֶיךָ; from שָׁבַע which see) <u>n. a seven, a number seven</u> ; hence 1, <u>a sennight = a week</u> , <u>ἑβδομήκην</u> , septimana, of the nuptial week GEN. 29, 27, comp. שָׁבוֹת; with יָמִים DAN. 10, 2, probably like שָׁבָעוֹת 9, 24 <u>a week of years</u> ; חַג שָׁבָע a festival of (seven) weeks Ex. 34, 22, Deut. 16, 9, fully חַג שָׁבָעִים, ἡγία ἐντὶ ἑβδομήκην Tob. 2, 1; on the contrary חַג שָׁבָעוֹת יָמִים Ez. 45, 12 is the passover continuing seven days. — 2. <u>seven years, a week of years</u> , DAN. 9, 24.	שָׁבַע	SEVEN	
		שָׁבָעִים	SEVENTY
		שָׁבָעִי	SEVENTH
		שָׁבָעוֹת	SEVENFOLD
		שָׁבָעוֹת } (Dn. 9: 24-27)	PERIOD OF SEVEN, HEPTAD, WEEK BESEVENED
		שָׁבָעִים }	
		יָוֶם	DAYS (DAYS) NEITHER PRESENT NOR IMPLIED

We enclose a few lexical comments and other extracts. It is the facts they refer to, and not any authoritative source with which we are interested. *BDB* and all lexicons we know of are agreed that the original term in Dan. 9:24 has no necessary connection with days and points to any kind of septenary arrangement. While the root term is commonly used for a week of days, the plural masculine form here found in Dan. 9 is never found outside of Daniel for weeks of days. The feminine instead is found in all such plural instances. Possibly for this very reason we have here the unusual masculine termination. The fact that in Dan. 10:3 the term is linked with days shows that it does not **of itself** mean a seven of days. Consider particularly the conclusions of the famous Hebraist Tregelles.

9:24-27 THE PROPHECY OF THE SEVENTY SEVENS

This remarkable section declares that a definite period of time has been decreed by God for the accomplishment of the restoration of His people from bondage. The general theme, viz. the decreeing of a period of seventy/sevens is stated in v. 24, and the details are worked out in the three subsequent verses. It will be necessary to discuss the meaning of practically every word in this brief section.

24 *Seventy weeks of years.* The word which is usually translated *weeks* is more accurately rendered *sevens*. It means a period divided into sevens, the precise length of this 'besevened' period not being stated. The word comes first in the Hebrew, and we may paraphrase, 'a period of sevens, in fact, seventy of them'. *Are decreed; i.e. the sevens were decreed by God as*

The New Bible Commentary

Daniel 9:24—E.J. Young

1) vs. 24. The announcement of the seventy sevens.

Vs. 24. *Seventy sevens are decreed upon thy people and upon the city of thy holiness, for restraining the transgression, and completing sin, and covering iniquity, and for bringing in everlasting righteousness, and for sealing vision and prophet and anointing a holy of holies.* This vs. is a Divine revelation of the fact that a definite period of time has been decreed for the accomplishment of all that which is necessary for the true restoration of God's people from bondage. *Seventy sevens*] lit., sevens seventy, the word sevens—usually translated weeks—is placed first for the sake of emphasis. It constitutes the great theme of the passage. For the same reason, the numeral here follows the noun, and does not precede it, as is usually the case. The thought of the author may then be paraphrased, Sevens—and in fact seventy of them are decreed, etc." The word *sevens* here occurs in the m. pl., whereas it generally has a f. pl. This m. pl. also appears in Dan. 10:2,3. The reason for this m. form is not that Dan. is a late writing (BDB), nor was it likely that the m. was chosen because it would sound like the word seventy (Rosenmueller—the two words are spelled with exactly the same consonants), nor is it to indicate that the usual weeks of seven days are not intended, nor is it to be regarded as an arbitrary correction (Ewald), since it has already appeared in Gen. 29:27 (in the 5.). The form is really a participle meaning *besevened*, i.e., computed by sevens (so Stuart and H), and here gives evidence of the fact that the word was originally m. What led Dan. to employ the m. instead of the f. however, is not clear unless it was for the deliberate purpose of calling attention to the fact that the word sevens is employed in an unusual sense. The word means *divided into sevens*, and generally signifies the most common of such divisions, namely, the ordinary week of seven days, e.g., Gen. 29:27 f. and Dan. 10:2, 3. In the expression itself there is no intimation as to the length of time intended. How long, then, is the seven? In Dan. 10:2, 3 an expression of time, *days*, is added, so that in this passage we are to understand ordinary weeks of 7 days each, or perhaps, three full weeks. Also in Dan. 8:14, where Dan. intends a definite period of time, he adds an expression *—evenings-mornings.*"

How then are we to determine the length of that which is designated by the present word *sevens*? We can determine this, now from the word ...

Daniel 9:24—Leupold

What, then, is the basic feature of our interpretation? First of all a grammatical factor that must be evaluated carefully. It is the simple fact that *shabhu 'a*, ~~week~~, regularly has as a plural the **feminine** form *shabhu 'oth*, ~~weeks~~. In this chapter (v. 24, 25, 26, 27) Daniel uses a different form, viz. *shabhu 'im*, **masculine** plural. True, in 10:2, 3 this form recurs, seemingly in reminiscence of our chapter, but with the word ~~days~~ appended, *shabhu 'im yamim*. Now the singular means ~~a~~ period of seven. ~~a~~ heptad" (BDB) or ~~Siebend~~" (K.W.) or, as some prefer to state it, ~~Siebenheit~~. Since there is nothing in our chapter that indicates a ~~heptad~~ of days" as a meaning for *shabhu 'im* or a ~~heptad~~ of years," the only safe translation, if we do not want to resort to farfetched guesses, of this fundamental expression is seventy ~~heptads~~" — seventy ~~sevens~~" — seventy *Seibenheiten*.

Broadman Bible Commentary

24. Seventy weeks are determined. The Hebrew word for **week** (*shabu'im*), ~~sevens~~" means ~~sevens~~" of years. This interpretation was the common one in antiquity. Daniel had been thinking of a multiple of ~~seven~~" of years (9:1, 2; cf. Jer. 25:11, 12). He knew that multiple (seventy years) to be an epoch of judgment for 490 years of violated Sabbaths ($490 \div 7 = 70$. See II Chr. 36:21). Furthermore, there was a common ~~seven~~" of years employed in civil and religious reckoning (Lev. 25, esp. v. 8) quite as aptly called a ~~week~~" as the seven of days. Not only so, but when weeks of days are intended (Dan. 10:2, 3), the Hebrew for ~~days~~" (*yamim*), is added to ~~weeks~~" (*shabu'im*). This apparently indicates a break from the use of chapter 9. More importantly, if any literal meaning is to be attached to the weeks, no period less than weeks of years meets the contextual demands.

DANIEL 9:24—Moses Stuart

As to the masc. form שָׁבָעִים being employed here, in all probability the speaker meant to attract special attention to the word so important in the sequel, and therefore he has put it first, as well as given to it a peculiar form. He may also have been influenced in his choice of the form, by the שָׁבָעִים which follows; or it may have been the prevailing dialect of the day. That he designs to designate *heptades of years* by it, would seem quite probable, if we merely compare 10:2, 3, where יָמִים is added after it in order to explain it, and to tell the reader that he does not mean a שָׁבָעִים of the same length or of the same kind as before. No explanation is needed, however, in the present case, except what the context gives. Daniel's meditation had been upon the seventy *simple years* predicted by Jeremiah. The angel tells him, that a *new-seventy*, i.e. seventy week-years or seven times seventy years, await his people, before their final deliverer will come. The reader almost spontaneously adopts this view of the meaning, who is familiar with the *week-years* of the Hebrews. As to the *third* way in which the Hebrews used the word שָׁבָעִים designated the Jubilee-year — forty-nine years or seven times seven. If now we choose this last period as the meaning of שָׁבָעִים *meral* is sing. and *fem*. (§96.1), it may be united with זָמַן ; and שָׁנִים seems to be fairly implied, as any one may see by comparing Gen. 29:18, 20, 27 together. If this criticism be just, (it seems to me plainly to be so), then we have no instance of a masc. form of the word in question, out of the book of Daniel. This however will prove nothing against the existence of one, since it is altogether a feasible form. The simple truth is, that both שָׁבָעִים and שָׁבָעִית are *participial* forms, meaning *besevened*, (*sit venia!*), i.e. computed by sevens. Lit. then we might translate thus: *Heptades seventy are decided upon*, etc. This leaves the

question entirely open, whether the meaning is heptades of days, or of ordinary years, or of sabbatical years; and this question must be decided of course by the context. The Jews had three kinds of *Heptades* in respect to *time*; first, that of *days*, seven of which make a *week*; secondly, that of *years*, seven of which make a *sabbatical* year, Lev. 25:1-7; thirdly, that of the seven periods of years before the *jubilee-year*, for this last comprises seven times seven years = forty-nine years, after which comes the jubilee-year, Lev. 25:8. Which of these three is meant in the present case? for the clause before us may be interpreted in either way. Not the first, for ...

Walvoord

In the Christological interpretation of Daniel 9:24-27, it is generally assumed that the time units indicated are years. The English word “~~weeks~~” is misleading as the Hebrew is actually the plural of the word for seven, without specifying whether it is days, months, or years. The only system of interpretation, however, that gives any literal meaning ...

*Zockler adds, “Such a prophetic or mystical transformation of the seventy years into many periods of seven years each is not unparalleled in the usage of the ancients; cf., e.g., the remarks of Mark Varro in Aul. Gellius, NA. III., 10: *Se jam undecimarn annorum hebdomadem ingressum esse et ad eum diem septuaginta hebdomadas librorum conscripsisse*”; also Aristotle, *Polit.*, VII 6; Censorin., *de die natali*, C. 14. It was, however, peculiarly adapted to the prophet’s purpose, and was especially intelligible to his readers, inasmuch as the Mosaic Law (Lev. xxv.2, 4 et seq.; xxvi.34, 35, 43; cf. 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21) had designated every seventh year as a sabbath of the land, and had introduced the custom of dividing the years into hebdomads, which thus became familiar to every individual in the Jewish nation during all subsequent ages. The thought that instead of seventy years, seventy times seventy were to elapse before the theocracy should be restored in all its power and significance, and that, consequently, an extended period of delay should precede the advent of the Messianic era, is an integral feature in the mode of conception which prevails throughout the book’ (Kranichfeld)” (“The Book of the Prophet Daniel,” in *Commentary on the Holy Scriptures*, 13:194).

DANIEL 9:24—Tregelles

III. Another passage which has been used as a basis for this system is the latter part of the ninth of Daniel; — some, however, of the strenuous advocates of the year-day principle fairly own that it has no bearing upon the question. Its supposed connection arises from the word שָׁבִיעַ, rendered “~~week~~,” having been taken as though it must be simply in its literal meaning seven *days*. This might be called wholly a question of lexicography: — the word itself is strictly, *something divided into* or consisting of *seven parts* — a *heptad*, a *hebdomad*. It bears the same grammatical relation to the numeral *seven*, as one of the Hebrew words used for ten does to the other of similar meaning. Gesenius simply defines its meaning to be “~~a~~ septenary number,” he then speaks of its use as applied sometimes to days, sometimes to years; — the word itself, however, defines nothing as to the denomination to which it belongs, whether the one or the other. In Ezek. xlv. 21, it is used almost entirely like a numeral, standing with a feminine plural termination in connection with a masculine noun, שָׁבִיעַ וְיָמִים (according to the peculiar usage of numerals in Hebrew and the cognate languages); and this passage is important as showing its use. It is not to be denied nor yet to be wondered at that it should be more often used of *week* than anything else, for this obvious reason, that of all

things admitting a septenary division there is nothing so often spoken of as a week. In this sense, however, it more commonly takes the feminine plural termination.

In the present passage it takes its denomination from *years*, which had been previously mentioned in Daniel's prayer: Daniel had been praying to God, and making confession on behalf of his people, because he saw that the seventy *years*, which had been denounced as the term of the captivity of Judah, were accomplished; and thus the denomination of *years* connects itself with the answer granted to him: he had made inquiry about the accomplishment of *seventy years*; he receives an answer relative to seventy *heptads of years*. The word has here the masculine plural termination, which *may* arise from *year* being *feminine*; but this could not be absolutely stated as the reason, for it is once used (Dan. x. 2) with the masculine plural joined to *days*.*

CITED BY EXPOSITORS.

I am well aware that strong assertions have been made to this effect: — that if we follow the conventional reading (i.e. with points) it is simply —seventy weeks” (i.e. of seven *days*), but that if we reject the points, it must mean —seventy seventies;” — this statement is very incorrect. I do read with the points, but the argument does not rest upon them. I do not admit that periods of seven days are necessarily indicated by the word itself. But if we paid no attention to the points, we are not left to any such meaningless rendering as —seventy seventies;” — the fact must have been overlooked, that in verse 27, where the word occurs in the singular, it is twice written *full* (i.e. with the letter Vay inserted), and this, without any points to help us, decides the matter.

In translating, we may use the word —week,” not at all as conceding the point of the meaning of the Hebrew word, but simply for convenience sake, and as requiring less explanation and circumlocution than any other in common use. I believe that I need say no more to prove that this ninth of Daniel in no way upholds the year-day scheme.

[Footnote] *In this case, the addition of the word יָמִים *days*, is important, as it shows that the term *might* else be understood differently; it is therefore a natural addition, especially as it comes just after the prophecy of the seventy heptads of *years*.

DANIEL 9:24

Genesius, translated by Tregelles

שְׁבוּעָה ("captive of God", [*Shebua*], 1 r. a m.—(1) 1 Ch. 23:16; 26:24; called 1 Ch. 24:29 שְׁבוּעָה.—(2) 1 Ch. 25:4; called 1 Ch. 25:20, שְׁבוּעָה.

שְׁבוּעָה Jer. 18:15 שְׁבוּעָה for שְׁבוּעָה, which see.

שְׁבוּעָה m. (Dan. 9:27, שְׁבוּעָה Gen. 29:27, should be rendered *the week of this woman*), const. שְׁבוּעָה Gen. 29:27, 28; dual שְׁבוּעָה Levit. 12:5; pl. שְׁבוּעָה m. (Dan. 9:25; 10:2, 3), and שְׁבוּעָה, const. שְׁבוּעָה, with suff. שְׁבוּעָהֶם Nu. 28:26, *a hebdomad*, ἑβδομαδ, *septenary number* (denom. from שֶׁבַע seven compare עֶשְׂרִי a decad).

(1) of *days, a week* Gen. 29:27, 28. Dan. 10:2, שְׁלוֹשָׁה שְׁבוּעָה "through three weeks" (where יָמִים is not a genit., see יָמִים No. 2, b, page cccxlii, A). הַן שְׁבוּעָה the feast of (seven) weeks, pentecost, so called from the seven weeks which were counted from the passover to this festival, Deu. 16:9. Fully, Tob. 2:1, ἡγία ἐστὶν ἑβδομάδων. But, Eze. 45:21, הַן שְׁבוּעָה יָמִים the feast of hebdomads of days is the passover, which was celebrated through the whole of seven days.

(2) *a hebdomad of years*, Dan. 9:24, seqq. Compare Hebdomas annorum, Gell. N. A. iii. 10.

Davidson

שְׁבַע (constr. שְׁבַע § 35, rem. 7) fem. שְׁבַע־מָסָה masc. (constr. שְׁבַע־מָסָה).—I. num. card. שְׁבַע 1. num. card. שְׁבַע seven years, and with the constr. יָמִים שְׁבַע־יָמִים seven days; less frequently preceded by the noun, מֵשֶׁבַע שְׁבַע־יָמִים seven rams; also as an ordinal when preceded by a noun in the construct state, מֵשֶׁבַע שְׁבַע־יָמִים seventh year; שְׁבַע־יָמִים by seven; שְׁבַע־יָמִים fem. & שְׁבַע־יָמִים masc. seventeen.—II. (שְׁבַע) adv. seven times, Ps. 119. 164; Pr. 24. 16. Du. שְׁבַע־יָמִים sevenfold. Pl. שְׁבַע־יָמִים (§ 35, rem. 16) severally. For another שְׁבַע (& שְׁבַע־יָמִים) see below.

שְׁבַע Chald. masc. seven

שְׁבַע־יָמִים masc. שְׁבַע־יָמִים, Job 42. 13.

שְׁבַע־יָמִים masc. (constr. שְׁבַע־יָמִים, pl. c. שְׁבַע־יָמִים, d. 3a; but also pl. (abs.) שְׁבַע־יָמִים, with suff. שְׁבַע־יָמִים § 32, rem. 1).—I. a week seven days; הַן שְׁבַע־יָמִים the feast of weeks, pentecost.—II. a week of years, comp. Da. 9. 24, seqq.

Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon

שְׁבִיעִי m. שְׁבִיעִית f. , adj. num. ord.

seventh;—m. שְׁבִיעִי Gn 2² +, שְׁבִיעִי Ex 12¹³ +; f. שְׁבִיעִית Jos 6¹⁶ +, עַתָּה Ex 23¹¹ +, שְׁבַעַת 21³, עֵת 1 K 18⁴⁴ 2 Ch 23¹;—seventh, esp. P; always c. art.: 1. m. 7th day Gn 2³ + 47 t.; month (חֹדֶשׁ) 8⁶ + 23 t. + (n. om.) Ez 45²³ + 3 t.; lot (חֶגְלִיל) Jos 19⁵⁰ + (n. om.) 1 Ch 24¹³ 25¹⁴; n. om. also 1 Ch 2¹³ 26³³ (son), 12¹¹ (man), 27¹⁰ (captain). 2. f. 7th year, 2 K 11⁴ + 7 t. + (n. om.) Ex 21² 23¹¹, also שְׁנַת הַשְּׁבִיעִית (Ges¹¹⁴) Ezr 7⁶; sabbath Lv 23³⁸; time (פֶּעַם) Jos 6¹⁸ + (n. om.) 1 K 18⁴⁴.

שְׁבַעַת Jb 42¹³ read שְׁבַעַת Ges¹¹⁴ and most.שְׁבַעַתִּים n. f. du. seven-fold, seven

times (cf. Ges¹¹⁴ 114¹);—1. seven-fold, seven times as much, Is 30²⁸ Pr 6³¹; as adv. Gn 4^{13,24} ψ 79¹². 2. seven times, adv. ψ 12⁷.—2 S 21⁸ read Qr שְׁבַעַתִּים, v. 1. שְׁבַעַת.

שְׁבִיעִי n. m. period of seven (days,

years), heptad, week (ou format. v. Lag²³⁴);—abs. שָׁבִי Dn 9^{20,21}; cstr. שְׁבַעַת Gn 29^{27,28}; du. שְׁבַעַתִּים Lv 12⁵; pl. שְׁבַעַתִּים Ex 34²² + 4 t. Dt + (in term. techn.) 2 Ch 8¹²; late שְׁבַעַתִּים Dn 9²¹ + 4 t. Dn; cstr. שְׁבַעַתִּים Je 5²⁴ (Ex 45²¹ read שְׁבַעַת with Vrss and all mod., v. שְׁבַעַת); sf. שְׁבַעַתִּים Nu 28²⁸;—1. period of seven days (fr. a given time), week: Dt 16^{8,9} Lv 12⁵ (P); of marriage feast Gn 29^{27,28} (E; cf. Ju 14¹² Tob 11¹⁸); שְׁבַעַתִּים Dn 10¹² three weeks, days (three weeks long); שְׁבַעַתִּים Je 5²⁴ weeks of statutes (i. e. weeks appointed by 'i) for harvest; term. techn. שְׁבַעַתִּים Ex 34²² (J) feast of weeks (ending seven weeks of harvest), Dt 16^{9,10} 2 Ch 8¹², so שָׁבִי alone Nu 28²⁸ (P). 2. heptad or septet of years, late, Dn 9^{24,25,26,27},—שְׁבַעַתִּים Ez 21¹⁸ v. [שְׁבַעַת].

THE 1260-YEAR PERIOD, ETC.

We have already referred to our lack of consistency in Daniel and Revelation in applying chronological terms. Even where we do apply them according to the year-day principle, we remain in difficulty historically. For example, Rev. 11:9 has been applied to a three-and-a-half year period at the time of the French Revolution when supposedly the Bible was banned. But there never was such a period, and the references used originally by Croly, copied by Storrs, and then used by Uriah Smith, and from him incorporated into *Great Controversy* are

invalid. Our researchers have gone through the history of France of the last decade of the eighteenth century with a fine tooth comb, and found nothing to support such a view.

Note again some words from our leaders in 1919 regarding the 1260 years, etc.

W.W. PRESCOTT: Is it not true, as a fact of history, that the papacy exercised greater political power in the fourth and fifth centuries than it did under Justinian?

H.C. LACEY: Certainly.

C.M. SORENSON: We all recognize that a correct explanation includes all the facts in the case. Of course that is the only explanation that takes recognition of all the facts in the case, and that is the ideal explanation toward which we strive.

We have been speaking about reading things into the Bible, and of course that is wrong. But there is another practice that is bad, and that is reading things into history. That is one of the evil legacies left us by A.T. Jones' leadership. His books are full of that practice, and we have consigned them to the scrap heap. They contain some facts, but the facts are biased by a preconceived notion.

Now there is another point: There is no connection between the plucking up of the three horns and the giving of the saints into his hands for a time, times and the dividing of time. If we will keep those two lines absolutely separate, it will be better.

There was no tremendous change that took place in 533, so far as the status of the papacy is concerned. There is that question of supremacy. Do we use that understandingly? There was a time when the papacy was the supreme power in Europe — from 1100 to 1300. The papacy was not supreme in any ordinary sense of the term during the 1260 years, but he did exercise domination over God's people.

M.D. WILCOX: I have been trying to get a term that is suitable. What do you suggest?

C.M. SORENSON: The word —domination."

M.C. WILCOX: That is the word I have been using — papal domination.

C.M. SORENSON: During those two hundred years the papacy did exercise actual political supremacy over all the rest of Europe and civilization. King John, right in the climax of that period, signed over his kingdom to the pope.

W.W. PRESCOTT: Can you say, Brother Sorenson, that the papal domination began in 533?

C.M. SORENSON: There was a legal enactment by Justinian at that time. But the actual domination over God's people was tapered off at the beginning and at the end for the elect's sake. It seems to have been lessened somewhat at the beginning, but more especially at the close of that period.

W.W. PRESCOTT: I know, Brother Chairman, it was a great surprise to me after I had read our books when I actually read history and found that the papal supremacy was only from 1100 to 1300, and gradually rose to that climax, and then gradually faded out. I think we have used that term —supremacy" very carelessly. We have heard and we have read how that in 538 the pope became supreme, but it was in that very year that he was absolutely humbled.

C.M. SORENSON: That was one of the worst years he ever had.

W.W. PRESCOTT: And yet you read in our books and hear in our sermons that in 538 the pope became supreme. If there is any way of correcting these statements, I wish it might be done.

W.L. BIRD: The Dark Ages should be considered in the same way.

C.P. BOLLMAN: I would just like to read the prophecy. —After this I saw in the night visions, and behold a fourth beast, dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly; and it had great iron teeth: it devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it: and it was diverse from all the beasts that were before it; and it had ten horns.”

That is a picture of 478.

—I considered the horns, and, behold, there came up among them another little horn, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots: and, behold, in this horn were eyes like the eyes of man, and a mouth speaking great things.”

When did this little horn come up? — then, or two or three hundred years before? It says, —I considered the horns, and, behold, there came up **among them**.” And the term —another” conveys to my mind that the ten horns were there when it came up. It came up —among them.” They must have been there or it could not have been —another” one. It seems to me that we shall have to solve it along the lines suggested by Professor Lacey. I think we attribute to this power some things that were actually done before.

A.G. DANIELLS: This is very interesting and very profitable, and what has been said here shows a need for careful study and comparison of views and teaching.

W.W. PRESCOTT: People say that in 1798 the pope was taken prisoner and carried into exile. But Pope Gregory was taken prisoner and also died in exile. If you choose to make that event the condition fixing the date, what is the difference between the experience of Pope Pius and the experience of Pope Gregory. The significance of 1798 is in its setting, that is all. That is the only thing that distinguishes it. Otherwise you have nothing to distinguish it. My difficulty has been that the date is set arbitrarily at 538-1798, and when the pope was taken prisoner that ended it. I know another pope that was taken prisoner.

May I add a word on this general basis? I would like to be understood as being a conservative. I thought I would have to proclaim it to you myself. [Laughter] I do not think we should be looking around for opportunities to change what we have taught. We should start with the idea that this message is a true message, and we are not here to tear it down. That is my position. But I stand here: Because we have taught a thing that does not prove that it cannot be changed; and when we see clear light, we should advance in the light.

There are many people who have thought that they were taking the word of God for their belief in the return of the Jews, the Sunday Sabbath, and many other doctrines. But we come around with a tent and tell them they must not hold those beliefs because their fathers did; and we ask them to change all their creed and tradition. I take my stand on the same platform.

G.B. THOMPSON: Then you do not believe the fathers in this movement were any more infallible than the early fathers?

W.W. PRESCOTT: I believe they were godly men, and that they were led by God.

H.C. LACEY: If I am incorrect in any statement, I would like correction. Our current interpretation and the acceptance of *Thoughts on Daniel and Revelation* as our standard authority, has caused for years independent study and presentation of the study. For 30 years now or more there has been a growing dissatisfaction with the current view, based upon the manifest inaccuracies of the earlier presentation, historical and philological. And a new view, adhering more faithfully to the original text, and in closer harmony with historical facts, has been advocated.

C.S. LONGACRE: I would like to ask a question on the great river Euphrates: Does it represent Turkey or Babylon the Great?

A.O. TAIT: Our brethren have taught that it represents Turkey.

M.C. WILCOX: Maybe we can tell better when we get over there when the sixth plague is poured out.

A.O. TAIT: The Turkish power has not been a king for 300 years. The Turkish power has not been a power in any sense of the word. It has been a puppet that has been holding territory that none of the rest of the powers in Europe was willing to let the others have. The Turkish power cannot answer to that prophecy.

A.G. DANIELLS: Didn't the Lord recognize that decaying process in the book of Revelation of that very power, the Turkish power — its drying up?

A.O. TAIT: Then I will throw in another question: We teach that he dried up or lost his dominion on Aug. 11, 1840.

A.G. DANIELLS: Lost his dominion?

A.O. TAIT: He lost his independence Aug. 11, 1840. We talk that, and then we just whirl right around and set him up there and say that ~~he~~ shall go forth with great fury to destroy, and utterly to make away many," and we put that back in 1798. But, brethren, I cannot see it that way. I do not think that Napoleon Bonaparte meets these specifications at all. I think I am prepared to show very clearly from history that he does not. Napoleon met the Turkish armies twice and destroyed them. They never gathered themselves after that. I do not see how you can have him lose his dominion in 1840 and be the king of the north in 1919.

W.W. PRESCOTT: No the day July 27, 1299 is absolutely discredited. I had the original Greek history out of the Congressional Library for quite a long time, and went over the whole matter. It is a history in Greek with a parallel column translated into Latin, and accompanied by a chronological table, and the author put that event that Gibbon refers to as occurring in 1302. Von Hamer puts it in 1301. Somebody else in 1300, I believe. From my standpoint it doesn't make any difference which it is, and there is no occasion to attempt to prove which it is, because just so long as we interpret the symbols as applying to the Saracens, we certainly must give the time to the Saracens and not to the Ottoman power, and what was presented this morning was simply to show in a general way the beginning of the Ottoman power here at the end of the 13th century.

But the same authority said that from these small beginnings rose a power that was established in 1453. Now we don't date our interpretation of the prophecy of the Roman power from 754 B.C., and yet Rome had its beginning in 754. Now all I ask for is that we shall be consistent with ourselves so that when we stand up before an audience or appear in print we don't expose ourselves any longer to that shocking inconsistency of applying the symbols to two powers, and then turn right around and give the time that belongs right in that prophecy and date it five centuries at least after the power has ceased to be aggressive as a tormentory.

Before 1844 in William Miller's lectures he gives both symbols to the Ottoman power. He adds the periods together, makes 514 years and 15 days date from July 27, 1299, and follows it straight through. Now when you go further you say we will start from July 27, 1299, and we come to 1499. What happened then? We must have something on a day. What happened July 27, 1449, that both marked the ending of one period and the beginning of another, because you must not begin the next day. That is, when we are trying to arrive at Aug. 11, 1840 you can't say this period ends July 27, 1449, and the next began July 28. You have got to make them lap one day or else you are thrown out when you get to the end. That question must be answered. What marked the close of the 150 years on July 27, 1449? What event on that day marked the beginning of the next period? What marked the close of the next period? Until that is out of the way I don't see that we shall be helped very much by any papers seeking to establish a date for something relating to the Ottoman Empire.

W.G. WIRTH: What dates do you give for the 150-year period?

W.W. PRESCOTT: According to the best light I can get, and I am not alone — I suppose it is more or less known here that this whole matter came up several years ago, and the Review and Herald Board appointed a committee to study the question. This committee was composed of F.M. Wilcox, Chairman, W.A. Spicer, M.E. Kern, C.S. Longacre, C.L. Benson, S.M. Butler, and myself. We took up this question, went into it quite thoroughly, and that committee which I think you will regard as not a very extreme or wild committee, came to the conclusion that we could not apply this 150 years beginning July 27, 1299, for the double reason, first, it didn't belong to that power, and second, the date itself could not be established. Then there were further things brought in, so that all the committee came to the conclusion that there was not sufficient evidence to establish the date Aug. 11, 1840. Therefore it was recommended that since it was too large a question for us, it be presented to the General Conference Committee in Council.

The board adopted the recommendation presented. Brother Spicer was to present one phase, Brother Benson another, and I was to present a third phase. We prepared our matter and presented it at the Spring Council, and our papers, working together, set forth these suggestions, not as established orthodoxy, but as suggestions from the Committee for consideration.⁵⁹

It is not strange that our critics deal with us sternly in this area. Very typical is N.F. Douty as he writes on our interpretation of Dan. 9 and the year-day principle in general.

Now, there are two stubborn facts which militate against this construction of Dan. 9. One is that the prophecy is not symbolic but literal. Strange to say, this is acknowledged on p. 227, of *Questions on Doctrine*, where we read: "Dan. 9:24-27 is a continuation of the literal explanation of the symbolic vision." Inasmuch as the literal explanation of a

prophecy is to be taken literally (*ibid.*), it follows that, on Adventist principles, Dan. 9:24-27 is not to be taken symbolically but literally. So, even if the Hebrew word translated “week” meant “seven days,” there would be no way of converting it into “seven years.”

The other stubborn fact is that the Hebrew word translated “week” does not necessarily mean seven days, but often in itself merely denotes a unit of seven, just as “dozen” represents a unit of twelve. Gesenius, in his Hebrew Lexicon, simply defines it as “a septenary number” and adds that sometimes it is applied to days and sometimes to years. The context must determine which it is. In Dan. 10:2, 3, there is an accompanying word, defining the sevens to be those of days. In the preceding chapter, it was not necessary to have an attendant word defining the sevens to be those of years, because the occasion of the prophecy was Daniel’s consideration of the “seventy years” foretold by Jeremiah (vv. 1-2). Over against those seventy are now set seventy sevens. As the former were years, the latter must be such too.

Accordingly, E.B. Elliott, the learned author of the monumental *Horae Apocalypticae* and a firm believer in the year-day idea, admitted that “the Hebrew word (...) has been shown to be a word etymologically of ambiguous meaning, signifying any septenary and applicable to seven years as well as seven days” (Vol. III, p. 962). Again, strange to say, this fact is acknowledged on pp. 276-277 of *Questions on Doctrine*, where we read that the Hebrew word “simply denotes a unit of seven and may designate a period of either seven days or seven years. The intent must be determined by context and usage.” (Cf. *The Bible Made Plain*, p. 42; Thurber, *Symbols of Salvation*, p. 32.) Thus the idea that Dan. 9:24-27 is an instance of the year-day principle, advanced on pp. 309-310, is doubly refuted on pp. 276-277!

This refutation of its own contention about Dan. 9, on the part of Seventh-day Adventism, annihilates the case for the year-day theory. Nevertheless, Adventists infer that the pre-Christian Rabbis and the early Fathers adhered to it, because they understood “the seventy weeks” as seventy weeks of years. However, we have positive evidence from their own writings that the Fathers did not follow this line of interpretation. Justin Martyr, in his “Dialogue with Trypho, a Jew,” says: “He who Daniel foretells would have dominion for a time and times and an half, is even already at the door, about to speak blasphemous and daring things against the Most High. But you, being ignorant of how long he will have dominion, hold another opinion. For you interpret the ‘time’ as being a hundred years. But if this is so, the man of sin must, at the shortest, reign three hundred and fifty years” (Chap. 32). Irenaeus, the Apostle John’s spiritual grandson, says that the three and a half times mean “three years and six months” (*Against Heresies*, Chap. 25.3).

As a matter of fact, *Questions on Doctrine* itself shows that the early church could not have followed the year-day idea. On pages 467-468 we read: “Premillennialism was strong in the early Christian Church. The believers looked for a break-up of the Roman Empire and the coming of a malign anti-Christ who would persecute the saints for three years and a half, followed by the personal advent of Christ. They expected a literal first resurrection at the advent and the setting up of a thousand-year kingdom of the saints reigning with Christ. ... This belief they based on the N. T. prophecies together with the historical prophecies of Daniel, in which they found themselves under the fourth kingdom. They expected the further unfolding of these events in history soon after their day, for they looked for the second advent shortly. ... The millennial kingdom ... was

generally understood to be on earth with the saints reigning over the nations in the flesh.” This accurate account shows that the early Fathers could not have contemplated any prolonged period as preceding Christ’s return. (Incidentally, note the difference between primitive eschatology and that of Adventism.)

It was not until medieval times that Jewish and Christian teachers actually advanced year-dayism (cf. pp. 260, 310). It was first set forth by the former group in the ninth century, and by the latter three centuries later. Joachim of Floris, in Italy, at the close of the twelfth century, applied it to the 1260 days of Rev. 12. Shortly after him, other writers applied it as well to the 1290, 1335 and 2300 days found in Daniel. Joachim was one ~~whose~~ object it was to exalt the Papacy on the ruins of the episcopacy” (Jas. H. Todd on Antichrist, p. 453). The writers who immediately followed him were defenders of extreme authority for the Pope.

These historical facts are very damaging to this system of interpretation. Sober men are not likely to favour a principle that ~~was~~ altogether unknown by the Jewish Church before the Christian era, by the Apostles of our Lord, by the primitive Church, by the Fathers — in short, that no one ever thought of ... during ... the first twelve centuries of Christianity” (S.R. Maitland in *Second Enquiry respecting the prophetic period of Daniel and St. John*, p. 77). Moreover, such men will not have their reservations removed by observing that it originated in apostate Judaism and was developed by the Church of Rome. These considerations give strong reasons for suspecting the validity of the theory.

It is true that most, though not all, of the Reformers, from Wycliffe down, applied the year-day principle to the interpretation of prophecy, but it is plain that they derived it from Rome. The remark of John Robinson, at the departure of the Mayflower Pilgrims from Holland in 1620, is appropriate here: ~~It~~ is not possible the Christian world should come so lately out of such thick antichristian darkness, and that full perfection of knowledge should break forth at once.” It is plain, therefore, that ~~completing~~ the work of the Reformation” involves discarding the year-day theory. Yet Seventh-day Adventism, which claims to be divinely called to this work of completion, has this very theory as its bed-rock foundation, so that to discard it would be to destroy itself.⁶⁰

WERE ADVENTISTS WRONG CONCERNING DANIEL 8:14?

What then are we to say regarding Dan. 8:14? Have we been wrong all these years in seeing in this prophecy a divine word regarding the emergence of the Adventist movement? No, by no means. The year-day principle as regards its practical essence has always been correct — that which could have been fulfilled in days had the church been faithful is now taking years. The expression ~~many~~ days” in Scripture at times has the meaning of ~~many~~ years.”⁶¹ See Num. 20:15 original, and similar verses.

We place in the appendix the best this writer has ever been able to muster for the year-day principle, and now twenty years after producing that statement he is still in sympathy with it as a philosophic basis for God’s permissive providence in hermeneutics. Rev. 11:9, which pictures the witnesses as the same number of days dead as they had previously witnessed in years, as well as our traditional texts Num. 14:34; Eze. 4:6 show that there is a symbolic relationship between days and years, though there are no grounds for asserting that every apocalyptic prophecy should be inevitably so applied. On the contrary, the evidence shows that the long-drawn-out millenniums of evil were no part of God’s ideal plan. Furthermore, the general endorsement of the truth that years rather than days now fulfil the prophecies is a

generalization not intended to authorize dogmatic assertion of precise dates for the fulfilment of apocalyptic symbolism. (Dogmatism on Oct. 22 is certainly without good cause. Our own *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* tells us clearly that the actual time of “the going forth of the word to restore and rebuild Jerusalem” is unknown. See 4:853: “The specifications of the decree were not carried out until Ezra returned from Babylon, which was late summer, or early fall of 457 B.C.” Compare 3:102 which places Ezra’s arrival in the fifth month, not the Day of Atonement on the tenth day of the seventh month. We also would need to settle whether the decree should be dated from the time of issue or the time of implementation.)

Time and again in the early years of the movement, even Sabbath-keeping Adventists set dates for the Lord to come. Joseph Bates, for example, and many of his fellow believers anticipated that Christ would return in 1851, because the high priest traditionally sprinkled seven drops of blood on the mercy seat. Seven added to 1844 made 1851. Only the sage counsel of Ellen G. White diverted the church from that dead-end of continued time-setting.

We have also erred (with the exception of Ellen G. White and a few others) by a rigid historicism as regards prophetic exegesis. While Scripture clearly shows that prophecies may have more than a single fulfilment, and Ellen G. White amply exemplified that truth — as a denomination we have been slow in coming to appreciate the apotelesmatic principle, or what Strand calls “the philosophy of history” approach.

It seems to this writer that the apotelesmatic principle is the very key we need to authenticate our denominational appropriation of Dan. 8:14 to our own time and work. See upcoming section *Dan. 8:14, Day of Atonement, Judgement* (page 234ff); and the section *EGW Prophetic Interpretation in Great Controversy* (in chapter 6); and our following three chapters. **By apotelesmatic we mean dual fulfilment or more.**

So much for the year-day principle, and the conditional element of prophecy. Although clearly stated by Ellen G. White and some of our leading writers, this fact of “conditionality” has never been fully understood among us. Yet it is vital for correct exegesis. The Sabbath school quarterly on Daniel, sent out to the world field in 1967, based its whole scheme of exegesis upon this pivotal point. See appendix, *Studies In the Book of Daniel* (R. Cottrell). Particularly note also our appendix called “Summary on Daniel 8:14 and 1844.”

THE CONTEXTUAL PROBLEM FOR THE TRADITIONAL INTERPRETATION

Next, we must attend to the contextual problem created by our traditional exegesis of Dan. 8:14. When Ellen G. White copied from U. Smith and J.N. Andrews while preparing the sanctuary chapters of *Great Controversy* she also followed their neglect of the question to which Dan. 8:14 is the answer. We do not find Dan. 8:13 quoted in *Great Controversy*. (See appendix, “Should a Question be Answered? A Study of Dan. 8:14.”) But elsewhere, as we shall see, Ellen G. White showed a clear awareness of the significance of that verse.

After describing the successes of the wicked little horn against the sanctuary and its worshippers, the inquiry was made by an angel as to how long such ravages would be permitted to continue. When would heaven intervene and punish the wicked aggressor? Verse 14 was the answer to that inquiry, but the traditional exposition by Seventh-day Adventists never relates the two. Instead, we switch from the theme of the verses about the evil deeds of anti-God powers and concentrate instead on the sins of the saints defiling the

sanctuary. Let it not be missed — the context says nothing about believers doing despite to the sanctuary, but unbelievers.

In an endeavour to meet this enigma, the article “The Problem of Dan. 8:14 and its Context” was written in the early 1960’s and sent to the General Conference. The same general approach was followed in the SPA commentary on Daniel recently published. (See appendix for the former which is mirrored by the latter.) The solution was based on recognition of the apocalyptic nature of the prophecy (apocalyptic is usually cosmic in scope rather than merely national), and the apotelesmatic principle, as well as upon paralleling the “How long” of 8:13 with similar passages. The correct meaning of *tsadaq* was also invoked. **Only when the little horn is seen as the earthly symbol of Satan**, in the sense that the beast of Rev. 12 could be not only pagan and papal Rome, but the great adversary himself — **only then do we see that 8:14 points not merely to a local sanctuary cleansing in the days of Antiochus, but rather to the final resolution of the sin problem by the last judgment**, beginning before the Second Advent, and terminating with the end of the millennium.

To meet the contextual problem it has been suggested that in verse 14 we have audition rather than vision and that heaven is now the centre, and that therefore the sanctuary to be cleansed is in heaven.

But this will not stand investigation. Dan. 8:13, 14 parallels Dan. 12:5-7. Both passages refer to auditions on earth, not in heaven. Dan. 8:16 refers to one of the speakers as a man between the banks of the Ulai. But this “man” is a heavenly visitor for he gives commands to Gabriel. 9:21 refers to the latter as “the man Gabriel.”

It has also been suggested that the militant action described in verses 11-13 did not necessarily defile the sanctuary and that therefore verse 14 does not have such action in mind. But the parallel passage of 8:11-13 is 11:31 and here we find definite reference to a profaning of the sanctuary. The key verb *shalak* is variously translated as cast away, cast down, cast forth, cast off, cast out, hurl, pluck, throw, etc., and certainly fits defiling action. Neh. 13:8 is an example of its highly negative connotation.

THE LINGUISTIC PROBLEM FOR THE TRADITIONAL INTERPRETATION

We have referred to the verb of Dan. 8:14. This Old Testament *hapax legomenon* has its root in a term used hundreds of times in Scripture. But its meaning is not primarily “~~e~~cleanse,” but “~~v~~indicate.” The verb here used, automatically leads us to the question of verse 13 — that is, to the need for vindication.⁶² But vindication is something quite different from blotting out the sins of the saints. While it is true that among the many lesser meanings of *tsadaq*, “~~t~~o cleanse” could be invoked, the cleansing thus indicated would have to comport with what the context states about the need for cleansing. And the context says nothing whatever about saints creating a need for purification when they confess their sins. In fact, if it is only the confession of our sins that causes them to be registered against us, the personal solution for all of us is clear — don’t confess them. Does the record depend upon our fidelity of confession, and our possession of a good memory? And what about our thousand shortcomings which we do not recognize as sin and deserving of repentance? Neither the Old nor the New Testament teach what we have traditionally taught about the confessed sins of the saints defiling the heavenly sanctuary. Even on earth the sanctuary was defiled by the **act** of sin, not its confession. See Num. 19:13, 20; Lev. 20:3.

The whole argument about the sins of believers (though forgiven still requiring blotting out), falls far short of the teaching of Scripture. The text we use in support, Acts 3:19, teaches nothing of the sort. One only needs to compare with Acts 3:19, Acts 2:38, and Psalm 51:1, 2, to see this. Note also that the Greek of Acts 3:19 does not teach a blotting out of sin during the falling of the latter rain, but as a precursor. Thus as Acts 2:38 promised the gift of the Holy Spirit to all who come to Christ as penitents, so does Acts 3:19 — that and no more. Not one of the texts we use for the investigative judgment has any validity in that regard, and will not stand up to grammatico-historical exegesis. This is not to deny the reality of a pre-advent judgment as we will later show, but it is to protest the traditional mode of teaching such.

But — to return to *tsadaq* — that verb has no vital connection with the *taher* of ritual cleansing in Lev. 16. Thus *taher* is not found in Dan. 8, and *tsadaq* is not found in Lev. 16. Why then did the LXX use *katharizo* in Dan. 8:14? Because they saw in that verse a prophecy of the reconsecration of the sanctuary by the Maccabees in their victory over Antiochus Epiphanes. So the vast majority of scholars believe.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE CONTEXTUAL AND THE LINGUISTIC EVIDENCE

It may appear to some that the arguments from context and language are separate, but this is not the case. They should be viewed together. The context sets forth a situation that demands redress — the host of God, the truth of God, the temple of God — all are being shamefully treated. —How long, O Lord?— is a cry which is the very essence of apocalyptic. See Rev. 6:10, and compare Ps. 74:9, 10; 89:46; 94:1-6; Hab. 1:2; Zech. 1:12, etc.

To detach Dan. 8:14 from this cry is to be exegetically at sea without an anchor. Verse 14 is the promise of encouragement to beleaguered saints. These evils will not go forever uncorrected. Transgression will be punished, and sin avenged. That which is cast down will be restored to its rightful estate.

Furthermore, Dan. 8:13, 14 is no isolated pericope, but the heart and pulse-throb of the entire book. It illuminates the whole and is illuminated by the whole. Every chapter of Daniel is concerned with the theme of vindication, and the Hebrew *ad* (until when) is a recurring linguistic phenomenon as might be expected.

In chapter one, Daniel and his fellows are on trial. Their religion is being tested before the heathen. But the trial has a limit. And at the end of the time they are vindicated, found better than the heathen, and elevated to honour. In chapter two, the wisdom of Israel is on trial, compared with the wisdom of the heathen astrologers. Daniel asks for time, and is given it. At the end of the time, again Israel and Israel's God are vindicated.

In the third chapter, those faithful to the Torah are threatened with incineration. They are given time for reconsideration, but then are thrown into the fiery furnace, only to be vindicated by the delivering Son of God. Chapter four shows a proud, arrogant monarch who exalts himself against the God of heaven, but only for a limited period. Then judgment falls, and heaven is seen as ruler indeed. Similarly, in chapter five, another presumptuous king profanes the holy things of the sanctuary. But God has fixed the limit of transgression, and Belshazzar has reached that limit. He falls under the invader's knife.

Chapter six is a replay of three, with those loyal to the law of their God threatened once more. He, in whom has been found an excellent spirit, endures trial triumphantly, and is delivered

by the God who had been thus challenged by heathenism. In the following chapter, what has been repeatedly **acted** out, is **taught** out by prophetic vision. A tyrant, embodying the characteristics of pride, idolatry, and vengeful persecution, personified by Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, and Darius, is to arise to lay waste the saints. But only **until** the judgment sits. His period of apparent victory is limited to a time, times, and half a time, and then the heavenly assessors condemn him to the fire.

Chapter eight goes over the same ground — earthly powers are again represented by beasts, and finally a beast who brings forth a little horn which grows great even to the host of heaven, and casts down the stars and tramps upon them. The holy truth and places are trodden down, and the cry ascends: ~~How~~ long, O Lord? Until when shall this iniquity triumph?" In reply, the heavenly messenger gives the assurance:

~~Unto~~ two thousand and three hundred days, then shall the sanctuary be restored to its rightful estate — then shall truth and its followers be vindicated."

As we turn to chapter nine, the sequence is the same. **The whole chapter is an elaboration of 8:13, 14.** The prayer pleading for vindication and restoration can be equated with the plea of 8:13. Listen to the climax of that prayer: ~~Now~~, therefore, O our God, hearken to the prayer of Thy servant and to his supplications, and for thy own sake, O Lord, cause thy face to shine upon thy sanctuary, which is desolate. ... O Lord, hear; O Lord forgive; O Lord, give heed and act; **delay not** for thy own sake ..." (9:17, 19). Then comes the equivalent of 8:14. 9:24-27 is but an expansion of the promise of that verse. The Most Holy Place is to be anointed afresh, restored to its rightful place, and sin is to be ended, transgression finished, and iniquity expiated — thus the sanctuary is ~~e~~leansed" or ~~v~~indicated."

This same sequence of trial and deliverance, threat and promise, night and morning, death and resurrection continues throughout the remaining chapters.

Particularly observe the following parallels:

- 7:8, 9 ... another horn, a little one, ... eyes like the eyes of a man, and a mouth speaking great things. I looked **until** (Hebrew: *ad*) the thrones were placed ... The court sat in judgment ...
- 7:21, 22 As I looked, this horn made war with the saints, and prevailed over them, **until** (Hebrew: *ad*) the Ancient of Days came, and judgment was given for the saints of the Most High ...
- 8:13,14 ~~For~~ how long (Hebrew: *ad*) is the vision concerning the continual burnt offering, the transgression that makes desolate, and the giving over of the sanctuary and the host to be trampled under foot?" And he said to him, ~~For~~ two thousand three hundred evenings and mornings; then the sanctuary shall be restored to its rightful state."
- 9:27 ... and upon the wing of abominations shall come one who makes desolate, **until** (Hebrew: *ad*) the decreed end is poured out upon the desolator.
- 11:36 And the king shall do according to his will, he shall exalt himself and magnify himself above every god, and shall speak astonishing things against the God of gods. He shall prosper **until** (Hebrew: *ad*) the indignation be accomplished; for what is determined shall be done.

12:6 ~~How~~ **long** (Hebrew: *ad*) shall it be till the end ...

12:9 —...**until** (Hebrew: *ad*) the time of the end.”

Both the narratives and the visions tell the same story. Evil is allowed to prosper for only so long, only **until** the judgment sits, and the books recording the evil deeds of the blasphemers are opened. Then comes deliverance, restoration, vindication. This is the message of Dan. 7:9-13; 8:13, 14; 9:3-27; 12:6-13 — indeed this is the message of the entire book. We find the same theme echoed in the New Testament apocalypse: ~~I~~saw under the altar the souls of those who had been slain for the word of God and for the witness they had borne; they cried out with a loud voice, O Sovereign Lord, holy and true, how long before thou wilt judge and avenge. ...‘ Then they were each given a white robe and told to rest a little longer, **until** the number of their fellow servants and their brethren should be complete, who were to be killed as they themselves had been” (Rev. 6:9-11).

THE JUDGMENT FOCUSES ON UNBELIEVERS, NOT BELIEVERS

The over-all message, and witness of the parallel passages of Daniel, make it quite clear that 8:14 has to do with the redress of wickedness, the punishment of those outside of Christ, and the vindication of believers. The judgment brought to view has the lost as the focus — not the people of God. It is the little horn that is being investigated, not the suffering saints. The books enshrine the records of wilful transgressions of Satan’s followers, not the failures of the worshippers of Yahweh.

Similarly, the judgment of Rev. 14:7, (as set forth in the *Daniel* quarterly of 1967) is not a judgment of the saints but of Babylon. This harmonizes with the use of ~~judgment~~” throughout the apocalypse. Rev. 14:7 is made clear by the parallel passages cf 6:9, 10; 16:4-7; 17:1; 18:6-10; 18:20; 19:1-3.

And he said with a loud voice, ~~Fear~~ God and give him glory, for the hour of his judgment has come; and worship him who made heaven and earth, the sea and the fountains of water.” (Rev. 14:7 RSV)

When he opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar the souls of those who had been slain for the word of God and for the witness they had borne; they cried out with a loud voice, ~~O~~ Sovereign Lord, holy and true, how long before thou wilt judge and avenge our blood on those who dwell upon the earth?” (Rev. 6:9, 10 RSV)

The third angel poured his bowl into the rivers and the fountains of water, and they became blood. And I heard the angel of water say,

~~Just~~ art thou in these thy judgments, thou who art and wast, O Holy One. For men have shed the blood of saints and prophets, and thou hast given them blood to drink. It is their due!”

And I heard the altar cry, ~~Yea~~, Lord God the Almighty, true and just are thy judgments!” (Rev. 16:4-7 RSV)

Then one of the seven angels who had the seven bowls came and said to me, ~~Come~~, I will show you the judgment of the great harlot who is seated upon many waters.” (Rev. 17:1 RSV)

Render to her as she herself has rendered, and repay her double for her deeds; mix a double draught for her in the cup she mixed. As she glorified herself and played the wanton, so give her a like measure of torment and mourning. Since in her

heart she says, “A queen I sit, I am no widow, mourning I shall never see,‘ so shall her plagues come in a single day, pestilence and mourning and famine, and she shall be burned with fire; for mighty is the Lord God who judges her.”

And the kings of the earth, who committed fornication and were wanton with her, will weep and wail over her when they see the smoke of her burning; they will stand far off, in fear of her torment, and say,

~~—~~Alas! alas! thou great city, thou mighty city, Babylon! In one hour has thy judgment come.” (Rev. 18:6-10 RSV)

~~—~~Rejoice over her, O heaven, O saints and apostles and prophets, for God has given judgment for you against her!” (Rev. 18:20 RSV)

After this I heard what seemed to be the mighty voice of a great multitude in heaven, crying,

~~—~~Hallelujah! Salvation and glory and power belong to our God, for his judgments are true and just; he has judged the great harlot who corrupted the earth with her fornication, and he has avenged on her the blood of his servants.” Once more they cried, ~~—~~Hallelujah! The smoke from her goes up for ever and ever.” (Rev. 19:1-3 RSV)

Note that not only does the word ~~—~~judgment” of Rev. 14:7 recur in later passages, but also ~~—~~hour.” See 18:10, 17, 19. Rev. 14:7-8 reflects Jer. 51:6: ~~—~~Flee from the midst of Babylon, let every man save his life! Be not cut off in her punishment, for this is the time of the Lord’s vengeance, the requital he is rendering her.” And Jer. 51:9, 10: ~~—~~Forsake her, and let us go ... for her judgment has reached up to heaven. ... The Lord has brought forth our vindication. ...”

Particularly observe the relationship between God’s judgments and His sanctuary. Jer. 50:28: ~~—~~Hark! they flee and escape from the land of Babylon, to declare in Zion the vengeance of the Lord our God, **vengeance for his temple.**” Cf. Rev. 6:10: ~~—~~... how long before thou wilt judge and avenge? ...” (*Neqamah* and *ekdikeo* are synonyms, and both are conceptually related to *tsadaq* of Dan. 8:14, and *krisis* of Rev. 14:7.) Rev. 6:10 also has a sanctuary context.

This review makes it evident that the sequence of the apocalyptic prophecies of Daniel and Revelation is universally one of threat and deliverance, aggression and judgment, the triumph of the wicked and the vindication of the saints. This sequence is the key to Dan. 8:13, 14, and is a test for every proposed interpretation of that passage including our traditional Adventist presentation. Judgment throughout apocalyptic is judgment upon the wicked and in favour of the saints. Never are the saints the focus of divine investigation. If they are in right covenant relationship with God, their status is not open to question at any time.

So far, it will have seemed that we have contented ourselves with throwing verbal stones at the denominational position on Dan. 8:14 — although as earlier shown, the traditional position is often not even invoked by contemporary Adventist expositors of Dan. 8:14. If we deny that it teaches an investigation of the sins of the saints from Adam on, beginning in 1844 — what does it teach?

The inquiry is crucial, and simple. But while an adequate reply is also crucial, it cannot be simple. There are just too many factors involved. We can give a simple reply, but not one that will immediately answer all subsequent inquiries. In essence, such a reply would be as follows:

DANIEL 8:14, THE DAY OF ATONEMENT, AND THE JUDGMENT

Dan. 8:14 is the heart of the book of Daniel. It is the verse that links the narrative and prophetic sides of the book, and enshrines the word which best sums up the theme of the whole — vindication. This verse is the zenith of the symbolic presentations of Daniel, and all thereafter contributes to its meaning. It is the seed of all key apocalyptic presentations of the New Testament, being invoked by Christ, Paul, and John. Dan. 8:14 is indeed the most important verse, summing up its key themes of the sanctuary, the kingdom of God (symbolized by the sanctuary), the judgment and *paliggenesia*, redemption provided and applied, Christ and Antichrist. It parallels the stone of Dan. 2 which becomes a mountain (analogous to a temple in Jewish and other eastern minds), the Son of Man receiving the kingdom in Dan. 7, and the standing up of Michael in Dan. 12. According to the explanation given of it in 9:24, this vindication of holiness (there is no article before *kodesh* in 8:14) takes place through the antitypical day of atonement. The verse, like Dan. 2:44; 7:9-13; 12:1; and 9:24-27 is apotelesmatic in application, fitting not only the victory over the typical Antichrist, Antiochus, in 165 BC, but the great redemption of the cross, and its final application in the last judgment. (Just as Isaiah 40-66 picture not only the victory over Babylon, but over sin.) **It applies also to every revival of true religion where the elements of the kingdom of God, mirrored in the sanctuary by the stone tablets and the mercy seat, are proclaimed afresh, as at 1844.**

Central to this explanation is the fact that when the same angel of Dan. 8, Gabriel, returns in 9 to help Daniel — “understand the matter,” he covers the identical ground of the times of Medo-Persia, Greece, and Antichrist — but instead of speaking of the vindication of the sanctuary, he speaks of — “finishing the transgression, making an end of sin, making atonement for iniquity, bringing in everlasting righteousness, sealing up the vision, and anointing the most holy.” **This statement is the explanation of 8:14, just as Dan. 7:9-13 pictorially represents the same. Note that the key ideas: transgression, sin, iniquity, atonement, most holy — all five occur in only one other place of Scripture — Lev. 16. Dan. 9:24 (and 8:14 of which it is explanatory) points to the antitypical day of atonement in fulfilment and consummation (that is, to both advents).** Even those who date Daniel as belonging to the second century BC and who believe Antiochus is its centre, recognize that 9:24 and 8:14 mean the same thing.⁶³

The purpose of *Yom Kippur* was to symbolically portray the end of sin. The basic meaning of *kippur* is not forgiveness but eradication of sin. (See our later discussion in this chapter. The *HERE* article on expiation states that the original meaning *kippur* was probably “to wipe out” rather than “to cover up.”) The former springs from the latter. The defiled sanctuary was a symbol of the kingdom of God — a kingdom requiring vindication. How could a God who passed over sin be esteemed? This is the very problem linked with atonement and the mercy seat in the doctrinal heart of the New Testament — Rom. 3:21-28.

The problem was, and ever has been, how can God be just and yet the justifier of the penitents who defile His kingdom, and patient with reprobates who do the same and more? Only the cross could answer that, and that answer is the heart of the New Testament. See Rom. 3:3, 26.

But the cross is only fully understood in the light of the last judgment when the fruitage of faith and unbelief are both manifested. It is vital we recall the whole Biblical package of atonement. While primarily and basically implying the abolition of sin — its elements can be differentiated as follows: the atonement as to God Himself means propitiation, to penitent sinners it means reconciliation, but to sin it means eradication. In the words of Ellen G.

White, ~~the~~ purification of the sanctuary” pointed to ~~the~~ final purification of the universe from sin and sinners” (PP 358). Note the words of the SPA *Daniel* commentary:

The Cleansing, Vindication, Restoration, of the Sanctuary

We have come now to the crux of our studies: What is meant by the cleansing of the sanctuary?

And, of course, our answer has already been laid down for us if our reflections so far have been accurate. If this verse is the high point of the symbolic presentation, the seed of all that follows (including New Testament eschatology) as well as the summary of what has preceded, if its verb reflects the theme of the book, then the correct exegesis is already prescribed for us. ~~Then shall the sanctuary be cleansed [restored,~~ **judgment, restoration, vindication, the coming of the kingdom, elevation of the saints, punishment of the wicked, the establishment of a new order of things.**

If 8:14 parallels 7:9-13, it is saying the same thing and points to the great assize and Christ’s taking the kingdom for His people. If it is expanded in 9:24 and is parallel thereto, we must look for the consummation of what took place at Calvary — finishing of transgression, the making of an end of sin, atonement for iniquity, the bringing in of everlasting righteousness, the fulfilment of all prophetic vision, and the anointing or dedication of a new system of things, even fellowship between God and His restored people.

If the last part of the book is commentary on the last part of this vision as previously suggested, then 8:14 means that chapter 12 — particularly 12:13 — says that all the saints shall stand in the judgment and receive their eternal destiny after the 2300 days. In that case ~~the time of the end~~” spoken of in 8:17 will mean the period of the judgment.

If 8:13 echoes the common Biblical plea for divine intervention and judgment, then verse 14 must point to the answer to that plea.

Once more, if the sanctuary is the microcosm of the kingdom of God, then its cleansing, vindication, restoration, must point to the reestablishment of that kingdom over the kingdom of men. [Footnote: To understand Daniel’s own reflections in connection with this vision, it is essential that we view it against his experience as recorded in the opening verses of the book. There we read of the despite done to the sanctuary by a power from the north. Subsequently the daily ~~was~~ taken away.” Ancient and modern commentators are agreed that the calamity that overlooks the sanctuary between 605 and 586 BC represents the dissolution of the kingdom of God on earth. The sanctuary was a microcosm of the divine kingdom operating among men. It represented not only the reign of God according to His righteous law but also His desire to dwell among men in order to bless them. Therefore the promise of Dan. 8:14 could have meant to Daniel nothing less than the restoration of the sanctuary, with the reestablishment of all its services, particularly those which emphasized the final judgment on sin and complete reconciliation between Jehovah and His people. Thus the kingdom of God on earth would once more become operative.]

Furthermore we would expect to find something in the typical services of the sanctuary that comprehends all the concepts so far specified — something which would point to a

finishing of sin, an atonement, a reconciliation, and a new beginning, with joy for the righteous and sorrow for those who have refused the sanctuary's provisions.

Was there any familiar sanctuary ritual that spoke of all these things to the Jew? Indeed there was! [Footnote: Some refer to the enthronement festivals, and although these may not have involved all that such scholars refer to, it is certain that the autumn feasts prefigured the enthronement of the Almighty among His purified people.] The Day of Atonement, the crucial service of the seventh month, to the Jew was a summation of God's salvation. Coming at the end of the religious year, it pointed to the end of time. It belonged to the second complex of feasts, each member of which had eschatological significance. [Footnote: Revelation, the eschatological book par excellence in the New Testament, selects for its setting the imagery of the autumn feasts of Israel — trumpets, atonement, and tabernacles. In connection with the seventh seal, the seventh trumpet, the seven last plagues, and the commencement of the millennium we find elements of the Day of Atonement ceremonial.]

On this special day, the only such of the year, the whole camp felt that it was on review by God. While day by day the Israelites had come individually to the sanctuary, now all were present at the one time for the sealing of decisions made throughout the months preceding. The camp saw in the two goats not only the representatives of God's dealings with Christ and the antichrist but also the representatives of the two groups in their own midst — one to be sealed for Jehovah and the other marked for Azazel.

The solemn silence marking the camp that day; the absolute prohibition of all types of secular work; the divesting by the high priest of his glorious robes and the substitution of an ordinary linen garment; his provision of much incense in order to pass into the second apartment where resided the law, the mercy seat, and the Shekinah glory; the return to the courtyard after a change back into the special apparel; the laying hold of the goat for Azazel and the symbolic lading of it with all the forgiven sins from the sanctuary (which hitherto had taken responsibility for them); the sending away of the goat into the wilderness; the final heap of ashes in a clean place as the only visible memory of the day; the subsequent rejoicing as the people now entered into the joys of the great harvest festival; the ascension to Jerusalem for festivity; the beginning of the jubilee (if it was the fiftieth year), with its freedom and release from bondage and debt — each and all of these pointed to the great reality of the final judgment and the kingdom of God in glory thus ushered in. Here then was the cleansing, vindicating, restoring, of the sanctuary in type. [Footnote: Our reasoning concerning the significance of the Day of Atonement for 8:14 is confirmed when we find the prophet in the next chapter praying for the restoration of the sanctuary and its services. In harmony with his prayer regarding the iniquity, transgressions, sins, of his people, pleading the everlasting righteousness of God as witnessed by prophets, the prophet is visited by Gabriel, who takes all the key elements of his prayer and weaves them into heavenly promises. Part of the angel's message has to do with atonement for iniquity. The three words here used by the angel for sin had their chief combined usage in connection with the Day of Atonement (see Lev. 16:21 and cf. Dan. 9:24). Only in one other place in all the Bible are the three items conjoined — Ex. 34:7, where the character of God — which is to be vindicated in the judgment — is described. James Barr rightly says on 9:24: "The meaning ... is to be the eradication of sin, the completion of atonement, the establishment of an everlasting right order and a holy sanctuary." All of this was provided for and legally established by the atonement of Christ on Calvary, but it will be implemented in full only at the end of the age.]

It is not strange therefore that some Jewish and Christian scholars have paraphrased 8:14 as: —Then shall the sanctuary have atonement made for it.” Calvin says, —Some translate it — Then the sanctuary shall be expiated.’ —[Footnote: Calvin, Vol. II, p. 110.]

Concerning the day of expiation, Lev. 16 is indeed the final clue for the exposition of 8:14. Pointing forward to the great atonement made on Calvary for us by Christ, the antitypical Lord’s goat, it also prefigures the last work for us by Christ, our High Priest. (Footnote: The Old Testament always views redemption as a single act, and the first and second advents are not differentiated.) It pictures the placing of the responsibility for evil upon its true instigator, the true little horn — Satan himself. [Footnote: Cf. Rev. 12:4, 9.] Thus God’s character, so long trampled in the dust by the scandal of sin, will be vindicated.

In the light of these reflections it becomes apparent that the apocalyptic portrayal of 8:10-14 symbolizes the great controversy between good and evil and its climax. The vindication of the sanctuary, which represents the divine kingdom, points not only to the vindication of the saints in the judgment but also to the vindication of God and His truth. It must include, therefore, a work on earth that —cleanses” the church, God’s sanctuary on earth, from the traditions of men and the shame of sin. [Footnote: Notice these two statements by E. G. White: —The church of God upon the earth are one with the church of God above. Believers on the earth, and those who have never fallen in heaven, are one church. ... In the inner court of heaven they listen to the testimonies of the witnesses for Christ in the outer court on earth” (*The Signs of the Times*, June 6, 1895). —The Jewish tabernacle was a type of the Christian church. ... The church on earth, composed of those who are faithful and loyal to God, is the true tabernacle, ‘whereof the Redeemer is the minister. God, and not man, pitched this tabernacle on a high, elevated platform. This tabernacle is Christ’s body, and from north, south, east, and west, He gathers those who shall help to compose it. ... Through Christ the true believers are being represented as being built together for an habitation of God through the Spirit” (*Ibid.*, February 14, 1900).] The law, which is so often in Scripture called —the truth” and which has been cast to the ground, must be uplifted. The true —daily” — the everlasting gospel of righteousness by faith, which has been —taken away” by all counterfeit religious systems — must be proclaimed again. [Footnote: John Wycliffe, Walter Brute, Nicolaus von Amsdorf, and others of Reformation times expounded the —daily” of chapter 8 as the symbol for the true gospel and the acceptable worship accompanying it. Fletcher, Wesley’s close associate, did likewise. See excursus on 8:14 at end of commentary on chapter 8 for more on the —daily.”]

Part of God’s truth that has especially been made war against is the Sabbath commandment in the heart of the law. [Footnote: See comments on 7:25.] This commandment was intended by our Creator to be a constant symbol of the great truths of the gospel — a symbol that all we need comes by grace from Him and is not earned by human works but received through a vital relationship of trust and worship. This too must be proclaimed afresh in the —time of the end.” The heavenly sanctuary, one with the church sanctuary on earth and whence all that happens down here is controlled, where Christ ministers as the great *Goel* — the Redeemer and Avenger of His people — must become central in the thinking of God’s people. Its symbolism pictorializes all the great truths of law, gospel, providence, judgment, the kingdom, that we need to keep fresh in memory.

It would take another whole book to elaborate the truths implicit in the sanctuary and its cleansing. We do not attempt that here. Neither need we spell out in greater detail what has already been said, for if our foundations were well laid, the conclusions now reached are automatic. They are the logical consequence of all that has preceded all which follows in the Book of Daniel. Nevertheless, there is one aspect of the symbolism which should be yet alluded to — the reference to what scholars call the concept of “the new temple.” [Footnote: Keep in mind that the New Testament’s eschatological stress on the kingdom does the same thing as Daniel — repeatedly employs the imagery of the temple, or sanctuary. The theme of the new temple underlies several of Christ’s sayings about Himself, His church, and His coming kingdom, and Paul and John continue the same metaphor.] Both 8:14 and 9:24 are included in the series of Old Testament texts which promise the institution of a new temple.

The new temple is a central idea of biblical eschatology from the earliest times and is found in the most diverse backgrounds. It explains the priestly legislation and the priestly interpretation of history (both of which developed around the desire for a sanctuary worthy of God); it explains the great prophecies of the exile and post-exilic periods and the disappointment and enervation which the programme of Ezra and Nehemiah was designed to combat, **just as it provides an important key to the meaning of apocalyptic.** [Footnote: McKelvey, *The New Temple*, p. 179 (emphasis supplied).]

Already in Tg. on Isa. 53:5 (Str-B., I. 482) the Messiah builds the house of the sanctuary; cf. also Tg. on Zech. 6:12f. (Str-B., I. 94). ... There is no Jerusalem without the temple. [Footnote: Gottlob Schrenk, “*Hieron*,” TDNT, Vol III, p. 240.]

The glory of God — *kabod* in the Hebrew Bible, *doxa* in LXX and New Testament — is another name for the Shekinah. ... It may be specially associated with the tent of meeting ... or with the Temple. ... It is present in a special way in the heavenly temple (Rev. xv. 8) and in the heavenly city (Rev. xxi. 23). [Footnote: R. A. Stewart, “*Shekinah*,” *The New Bible Dictionary*, ed. J.D. Douglas (Grand Rapids: Win. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 62), pp. 1174, 1175.]

Why is Christ “greater than the Temple”? There can be only one all-embracing answer. It is because God’s presence is more manifest in Him than the Temple. On Him, not on the Temple, now rests the Shekinah, ... the Lord Himself is the true Temple. [Footnote: Alan Cole, *The New Temple*, p. 12.]

So neither the teaching about the New Temple “not made with hands,” nor the abolition and destruction of the old material Temple ... are accidents or afterthoughts to Christianity. They are of its *esse*, inevitable corollaries of its central message. [Footnote: *Ibid.*, p. 55. See also, Beasley-Murray, *Jesus And The Future*, p. 202; *Jesus als Weltvollender*, cited by Beasley-Murray, *ibid.*; cf. Reinhart Hummel, *Die Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kirche und Judentum in Matthäusevangelium* (Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1963), p. 93; Julius Schniewind, *Das Evangelium nach Markus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoe & Ruprecht, 1963), p. 175; A. Feuillet, *op cit*, pp. 196-198; Yves M. J. Congar, *The Mystery of the Temple*, trans. Reginald F. Trevett (Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1962), p. 159.]

Thus in recent years several scholars have devoted themselves to this study, and their work has direct bearing on our present task — the exposition of 8:14.

In one sense that which was promised by the Old Testament referring to a new temple met its fulfilment in Christ and His church. [Footnote: If the question is asked, “What relevance can the Jewish sanctuary have for Christians?” the answer is near at hand for all familiar with the New Testament. It is the Book of Hebrews particularly that shows the relationship between the old and the new covenant, the typical services and their antitypical substance. See, for example, Heb. 8 and 9. But the Gospels and many of the other epistles are also rich in teaching concerning the significance of the sanctuary, or temple, for the Christian church. While Hebrews speaks in terms of the heaven of heavens where Christ intercedes for us as the true tabernacle, it also implies that the church itself where the Spirit of Christ ministers is also God’s temple (see Heb. 12:22-24; 13:10-13). Says McKelvey, “The new temple of the epistle embraces heaven and earth” (*The New Temple*, p. 150). The Gospels emphasize this aspect of the ancient symbolism as they portray Christ as the New Temple, and teach as well that the same metaphor fits His body, that is to say, the church. Passages such as Eph. 2:20-22; 2 Cor. 6:16-7:1; and 1 Pe. 2:4-10 elaborate further such teaching. McKelvey shows that Christ’s cleansing of the temple in Passion Week is part of the motif of judgment. He points out that the Gospels purposely interweave Old Testament passages of eschatological significance into such descriptions as the triumphal entry and subsequent events (see *The New Temple*, pp.61-76). The Book of Revelation also abounds in temple imagery. Particularly does it incorporate allusions to the times of Antiochus Epiphanes and the defiling of the temple that then took place as symbolic of attacks on the Christian church through the ages and specially at the end time (see Rev. 11). Thus John’s presentation of the Holy City as a new temple with God Himself tabernacling with His people points to the issue of the final judgment upon sin and sinners. All earlier cleansings of the temple prefigured this eschatological climax (see Rev. 21:1-3; cf. with 11:19; 8:1-3; 20:1-3; and the typical ceremonial of Lev. 16).]

Let us summarize. We have viewed 8:14, the climax to the symbolism of the book, in the light of its historical and literary contexts. The historical context indicates that the treading down of the sanctuary could be vindicated only by its restoration and the implementation of all that its services symbolized, particularly the closing services of the year — trumpets, atonement, tabernacles — which pointed to the consummation.

The literary context of parallel passages leads to the same conclusion. Scholars equate 7:9, 10, 26, 27 and 9:24 with 8:14 as all pointing to the final establishment of the kingdom via the medium of the judgment. Also part of the literary context is the enlargement of chapter 8 found in chapters 11 and 12. Chapter 11, verse 31f, describes the same events as 8:10ff. It speaks of a polluting of the sanctuary that would call for a corresponding cleansing. It speaks of a defiling that would demand an atonement. In plainer words still, in that closing portion of the final prophecy (12:13), which corresponds in place to the closing verse of the symbolism of chapter 8 (v. 14), Daniel is told he will stand in judgment at the end of the days to receive his eternal lot or inheritance. The literary content of Daniel’s narratives also offers the same theme — the vindication of God and His people.

Even on the grounds of etymology the suggested meaning is supported, for 8:14 uses the Niph’al form of *tsadaq*, while 9:24 uses the same root and links it with the adjective *olam*, or “everlasting,” found in that section of chapter 7 corresponding to 8:14 (see 7:27). Thus scholars such as Feuillet rightly insist on linking the judgment scene of chapter 7 with the promise of vindication in 8:14 and the consummation of that everlasting covenant regarding the forgiveness of sins as found in 9:24.

The immediate context of verse 13 with its “How long?” inquiry confirms all the foregoing. This oft-repeated plea is ever a prayer for divine intervention and judgment.

Last of all, the larger context of 8:14 must include the New Testament, particularly its eschatological portions and chiefly the Book of Revelation. Here we find the end of all things and the fulfilment of the divine covenant promises regarding forgiveness and communion in the everlasting kingdom. It is spelled out in terms of the feasts of Israel’s seventh month, especially the Day of Atonement, **the day** of sanctuary ritual — that ancient symbolic day of judgment when Israel was divided into two camps and numbered either with the Lord or with the great adversary. In this book also we find pictured all that was symbolized by the ancient promise of a restored sanctuary. Rev. 21:3 tells of “the new temple” so long foretold.

Thus 8:14 points to (we employ various terms to communicate its meaning fully) —

- ... the eschaton.
- ... the undoing of the work of antichrist.
- ... the vindication of God’s people, His truth, and His character.
- ... the judgment day, which ushers in the kingdom of God with Christ dwelling with His people as the New Temple promised throughout the prophets.
- ... the final proclamation of “that gospel of the kingdom” (cf. Matt. 24:14 and Rev. 14:6, 7).

Our initial three questions regarding the terminus of Dan. 8, the identification of the little horn, and the cleansing of the sanctuary have now been answered. Let the reader evaluate whether or not the answers are interrelated consistent both with each other and with the premises earlier laid down by way of introduction and exegesis, and whether the conclusions arrived at match the grandeur of the Biblical passage as indicated by the points made at the commencement of this chapter. The personal spiritual challenge that results from an understanding of these truths is just such a challenge as might be expected in this crucial period of earth’s history. A true understanding of chapter 8 is calculated to furnish the dynamics needed for revival in the individual, the church, and the world.

This grand revelation assures us of the fidelity of God and of His plan to make an end of sin and to bring in everlasting righteousness. He has forgotten neither His downtrodden people nor the neglected law. Soon the universe will see holiness vindicated, [Footnote: Keil places much stress on the fact that the word used for the temple in 8:14 is not identical with that employed in 8:11; 9:17; 11:31. It is the abstract term for holiness that is employed. For this reason he objects to the view that the promise of 8:14 points merely to a consecration of the sanctuary at the end of the days. “The words of the text ... comprehend more than the purification and reconsecration of the temple” (p. 305). His suggestions that the promise of 8:14 implies the restoration to its right state of “all that is holy” (*ibid.*) Others, such as Moses Stuart, have also seen the breadth of the statement. Thus our own exposition as found above — an exposition that alone harmonizes with the subsequent Danielic use of this vision (see particularly 12:1-3), and the New Testament employment of the same throughout its eschatology (see Mk. 13; Matt. 24; Luke 21; 2 Thess. 2; and the entire Book of Revelation, especially 21:1-3).] and amid eternal hallelujahs heaven’s choirs will sing, “Just and true are thy ways, O King of the ages! ... For thy judgments have been revealed” (Rev. 15:3,4).⁶⁴

This is the great theme of Daniel. That kingdom of God which was symbolized by the sanctuary trodden down by Babylon and its successors would ultimately be vindicated through the kingdom of the Messiah which would swallow up all earthly powers. (See appendix, *“Daniel 8 and the Kingdom of God.”*) Thus the stone smites the image, the Son of Man judges the little horn and delivers the beast to the flames, the little horn of chapter 8 is broken and the sanctuary vindicated, the wicked come to their end with none to help them, but the saints whose names are found written in the book stand in their lot to shine as the brightness of the star’s for ever and ever.

Dan. 8 was not written in a vacuum. Its scribe had seen the Jerusalem sanctuary defiled by Babylonian invaders, and its *“daily”* taken away. He had prayed for more than half a century that God would intervene and vindicate His people and His holy place, and the response given him in Dan. 9:24-27 not only matched the prayer of that chapter, but the prayers of seventy years. The soon-coming redemption from the captivity of Babylon was used by God to mirror the greater redemption from sin. As Isaiah used the deliverance through God’s anointed Shepherd King Cyrus as a figure of the deliverance through the true Sun (Cyrus means *“Sun”*) of righteousness, and mingled the two advents as though one, so does Dan. 8:14 and 9:24-27 (and indeed all Old Testament pictures of the kingdom of God). Every climax to a prophetic chain in Daniel points to the establishment of God’s kingdom and 8:14 is unique among these in its depth of symbolic import. Seventh-day Adventists, and their predecessors the Millerites, were not wrong when they asserted the eschatological significance of this passage. In essence they were correct, and far in advance of most of their contemporaries who limited 8:14 to the Maccabean era.

So much for our simple answer, though some will not see it as simple. Because many questions will automatically arise from this shorthand presentation, we have attached in the appendices more detailed materials on Dan. 8:14 and its explanation in 9:24-27. We trust none will criticize our brief explanation until they have read the larger one. In fact, we venture to wish that the whole commentary on Daniel by this writer could be read — as, from the first page to the last, 8:14 is in view.

It should be observed that the exposition of Dan. 9:24-27 in the SPA *Daniel* is emphatic on the conditional nature of the promises there set forth, and upon God’s intention that all (thus including *“the cleansing of the sanctuary”*) should have been fulfilled and consummated by AD 34. The application made in this commentary to 1844, which has been criticized as much too slight, finds its explanation in this conditional nature of chapters 8 and 9 as clearly taught also in the lesson quarterly of 1967, and intimated in the *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* article on *“The Role of Israel in Old Testament Prophecy”* (4:27-36). 1844 thus becomes a providential reinterpretation and an apotelesmatic fulfilment, rather than the primary intention of the apocalyptic passage. It is by no means insignificant because of that, but ceases to be a competitor with Calvary and the Second Advent.

Seventh-day Adventists have been right in seeing the theme of judgment in Dan. 8:14. That verse finds its parallel in the judgment scene of 7:9-13, and also in 12:1-3, 14 (cf. Ps. 1:5). But the judgment is not something to be feared by penitent believers.

To the Jews the thought of judgment was ever *“good news,”* and as such it is presented, not only in the Old Testament, but also in the New. The conjunction between *“good news”* and *“judgment”* in Rev. 14:6, 7, has been too often overlooked. God’s great judgment does not place in jeopardy any who are trusting in the merits of Christ. They are continually being adjudged worthy through His intercession — this is the meaning of *“it is Christ that justifies.”*

This is Paul's answer to the inquiry: ~~Who~~ "Who shall bring any charge against God's elect?" (Rom. 8:33.) The accuser of the brethren, pointing to our failures, tries to bring such charges (Zech. 3:1; Rev. 12:10), but Christ knows our hearts, and ever imputes His righteousness to us — so that when probation closes for the world, and His priestly intercession ceases, all who have found Him through the gospel are ~~accounted~~ "worthy" of either resurrection or translation. Their judgment is over. They made peace with the great Law-giver while on the way to court, and will never be handed over to pay the uttermost farthing. Justification is an anticipated last judgment, and the final judgment is but the ratification of justification. Thus the New Testament applies ~~being made righteous,~~ i.e. ~~accounted~~ "righteous," to the moment of conversion, every succeeding moment, and the last moment when God's judgment is made public at the coming of Christ. See Rom. 3:20-28; 5:19; Acts 13:38, 39. This final justification is what Ellen G. White means by ~~the~~ "the complete fulfilment of the new covenant promise" (GC 485).

According to John: ~~Truly~~, truly, I say to you, he who hears my word and believes him who sent me, has eternal life; he does not come into judgment, but has passed from death to life"; (John 5:24 RSV). It is significant that on every occasion where the beloved disciple uses ~~judgment~~ (*krisis*), he uses it in its negative sense of condemnation. This also applies to Rev. 14:7. See the use of ~~judgment~~ and ~~hour~~ in the following chapters of Revelation and compare Jeremiah, chapter 51.

THE JUDGMENT OF DANIEL 7

When from this exercise we turn to Daniel 7 and that judgment scene which is the heart of the book, we see it is the wicked who are examined, condemned, and destroyed. The judgment goes ~~in~~ "in favour of" the saints, because their enemies are convicted and condemned. This, not an investigation of the sins of the saints, is the real meaning of the judgment of Daniel 7, and it has been recognized in recent years by most Adventist exegetes.

Note the words of Dr. A. Ferch, who did his doctoral dissertation on Daniel 7 and its judgment scene. The following are key admissions found on various pages.

The axial place of v. 26 (which specifically relates the judgment to the nefarious one), wedged between the zenith of evil (v. 25) and the felicity of the saints (v. 27) seems to be hardly coincidental.

The crescendo of the infamy of the little horn is reached in its blatant opposition to God and His people, thus justifying its condemnation and destruction.

The writer reports a most interesting feature, only too often neglected by students of this passage, viz., the contemporaneousness of the conceited and grandiloquent little horn and the heavenly tribunal before any verdict is passed upon the former's nefarious activity.

The first thing Daniel wants to convey — and that with considerable urgency — is the fact that the insolent despot is under judgment and will pass suddenly like a phantasm of the night (vs. 11-12).

This oppression of God's people ends when the judgment takes away its dominion and destroys the tyrant (vs. 9-10, 2, 26).

The former alternative followed by Ibn Ezra (who observes, ~~he~~ "he gave them their revenge," i.e. ~~judgment~~ "judgment rendered in their favour") claims the support of most modern

commentators. It is also more in harmony with the OT idea that the Lord “executes justice for the orphan and the widow” (Deut. 10:18) and “maintains the cause of the afflicted” (Ps. 140:12 [H-vs. 13]). Finally, the first option seems to be more appropriate in the context of Dan. 7 in which prominence is given to God as Judge and His saving judgment.

According to these verses the judgment will put an end to the oppression and extreme hardship imposed by the little horn upon the saints and by a favourable verdict set the stage for the fixed time when (whether immediately upon the verdict or later we are not told) the elect will possess the kingdom privileges.

The tribunal as in verse 10 will condemn the godless tyrant and de-robe him of power and life.⁶⁵

The dissertation by Ferch is the most detailed and accurate statement on the judgment of Dan. 7 ever put out by an Adventist, and its exegetical conclusions are that unbelievers, not believers, are the “eye” of that storm.

These statements by Ferch agree exactly with the intimations of the *Daniel* quarterly (1967), and the conclusions of such scholars as W.E. Read and E. Heppenstall, as well as all non-Adventist scholars we know of who have studied the matter. Dan. 8:14 by “vindication” means exactly the same as 7:22. The wicked are condemned, those workers of iniquity who have done despite to the truth and holiness of God, but His own are vindicated. The saints are indeed judged by God. “He that judges me is the Lord” says Paul. “The Lord will judge His people” says the author of Hebrews in agreement with 2 Cor. 5:10 and Rom. 14:10. This judgment is, as 1 Cor. 4:4 makes clear, both continual and ultimate. Only he that endures to the end shall be saved. The decision of faith has to be continually reaffirmed. It is those who abide in Christ and who are found trusting solely in His merits as evidenced by a life of loyal obedience who are “righteous still” when probation closes. For such, the thought of judgment holds no terrors. They are as surely accepted by heaven as is Christ. So says John - 1 John 4:17.

It is essential that we acknowledge the two-fold nature of the judgment as set forth in Scripture. That judgment has terrors for the wicked, but brings joy to penitent believers. It is always, so to speak, “a double header.” And whether it be Rev. 14, or Dan. 7, or Dan. 8, if we are going to be true to Scripture we must stress that the judgment in view is a warning to the wicked, and a promise to the saints. To interpret Dan. 7:9-13 as an investigation into the forgiven or unforgiven sins of those who have taken the name of Christ is quite wrong. There is no such thing in the text itself, or its parallels in chapters eight and twelve. Note how Dr. G. Oosterwal saw this very clearly in a paper presented by him in 1967.

What is the nature of this divine activity in the heavenly sanctuary? Since the pollution is first of all spoken of as the work of the little horn (Dan. 8:9-14), the restoration must be also a work directed against this anti-Christian power. That this is so is clear from Dan. 7. And Christ’s work against His enemies is there described as the great judgment. The little horn, which made war against the saints and prevailed against them, which spoke great words against the most High, etc., etc. trampling down the truth and the activities of the heavenly sanctuary, is **judged after** a period of prospering which lasted 1260 years (Dan. 7:9-26).

It is the Son of Man (Dan. 7:13) who passes definitely the judgment against the work of the little horn. From John’s visions in the book of Revelation, we get a clear

understanding of the nature of that judgment. The little horn is definitely rejected, condemned, fallen. It is the hour of God's vindication in Christ (Rev. 14:6-9). This is the time in which actually an end is made to sin and the sinner. It is the time of God's wrath (plagues).

The judgment has still another aspect. While Christ is standing up in the heavenly sanctuary to execute His condemnation of His enemies, the saints are being vindicated. For it was not only against the Prince of hosts, but also against those who followed Him in truth and in spirit, that the antichrist directed his attacks. John sees these saints ~~Under~~ "under the altar" and hears them crying, ~~How~~ "How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood. ..." (Rev. 6:9-11.) And white robes were given unto everyone of them. This is the vindication, the glorification of the saints. They have to wait ~~for~~ "for a little season" before they will be resurrected, but the judgment is executed. They are given white robes already, declared holy and redeemed.⁶⁶

This is a fine summary of the Scriptural teaching on judgment, particularly as found in Daniel, chapters seven, eight, and twelve, and also Rev. 14. But it contrasts strangely with traditional Adventist presentations. The same is true of Dr. Oosterwal's allusion to Dan. 8 in his *Mission Possible*.

As one considers Dan. 7, it is the terrible work of the fourth beast and the little horn which is made prominent. They require over 70 percent of what is said about the characters of the apocalyptic drama. The three first beasts are mentioned, but not explained in any detail. Neither Daniel nor the interpreting angel seem in any way preoccupied with these three powers. But the situation is the reverse with the fourth beast and its eleventh horn. While the first three beasts are essentially stage-props, the fourth and its chief horn are thrust to the front and held before the reader as before Daniel. Because of their wicked deeds they come into judgment. That judgment by the heavenly tribunal condemns them, and removes their authority and life. The kingdom they have tried to dominate is given to the Son of Man and the saints.

The ~~books~~ "of Dan. 7:10 apparently contain the record of the evil deeds of the fourth beast and the little horn. There is nothing here whatever about the saints being scrutinized by the heavenly court. None of **their** sins are indicated, and there is nothing to indicate that these books contain a record of their lives. But by order of the heavenly assessors, the judgment issues in direct action on the wicked powers, and the removal of their dominion and very existence. This dominion, said to last ~~a~~ "time, two times, and half a time" lasts right up until the judgment. See verses 9-11, 21-22, and 25-26. There is no lapse between this period of oppression coming to its end and the beginning of the judgment. It is the judgment which accomplishes the end of the persecuting period, and the persecution. This, of course, will not match the traditional exposition of persecution coming to its end before 1798, and then judgment commencing half a century later.

Dr. Hasel writes on the heavenly session pictured in Dan. 7 as follows:

This judgment is ~~in~~ "in behalf of the saints (holy ones) of the Most High (vs. 21-22a), then the saints receive the kingdom from the Son of Man. The picture is rather clear. The ~~saints~~ (holy ones)" have been under attack by the anti-God power represented by the little horn, but are vindicated in judgment. Vindication of the saints implies condemnation of the little horn power.⁶⁷

THE LITTLE HORN, THE SAINTS, AND THE SANCTUARY IN DANIEL 8

In the *Ministry* insert “Christ’s Atoning Ministry in Heaven,” we have the following from the same pen:

Among Adventists the judgment of Dan. 7 is traditionally designated as the “~~investigative~~ judgment” and recently more adequately called “~~pre~~-Advent judgment” in order to separate it from the so-called last judgment that is to take place after Christ’s Second Coming. Actually the “~~pre~~-Advent judgment” may be conceived of as the first phase of the total judgment activities in heaven of which the last judgment is the second phase, and the execution of the judgment after the millennium (Rev. 20) the third and last phase.

c. Those Receiving Judgment. The ones who are judged in the pre-Advent judgment phase are “~~the~~ saints of the Most High” (7:22). They cannot be angels, as a recent trend in modern scholarship supposes. These “~~saints~~” belong to God as the possessive genitive shows. They are a people characterized by holiness, the holy people (12:7; cf. Isa. 4:2f; 6:13). The fact that the persecuting power “~~made~~ war with the saints” (7:21), prevailed over them, wore them out (v. 25), and shattered them (12:7), proves that they were reduced in power and decimated during the time, two times, and half a time (7:25). After this period judgment is pronounced in favour of “~~the~~ saints” (v. 22) by the Ancient of Days. These decimated “~~saints~~” are a remnant, God’s faithful followers constituting his remnant people, his chosen ones, persecuted by the power opposing God, but keeping the covenant faith and maintaining their trust and confidence in him who will be their Judge. After the judgment they “~~shall~~ receive the kingdom” (7:18-22), apparently through the Son of Man to whom God has given it (v. 14). They will possess it in perpetuity (7:18), because it is an “~~everlasting~~ kingdom” (v. 27) that shall not be destroyed (v. 14).⁶⁸

These quotations show a considerable advance upon usual expositions by Adventists of this passage. It is declared that the judgment is “~~in~~ favour of” the saints, and it is clearly said that the little horn is condemned. The context is here taken into account, rather than our usual wrenching of the judgment scene away from the description of the activities of the little horn.

But it still could be that even Dr. Hasel’s presentation could be misunderstood when he writes: “The ones who are judged in the pre-Advent judgment phase are the saints of the Most High (7:22).” This sounds as though the saints are central in the judgment and the chief object of the court’s attention, whereas this is clearly not the case. Also, the statement that “~~v~~indication of the saints implies condemnation of the little horn power” seems to reverse the actual picture. Would it not be less capable of misunderstanding if we said: “~~C~~ondemnation of the little horn power implies vindication of the saints”?

To make such comments may seem unduly particular, specially when these few statements appear in papers of such merit. But because the real issue in Dan. 7 is vital for an understanding, not only of that passage, but of Dan. 8, we must critically review the best that modern Adventist scholarship is offering. It may be that loyalty to the church we love and serve sometimes influences us toward a bias as we approach sensitive areas.

For the same reason we must attend to Dr. Hasel’s application of the typology of the Day of Atonement in connection with Dan. 7:9-13 and Dan. 8:14. When he says, for example, on page 24, that “~~the~~ term for cleanse’ ... means factual cleansing and not merely a

declaration ...” we have difficulty following him. True, as the author says, ~~the~~ Day of Atonement involved the cleansing of the sanctuary and the people (Lev. 16:19, 30),” but the New Testament commentator seems to affirm that the one thing the Day of Atonement could not do was to factually cleanse the worshippers. Note his words:

The law is only a shadow of the good things that are coming — not the realities themselves. For this reason it can never, by the same sacrifices repeated endlessly year after year, make perfect those who draw near to worship. If it could, would they not have stopped being offered? For the worshipers would have been cleansed once for all, and would no longer have felt guilty for their sins. But those sacrifices are an annual reminder of sins, because it is impossible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sins. (Heb. 10:1-4 NIV)

We are told in Heb. 9 what sort of cleansing was actually accomplished by ~~the~~ blood of goats and bulls” on the Day of Atonement. Verse 13 affirms it was ~~the~~ purification of the flesh” — in other words, a mere ceremonial accomplishment. See also Heb. 10:11. Not even the sacrifices of the Day of Atonement could really cleanse the worshipper by taking away his sins. Only Calvary could accomplish such, and now we who believe, indeed have been ~~washed~~” and can therefore ~~draw~~ near with a true heart in full assurance of faith” (Heb. 10:22).

In connection with the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary, Dr. Hasel follows our traditional route and intimates that Christ has a work to do in heaven analogous to the sprinkling of blood in the type. We quote him once more.

As earthly priests entered the sanctuary with blood during the daily (Lev. 4:5-7, 16-18, 25-26, 30, 34) and yearly (16:14-15) services, so the heavenly High Priest entered the sanctuary in heaven with his own blood (Heb. 9:12). As the earthly sanctuary of the old covenant was cleansed with blood, so the heavenly sanctuary, the ~~real~~ sanctuary” (Heb. 8:2 NEB) of the new covenant is ~~to~~ be cleansed” (*katharizesthai*) ~~with~~ better sacrifices than these” (Heb. 9:23).

The high priestly function of Christ is emphasized time and again in Hebrews. It is, therefore, not surprising to find that the idea of sprinkling of blood in Heb. 12:24, which plays a key role in the cleansing of the sanctuary (Heb. 9:23-24) on the Day of Atonement (Lev. 16:81 -19) is joined to several themes in the same context in Hebrews: (1) God as Judge (Heb. 12:23, 29), (2) The assembly of myriads of angels (v. 22) and (3) people whose names are written in the books of heaven (v. 23). Such themes are also present in the judgment scene in Dan. 7 to which we shall return shortly.

The cleansing of the sanctuary does not come at the beginning but toward the end of the plan of salvation, after the sanctuary was defiled.⁶⁹

As mentioned in the previous chapter, it was exceedingly rare for blood to be taken into the first apartment. That did not happen in the vast majority of cases where the ordinary people brought their sin offerings. Only when the high priest or entire congregation sinned was blood taken into the first apartment. Secondly, Hebrews is not saying that the heavenly sanctuary is to be cleansed, but that it already has been by the death of Christ. And thirdly, the one thing the author of Hebrews avoids, is to say that Christ needs to sprinkle blood in the heavenly sanctuary. He is so concerned to make it clear that the death of Christ made complete atonement, and reconciled the race to God, that he even manipulates the typical

pictures to that end, and refuses to use any elements of the type which would conflict with his purpose.

Some have raised the issue whether Hebrews 9:22 should be translated “sprinkling of blood” rather than “shedding of blood.” There are some features of the context which might seem to support such a position, and it is not at all strange that some have raised the question. It is clear that the preceding verses in the chapter do indeed refer to sprinkling, but as soon as the writer turns to Christ he emphasizes His death. “Sprinkling” was appropriate in verse 18-22 to contrast the Levitical ceremonials with the accomplishment of our Lord’s sacrifice, but when the apostle comes to that death itself, he uses a different term than one applied to a priestly sprinkling following sacrifice, such as on the mercy seat on the Day of Atonement. He chooses *ekchusis* because it signifies the pouring out of blood in death. It is the idea of a heavenly oblation that he labours to avoid.

Thus, as we survey that which our best modern scholarship has to offer on our traditional positions regarding the investigative judgment, we find it lacking. There is no exegetical connection possible between an investigation of the sins of the saints, Heb. 9, Dan. 7:9-13, and 8:14.

DANIEL 8:14 AND ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES

We turn to Adventism’s chief argumentation against opponents from the times of Uriah Smith to the present. It has concerned the inadequacy of the “alternative” interpretation — that related to Antiochus Epiphanes.

Let us first review the Scripture:

In the third year of the reign of King Belshazzar a vision appeared to me, Daniel, after that which appeared to me at the first. And I saw in the vision; and when I saw, I was in Susa the capital, which is in the province of Elam; and I saw in the vision, and I was at the river Ulai. I raised my eyes and saw, and behold, a ram standing on the bank of the river. It had two horns; and both horns were high, but one was higher than the other, and the higher one came up last. I saw the ram charging westward and northward and southward; no beast could stand before him, and there was no one who could rescue from his power; he did as he pleased and magnified himself.

As I was considering, behold, a he-goat came from the west across the face of the whole earth, without touching the ground; and the goat had a conspicuous horn between his eyes. He came to the ram with the two horns, which I had seen standing on the bank of the river, and he ran at him in his mighty wrath. I saw him come close to the ram, and he was enraged against him and struck the ram and broke his two horns; and the ram had no power to stand before him, but he cast him down to the ground and trampled upon him; and there was no one who could rescue the ram from his power. Then the he-goat magnified himself exceedingly; but when he was strong, the great horn was broken, and instead of it there came up four conspicuous horns toward the four winds of heaven.

Out of one of them came forth a little horn, which grew exceedingly great toward the south, toward the east, and toward the glorious land. It grew great, even to the host of heaven; and some of the host of the stars it cast down to the ground, and trampled upon them. It magnified itself, even up to the Prince of the host; and the continual burnt offering was taken away from him, and the place of his sanctuary was overthrown. And the host was given over to it together with the continual burnt offering through

transgression; and truth was cast down to the ground, and the horn acted and prospered. Then I heard a holy one speaking; and another holy one said to the one that spoke, “For how long is the vision concerning the continual burnt offering, the transgression that makes desolate, and the giving over of the sanctuary and host to be trampled under foot?” And he said to him, “For two thousand and three hundred evenings and mornings; then the sanctuary shall be restored to its rightful state.” (Dan. 8:1-14 RSV)

We should observe that the prophetic scene seemed to be reduced in Dan. 8 from what it was hitherto. There is no obvious reference to Palestine in chapters 2 and 7, and their prophecies, but Palestine is specifically referred to in chapter 8. Instead of the fierce lion, tiger, and the dreadful nondescript beast, we have the domestic animals used in sacrificial worship. Similarly, the language is now, not the Gentile Aramaic, but the sacred Hebrew. Thus we are prepared for a scene that particularly applies to the experience of Israel after the death of Alexander the Great (whose kingdom was the great horn of the ram). It is the **initial meaning** only to which we now attend.

THE LITTLE HORN—ITS MEANING FOR ANCIENT ISRAEL

Origin

Scripture says the little horn would spring up when the divisions of Alexander’s empire were in their latter days, and from one of these divisions. Thus we are to look for a power originating from the Greek world sometime after 300 BC and before Rome’s supremacy by 30 BC. It is a power to the north of Palestine for it waxes great towards the south and the east. Israel was never menaced from the west.

Neither Rome nor Italy ever belonged to the Alexandrian empire from which this horn was to arise. **The antichrist figure, it must be remembered, comes from the goat — from Greece — and has its origin as a new-born horn after the divisions of Greece have matured and are waxing old.** This also will not fit Rome, which has existed for centuries prior to the birth of Christ. To say, as some have said, that the little horn comes from one of the four winds of heaven, rather than out of one of the four horns, destroys the visual unity of the symbol. Note the visionary sequence: Goat — great horn between its eyes — horn broken off — in its place four horns — out of one of these four horns **another** little horn — all still linked to the body of the goat — i.e. the Alexandrian empire. Rome cannot fit such specifications of place or time.

Nature

The horn springs into prominence from a birth in obscurity. It naturally begins as much smaller than the horn from which it emerges. This could never fit Rome, which was much more potent than Macedonia at the time of its conquest of that territory. But the symbolism does fit Antiochus.

Work

This new horn first attacks the south, then the east, and en route to the latter, attacks the pleasant land. It waxes great, even to the host of heaven and casts down some of the host to the ground.

Rome became great particularly to the northwest, the east, the pleasant land of Palestine, and the south. But Antiochus came from the north against Egypt, then invaded Armenia and Persia after oppressing Palestine. The sequence of his operations exactly fits the prophecy but Rome does not so fit.

Antiochus has his sphere of operations only in three areas as mentioned. This is certainly not true of the widespread operations of Rome. It knew no such geographical limitations as are here laid down.

A popular criticism against the Antiochus interpretation is that it could not be said that Antiochus compared with Persia and Greece was *—exceeding great.*” But the prophecy does not say that. The little horn is not compared with other powers, but merely said to wax *—exceeding great*” in three directions of the compass; namely the south, the east, and the pleasant land. Its work against the pleasant land is described in verses 10-14, which were used by later Jewish writers such as the apocryphal writers and by Josephus to describe the work of Antiochus.

Observe how Maccabees uses the very words of Daniel to describe the work of Antiochus Epiphanes.

Alexander of Macedon, the son of Phillip, marched from the land of Kittim, defeated Darius, king of Persia and Media, and seized his throne, being already king of Greece.

Alexander had reigned twelve years when he died. His generals took over the government, each in his own province.

A scion of this stock was that wicked man, Antiochus Epiphanes, son of King Antiochus. He had been a hostage in Rome before he succeeded to the throne in the year 137 of the Greek era.

At that time there appeared in Israel a group of renegade Jews, who incited the people. Let us enter into a covenant with the Gentiles round about, ‘ they said, because disaster upon disaster has overtaken us since we segregated ourselves from them. ‘

When he was firmly established on his throne, Antiochus made up his mind to become king of Egypt and so to rule over both kingdoms. He assembled a powerful force of chariots, elephants, and cavalry, and a great fleet, and invaded Egypt.

On his return from the conquest of Egypt, in the year 143, Antiochus marched with a strong force against Israel and Jerusalem. In his arrogance he entered the temple and carried off the golden altar, the lamp-stand with all its equipment, the table for the Bread of the Presence, the sacred cups and bowls, the golden censers, the curtain, and the crowns. He stripped off all the gold plating from the temple front. He seized the silver, gold, and precious vessels, and whatever secret treasures he found, and took them all with him when he left for his own country. He had caused much bloodshed, and he gloated over all he had done.

Great was the lamentation throughout Israel;
rulers and elders groaned in bitter grief.
Girls and young men languished;
the beauty of our women was disfigured.
Every bridegroom took up the lament,
and every bride sat grieving in her chamber.
The land trembled for its inhabitants,
and all the house of Jacob was wrapped in shame.

Two years later, the king sent to the towns of Judaea a high revenue official, who arrived at Jerusalem with a powerful force. His language was friendly, but full of guile.

For, once he had gained the city's confidence, he suddenly attacked it. He dealt it a heavy blow, and killed many Israelites, plundering the city and setting it ablaze. He pulled down houses and walls on every side; women and children were made prisoners, and the cattle seized.

The city of David was turned into a citadel, enclosed by a high, stout wall with strong towers, and garrisoned by impious foreigners and renegades. Having made themselves secure, they accumulated arms and provisions, and deposited there the massed plunder of Jerusalem. There they lay in ambush, a lurking threat to the temple and a perpetual menace to Israel.

They shed the blood of the innocent round the temple;
they defiled the holy place
The citizens of Jerusalem fled for fear of them;
she became the abode of aliens,
an alien herself to her offspring:
her children deserted her.
Her temple lay desolate as a wilderness;
her feasts were turned to mourning,
her sabbaths to a reproach,
her honour to contempt.
The shame of her fall matched the greatness of her renown,
and her pride was bowed low in grief.

The king then issued a decree throughout his empire: his subjects were all to become one people and abandon their own laws and religion. The nations everywhere complied with the royal command, and many in Israel accepted the foreign worship, sacrificing to idols and profaning the Sabbath. Moreover, the king sent agents with written orders to Jerusalem and the towns of Judaea. Ways and customs foreign to the country were to be introduced. Burnt-offerings, sacrifices, and libations in the temple were forbidden; Sabbaths and feast-days were to be profaned; the temple and its ministers to be defiled. Altar, idols, and sacred precincts were to be established; swine and other unclean beasts to be offered in sacrifice. They must leave their sons uncircumcised; they must make themselves in every way abominable, unclean, and profane, and so forget the law and change all their statutes. The penalty for disobedience was death.

Such was the decree which the king issued to all his subjects. He appointed superintendents over all the people, and instructed the towns of Judaea to offer sacrifice, town by town. People thronged to their side in large numbers, every one of them a traitor to the law. Their wicked conduct throughout the land drove Israel into hiding in every possible place of refuge.

On the fifteenth day of the month Kislev in the year 145, the abomination of desolation was set up on the altar. Pagan altars were built throughout the towns of Judaea; incense was offered at the doors of houses and in the streets. All scrolls of the law which were found were torn up and burnt. Anyone discovered in possession of a Book of the Covenant, or conforming to the law, was put to death by the king's sentence.
(1 Maccabees 1:1, 7, 8,10,11, 16, 17, 20-24, 29-57 NEB)

2 Maccabees speaks on the same topic.

Shortly afterwards King Antiochus sent an elderly Athenian to force the Jews to abandon their ancestral customs and no longer regulate their lives according to the laws of God. He was also commissioned to pollute the temple at Jerusalem and dedicate it to Olympian Zeus, and to dedicate the sanctuary on Mount Gerisim to Zeus God of Hospitality, following the practice of the local inhabitants.

This evil hit them hard and was a severe trial. The Gentiles filled the temple with licentious revelry: they took their pleasure with prostitutes and had intercourse with women in the sacred precincts. They also brought forbidden things inside, and heaped the altar with impure offerings prohibited by the law. It was forbidden either to observe the Sabbath or to keep the traditional festivals, or to admit to being a Jew at all. On the monthly celebration of the king's birthday, the Jews were driven by brute force to eat the entrails of the sacrificial victims; and on the feast of Dionysus they were forced to wear ivy-wreaths and join the procession in his honour. (2 Maccabees 6:1-7 NEB)

And what about the cleansing of the sanctuary? This too is recorded by the Jewish historian.

Maccabaeus with his men, led by the Lord, recovered the temple and city of Jerusalem. He demolished the altars erected by the heathen in the public square, and their sacred precincts as well. When they had purified the sanctuary, they constructed another altar; then, striking fire from flints, they offered a sacrifice for the first time for two whole years, and restored the incense, the lights, and the Bread of the Presence. This done, they prostrated themselves and prayed the Lord not to let them fall any more into such disasters, but, should they ever happen to sin, to discipline them himself with clemency and not hand them over to blasphemous and barbarous Gentiles. The sanctuary was purified on the twenty-fifth of Kislev, the same day of the same month as that on which foreigners had profaned it. The joyful celebration lasted for eight days; it was like the Feast of Tabernacles, for they recalled how, only a short time before, they had kept that feast while they were living like wild animals in the mountains and caves; and so they carried garlanded wands and branches with their fruits, as well as palm-fronds, and they chanted hymns to the One who had so triumphantly achieved the purification of his own temple. A measure was passed by the public assembly to the effect that the entire Jewish race should keep these days every year. (2 Maccabees 10:1-8 NEB)

The New Testament points us to this history by its allusions in Rev. 13 to the yet future activities of Antichrist which will resemble those of Antiochus, and also by the reference to the Feast of Dedication in John 10. This feast was a commemoration of the event of the cleansing of the sanctuary in 165 BC. Josephus tells us why the feast was called the feast of lights. Says he:

Now Judas celebrated the festival of the restoration of the sacrifices of the temple for eight days; and omitted no sort of pleasures thereon; but he feasted them upon very rich and splendid sacrifices; and he honoured God, and delighted them by hymns and psalms. Nay, they were so very glad at the revival of their customs, when, after a long time of intermission, they unexpectedly had regained the freedom of their worship, that they made it a law for their posterity, that they should keep a festival on account of the restoration of their temple worship, for eight days. And from that time to this we celebrate this festival, and call it Lights. I suppose the reason was, because this liberty beyond our hopes appeared to us; and that thence was the name given to that festival.⁷⁰

If we inquire as to why the Lord should have devoted so much space in His Word to this crisis which only embraced a few years, the answer offered by R.D. Wilson is worthy of

consideration. (See appendix, “Importance of Antiochus Epiphanes,” for quotations from *Studies in the Book of Daniel*.) The Jewish people have ever recognized Dan. 8:10-14 as a prophecy of their greatest crisis between the two destructions of the Temple.

It has often been pointed out that it takes some juggling to make the events in the days of Antiochus fit the chronological requirement of the prophecy. This, of course, would be not one jot different to our own difficulties with history in applying the 1260 years and the 2300. Scriptural time periods are usually round numbers rather than precise, and this applies to the crisis of the second century before Christ.

The three-and-a-half year period during which the daily sacrifice was forbidden by Antiochus was preceded by oppression lasting almost as long. Dan. 8 sketches the entire period of persecution, not just the period of the interruption of the sanctuary services. This persecution was launched by events in 171 BC and included the murder of Jewish ambassadors at Tyre in 170, the subsequent slaughter and captivity of 80,000 Jews the same year, and the profanation of the temple at that time. In 168 came the entire suspension of the sanctuary rites, a suspension lasting until 165. The approximate period of oppression by Antiochus was 2300 days.

All attempts to make Rome the **first and major** fulfilment of all the specifications of the little horn ignore both the symbolism and the interpretation. Rome existed independently long before the Greeks became prominent. There would be just as good grounds for claiming that the Alexandrian empire came into existence via Medo-Persia, as to say that Rome came on the scene through the Macedonian horn. Neither is it said in the prophecy that one of the four horns was destroyed by the little horn. The Roman application makes the absorption of Macedonia something quite different to that indicated by the symbols of Daniel’s vision.

But the “clinger” rests in the fact that Dan. 11 explains the prophecy of Dan. 8 in greater detail, and the little horn is interpreted from verse 21 onwards, and while Uriah Smith has endeavoured to tailor history so as to fit the prophecy, his product is but a travesty. Only Antiochus fully fits the specifications of verses 19-35. Let any who wish to check the matter read the *Cambridge Ancient History*, or a source similarly comprehensive.

ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES AND DANIEL 11

At the 1919 Bible conference there was lengthy discussion of Dan. 11, and to read the account is to be convinced that those who saw Antiochus in that chapter won the day. We quote from the records of the discussion on the prophecies of Daniel.

WIRTH: You have asked for those who believe the new view to speak, and as I feel inclined that way, would like to say a word. It seems to me the great thing is as Brother Lacy brought out, the fact that Antiochus Epiphanes is really the great figure in this chapter.

One who has studied the history of Antiochus Epiphanes will find that he did the things for that time that the Pope did later. And if we are brought up to Antiochus Epiphanes in the 30th and 31st verses, see what a beautiful, forceful transition we have from that place to what the antitypical Antiochus, or the Pope, did to the people of God in a larger sense. I don’t know whether I make that plain or not, but Antiochus Epiphanes was a type of what the pope was afterwards to become.

H.C. LACEY:—Paraphrase of Daniel Eleven

Verse 21. And in his (Seleucus Philopater's) estate shall stand up (reign) a vile person (Antiochus Epiphanes 176-164) to whom they shall not give (offer) the honour of the kingdom (the sovereignty, for Theliostarus was plotting for it: another party favouring Ptolemy Philometor: also Demetrius) but he obtained the kingdom (gained the throne of Syria) by flatteries (Eumenes, King of Pergamus and Attalus, the Syrians, the Romans): thus the (Antiochus Epiphanes) came in peaceably (BC 176) and obtained the kingdom by flatteries.

Verse 22. And with the arms of a flood shall they (Heliodorus, Ptolemy Philometor) be overthrown from before him (Antiochus Epiphanes) and shall be broken (defeated) yea also, the prince of the covenant (Onias III deposed from high priesthood in 176 BC, and subsequently murdered). And after the league (between Antiochus Epiphanes and Jason, the new High Priest) made with him (Jason) he (Antiochus) shall work deceitfully (deposing Jason, and elevating **his** brother Menelaus, to the High Priesthood). **And** (not for) he (Antiochus) shall come up (to the sovereignty) and shall become strong with a small people (his few attendants).

Verse 24. He (Antiochus Epiphanes) shall enter into the peaceable and fat places of the province (the upper provinces [Asia Minor?] also Coele-Syria and Palestine) and he (Antiochus Epiphanes) shall do that which his fathers have not done, nor his father's father (making Timarchus and Heraclides [Rom. 1:27] the one governor of Babylon, the other, his Treasurer): he (Antiochus Epiphanes) shall scatter among them (his subjects) the prey (of his enemies) the spoil (of temples) and the riches (of his friends), etc.

Verse 25. And he (Antiochus Epiphanes) shall stir up (BC 171) his power and his courage against the king of the south (Ptolemy Philometor) with a great army (A great multitude); and the king of the south (Ptolemy Philometor) shall be stirred up with a very great and mighty army (~~very~~ many and exceeding strong horses" Newton) but he (Ptolemy Philometor) shall not stand (~~was~~ afraid and fled"): for they shall forecast devices against him (Eulacus, his minister, Macron, a premier, the Alexandrians).

Verse 26. Yea, they that feed of the portion of his (Ptolemy's) meat (his ministers, Eulacus, Macron, etc.) shall destroy (by corrupting and betraying) him (Ptolemy Philometor), and his (Ptolemy's) army shall overflow and many shall fall down slain.

A.G. DANIELLS: What does it mean by overflowing?

H.C. LACEY: They dispersed and were defeated. In the old view Rome shall overflow, and many shall fall down slain.

A.G. DANIELLS: Does overflow mean to disperse and to run out?

H.C. LACEY: Exactly the same criticism may be applied to both views. I suppose we could turn the thing around and make it apply to Rome.

Here is the language in 1 Maccabees 1:16, 17, 18, 19. (Reads)

You see that the language both in the Bible and the apocryphal book is practically identical.

Verse 27: And both these kings' hearts shall be to do mischief, and they shall speak lies at one table; but it shall not prosper: for yet the end shall be at the time appointed.

Upon his arrival at Memphis, Antiochus Epiphanes and Ptolemy Philopater frequently ate and conversed together ~~at~~ one table,” Antiochus pretending he would favour the cause of Ptolemy as against the usurpation of his brother Physson. This Antiochus pretends to espouse the cause of this older nephew against his brother, Ptolemy laying the blame of the whole campaign upon Eulasus, his majesty who betrayed him, and professing great obligations to his uncle Antiochus. But these protestations of friendship were ~~lies~~” on his part. As soon as Antiochus had withdrawn, the two brothers, Ptolemy and Physson, made peace through the mediation of their sister Cleopatra, and agreed to reign conjointly in Egypt. But even this did not prosper. The two monarchs came to blows at the time appointed.

Now let us read into the Scripture the names of these kings: And both these kings’ hearts (Antiochus Epiphanes and Ptolemy Philopater) shall be to do mischief (each hoping to circumvent the other), and they shall speak lies at one table (in apparent friendliness), but it (this patched up peace between them) shall not prosper: for yet the end shall be at the time appointed.

Verse 28: Then shall he return into his own land with great riches; and his heart shall be against the holy covenant; and he shall do exploits, and return to his own land. — That is the prophecy.

Antiochus hoping that the two Egyptian brothers would ruin each other in civil war, returned to Syria. He took with him immense treasures from the captured towns of Egypt. The verse says: ~~he~~ shall return ... with great riches.” History says he took immense spoils from the captured towns of Egypt. In 1 Maccabees 1:19 and 20 it is stated, ~~Thus~~ they got the strong cities in the land of Egypt, and he took the spoils thereof.” That is the history.

Notice it says ~~his~~ heart shall be against the holy covenant.” The next verse — (1 Maccabees 1:20) ~~And~~ after that Antiochus had smitten Egypt, he returned again in the hundred forty and third year (312 of the ___ era, which is BC 169) and went up against Israel and Jerusalem with a great multitude, and took away the golden altar, and the candlestick of light, and all the vessels thereof, and the table of the shewbread, and the pouring vessels, and the vials, and the censers of gold, and the veil, and the crowns, and the golden ornaments that were before the temple, all which he pulled off. He took also the silver and the gold, and the precious vessels: also he took the hidden treasures which he found. And when he had taken all away, he went into his own land, having made a great massacre, and spoken very proudly.”

That is the history. The prophecy reads thus: ~~and~~ his heart shall be against the holy covenant.” There is more to that than this, too, — ~~his~~ heart shall be against it.” When he was in Egypt a false report had been circulated of his death. Thereupon Jason, the ex-high priest — (Antiochus Epiphanes had done this) returned to Jerusalem, drove his brother Menelaus out of office, and cruelly ill-treated the citizens.

LACEY: Antiochus, thinking the whole nation had revolted, and hearing that they had made great rejoicing at the report of his death, besieged Jerusalem with a great army, took the city by storm, and vented his anger upon the helpless Jews. He slew 40,000 of them, and sold 40,000 more, polluted the temple, offered swine’s flesh on the altar of God, restored Menelaus to the priesthood, and made Philip, a barbarian, governor of Judea. ~~He~~ shall do exploits,” and then ~~return~~ to his own land,” just as these events here are brought forth.

PROF. ANDERSON: What verse in the chapter do you allude to when you speak of the pollution of the temple, as you read in the history?

PROF. LACEY: In the 11th chapter, when we get down to verse 30, there is the point. All these modern scholars, I believe — I don't like to say ~~all~~, but the majority of scholars, you will find, as I have stated, claim indisputably that the events occur under Antiochus Epiphanes to verse 30; but after verse 30 it is a little hazy, and you cannot group them all around Antiochus Epiphanes. Modern scholars have attempted to do it. Verse 30 speaks of the defiling of the temple. But we will come to that a little later on. In the career of Antiochus Epiphanes there is a kind of a little wheel within a wheel. There are events in his life which are very like what is predicted of the little horn — extremely alike, and I do not know why we could not consider this in the same way that Ezekiel expresses it — a wheel within a wheel. Just to illustrate: The things said about the little horn of Dan. 7 can apply to Antiochus Epiphanes in a small way. He is the eleventh down the line, three were plucked up in his place (names were mentioned), he did speak great words against the Most High, he did wear out the saints of the Most High in a small way, he did change the law of the Most High; things were given into his hand for just a time, times, and a half in a literal sense, which was three and one-half years. And in a very small way Antiochus Epiphanes might have been the little horn. So, suppose you and I had been living in that day we would have thought that that prophecy met its fulfilment to us, and we should have been sustained through that hour of persecution. In a small way I think this can apply to Antiochus Epiphanes. But in verse 30 we pass on to Rome, the great antichrist, of which Antiochus was here the personal representative.

(Mention was made of Josephus Book 12, Chapter 5, paragraph 3, but a question interrupted.)

PROF. LACEY: On his way back this Antiochus further vented his spite and his ill temper upon the unfortunate Jews, dispatching Apollonius with 20,000 men to Jerusalem, who slew great multitudes, plundered the city, set fire to it in various places, pulled down houses and walls, slew those who attended the temple, defiled again the Holy Place so that the whole service was discontinued, the city was forsaken of the Jews and strangers only remained in it. On his arrival at Antioch he published a decree obliging all upon pain of death to conform to the religion of the Greeks. So the Jewish law was abrogated, and heathen worship was set up in its stead, and the temple itself was consecrated to Jupiter Olympus.

QUESTION: What was the date of that?

ANSWER: BC 168.

PROF. LACEY: —They set up the abomination of desolation upon the altar. They did sacrifice upon the idol altar, which was upon the altar of God.” 1 Mac. 1:54, 59. You see that they placed the abomination of desolation in the Holy Place. The very language of the Bible, ~~the~~ abomination of desolation,” is placed in the temple; and this is history. I do not see why you object to taking this in a small way as referring to Antiochus Epiphanes — as a wheel within a wheel view of this prophecy. Living in those times we would have thought that the prophecy met its fulfilment, but in this time we see it has a larger fulfilment, we get a present message from it; and we read any chapter and make other slight allusion to those days and how it applies today. Sister White herself recognized the double application method.

M.C. WILCOX: Notice the parallels in the career of this contemptible or vile person, Antiochus, and the Papacy. To my mind it is a very striking parallel:

- (a) He found the Jews a backslidden people, following tradition, yet having many souls devoted to God. So the Papacy found the Christian church.
- (b) Antiochus did all in his power to pervert the Jewish faith and worship. The Papacy did all in its power to seduce and lead astray the people of God. Tradition took the place of the Word, and politics the place of the Spirit.
- (c) Those whom Antiochus could not pervert he persecuted. So did the Papacy.
- (d) The worst persecution the Jews ever endured came under that king. The worst God's people were ever to know came under the Papacy. In the one case thousands died, in the other hundreds of thousands.
- (e) Antiochus stood up against the prince of the covenant at that time, Onias, the head of God's children. Rome stood up against the great Prince of the Covenant, our Lord Jesus Christ, in the persons of his followers, and as the one Mediator and Saviour.
- (f) Antiochus and those whom he perverted took away the continual for a little time, and put in the place of God's centre of worship the abomination, a statue and the worship of Jupiter Olympus, with the head of the Jewish priesthood utterly corrupt himself. Antiochus Theos. Epiphanes, the god manifest in flesh. Rome took away the continual for a long period, and set a man in the temple or church of God, as God, a deification of self-salvation, or salvation by works, —God upon earth."
- (g) From the awful carnage of Antiochus men revolted and did mighty exploits for freedom, and the Reformation under the Maccabees came. Out of the carnage of the Dark Ages came the revolt of Protestant principles and the Reformation of the sixteenth century.
- (h) That Reformation was not complete till John the Baptist came. The Reformation of the sixteenth century is not complete without the last message of which John the Baptist was the type. The depredations and persecutions of Antiochus lasted a definite time — three years.
- (i) The days of persecution of the Papacy lasted a definite time also.

In these particulars — that is, in his connection with the people and work of God and his character — is Antiochus a type of Rome.⁷¹

If then Dan. 11 expands Dan. 8, and the history of the "vile person" is interpretation of the "little horn" of chapter 8, and if 2300 literal days approximately fits the oppression by Antiochus, we must also ask whether the 2300 days interpreted as years can be applied to Rome in the same sense — that is, as the period of time spanning its persecution of God's people? This persecution obviously did not begin in 457 BC. See also 8:14 NIV and TEV.

Our apologists from the beginning have been well aware that the usual interpretation by others of the little horn has been Antiochus Epiphanes. Thus even in the early editions of Smith's *Daniel and Revelation* this interpretation has been countered. But our rebuttals have not always been fair or accurate, as has been indicated already.

We add more examples. Smith says that far from being a success in his Egyptian campaign, Antiochus was ordered by the representative of the Roman senate to desist and return. This, however, did not take place during the first Egyptian campaign, which was a thorough success, but the second. See 2 Mac. 4:50; 5:1.

Smith also says: ~~“The~~ little horn came out of one of the four horns of the goat. It was then a separate power, existing independently of, and distinct from, any of the horns of the goat.”⁷²

Here Smith admits that this power originated from one of the sectors of Alexander’s empire, which certainly does not fit Rome which truly was a separate power. But the symbolism indicates a power that had its origin and growth as vitally connected with one of the four divisions of Greece. There is no hint of separation, as Smith claims.

In opposition to the Antiochus view, it is often claimed that the obvious identity of the two little horns is sufficient disproof. But the little horn of seven came from the Roman, not the Greek beast, and it came after a tenfold division, not a fourfold one. Moreover, the time does not fit. In chapter 8 the little horn arises in the latter days of the Greek kingdom, but in chapter seven the little horn arises after the fall of Rome and the emergence of the separate powers of Europe. There is a difference between a horn which comes out of a horn, and one that springs directly from a head. To say that the little horn of chapter eight is Rome turns the symbolism upside-down. It makes a beast (Rome — the little horn) come out of a horn rather than vice versa as given in the vision.

Smith objects that when Seleucus became king over the Syrian domains, he became one of the four horns of the goat, and that similarly, Antiochus later occupied that position. ~~“He~~ was, for the time being, that horn.”⁷³ In answer, it is clear that the four horns represent kingdoms rather than individual rulers. While a case could be made for a horn springing from a horn representing a single king, even here the kingdom of Antiochus could be intended, rather than the leader alone. Smith’s objection is quite invalid.

Another objection is that ~~“if~~ it were proper to apply the little horn to any one of these twenty-six Syrian kings, it should certainly be applied to the most powerful and illustrious of them all; but Antiochus Epiphanes did not by any means sustain this character.”⁷⁴ But this objection puts words into the prophet’s mouth which he did not utter. It is not said that this king is the most illustrious. He is only said to be ~~“fierce”~~ and ~~“vile”~~ (8:23; 11:21). It will hardly do to equate being vile with being illustrious.

It is also said by Smith that inasmuch as Rome defeated the father of Antiochus, and that Epiphanes himself had been a hostage at Rome, he could not have fulfilled the prophecy, for Rome was ever afterward in the ascendancy. This, however, forgets that Antiochus returned from Rome to be sovereign of Syria and worked independently of Rome.

The most valid objection made to Antiochus is that our Lord applied ~~“the~~ abomination of desolation” as yet future in His day. See Matt. 24:15. But this actually only proves that the significance of the prophecy had not yet been exhausted. In other words, Christ’s statement validates the apotelesmatic principle. Matthew gives other statements about fulfilment which mean only another application of prophecies already fulfilled. See Matt. 1:22; 2:15, 17. **We wish to stress that which elsewhere in this paper has been affirmed — that the prophecy, while originally fulfilled in Antiochus, and only in him as regards its details, also applies in broad outline to later manifestations of Antichrist including pagan and papal Rome.** Its final fulfilment is yet future, when the man of sin shall sit in the temple of

God showing himself as God — not merely the papal apostasy but the final Satanic counterfeit. See the *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* on 2 Thess. 2.

One other objection made by Smith should be mentioned. It is said that the little horn stood up against ~~the~~ prince of princes” which could only mean Christ. Matt. 25:40; Acts 9:5 are sufficient answer to that claim, but it should also be mentioned that the original word for ~~prince~~” (*sar*) means ~~chief~~” or ~~captain~~,” and could apply to any Jewish leader of the time such as the high priest Onias. Many, however, such as Albert Barnes, prefer to apply ~~Prince~~ of princes” to ~~God~~, the Ruler over the kings of the earth.”

We fully grant that there are details of Dan. 8 which hint at the grandeur of the scope being covered, lest the reader rest content with merely the second century application. But all true exegesis begins with the primary and original sense of the Scripture, and then works from there. Even Dan. 9:24-27 contains many elements which the Jews applied first to their situation under Antiochus, and secondly to the Roman attack on their land.

This is not to deny a sixth century authorship for Daniel. As apocalyptic **the prophecies of this book are not the snapshot variety of the other prophets, but offer a continuum with its climax in the last crisis and the kingdom of God. Had Israel fulfilled her mission, the powers of the world would have been enraged and a much greater fulfilment of the little horn than Antiochus been witnessed**, as the Messiah and His kingdom were challenged. God always warns His people of coming crises, and this is the only Old Testament book which covers the centuries from the end of the prophetic line to the rising of John the Baptist. Thus its exceptional stress on events yet well in the future. But even this had present relevance for the Jews first addressed. Daniel was saying to them: ~~Do~~ not expect that when you return from Babylon to restore the temple that all will be peace and joy. The challenge to faith will not end till the Messiah finishes all transgression and ushers in everlasting righteousness. Then He will tabernacle with us as the everlasting Temple in a clean universe.”

As one reviews our Adventist criticisms of the Antiochus position, one must confess to a certain uneasiness. In our eagerness to defend our own case we have not been entirely honest with the other side. To take any passage of Scripture and sever it from its own times and the people of those times is a far cry from reliable methods of exegesis. Today, it is a primary datum of hermeneutics that every part of the Bible had meaning for the people who first received it. Our own commentary, in theory at least, grants this principle. (See *SDABC* 4:702-709.)

Are we now detracting from what was earlier quoted from non-Adventist modern exegetes concerning Dan. 8? By no means. We are saying that **Antiochus did fulfil the little horn prophecy, but he did not fill it full**. And so say such scholars as earlier named. AD 70 witnessed the first fulfilment of the prophecy of Matt. 24, but not its consummation. **Rome** does not apply as the **primary** fulfilment of the little horn, but **in both its phases and at more extensive levels it meets the chief thrust of the prophecy**, though not its details — **both in chapters eight and eleven**. In other words, the apotelesmatic principle here applies as with Joel 2:28, Mal. 4:5, 6, and Deut. 18:15, all the *Day of the Lord* prophecies, etc. It is interesting to notice that Ellen G. White, who frequently applied the apotelesmatic principle, specifically did so for Dan. 11, which is the inspired commentary on Dan. 8.⁷⁵

Dr. W. Shea has suggested that ~~out~~ of one of them” means that the little horn came from one of the winds rather than from one of the horns — a horn on its own without any visible means of support.

There is provision for such a view in the grammar itself. And it must also be said that the four horns do point to a kingdom divided to the four winds — inasmuch as the fourfold division only lasted about twenty years — seven percent of the Hellenistic era. Even, however, if this position is granted, there is no reason that the new emerging power could not be Antichrist, first in the form of Antiochus Epiphanes and then later Rome in both its phases. If the four horns are the equivalent of the four winds, this could indeed be so.

However, with the *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, while we grant there are peculiarities in the Hebrew original, we must also assent with it that the angel's interpretation is the key to the symbolism rather than our own speculations. That interpretation is found in 8:20ff, but also in greater detail in 11:21ff. It should be observed that in 8:23, 24 the little horn is expressly said to belong to ~~the~~ latter end of their [the four horns] rule," and in 11:21 this vile power is expressly set in the line of the Seleucid horn as a successor of Antiochus Magus. This fully agrees with it being a ~~king~~ of the north" as shown both by the points of the compass mentioned in chapter 8 and the enlarged interpretation of chapter 11. Rome, on the other hand, came from the West and swallowed up Egypt to the south before troubling little Judea.

Any who attempt to interpret Dan. 8 without the angelic interpretation of chapter 11 will inevitably miss much. And let it be stressed, that Uriah Smith's attempt to fit Rome into chapter 11 as the **primary** fulfilment of such verses as 21ff is a travesty of history. The details of these verses fit only one person in all time — Antiochus Epiphanes. **His career in general terms prefigured that of Rome**, but not its details. We wish to underline that **nothing we have said is meant to deny the apotelesmatic application of the little horn**. We believe the last fulfilment will be that sketched in *Great Controversy* 624-625. See 2 Thess. 2:3-12.⁷⁶

THE DANIEL 8:14 CONTEXT AND THE "DAILY" CONTROVERSY

We pause to consider the implication of the facts presented. The close relationship between the prophecy of Dan. 8 and the history of God's people between 171-165 BC demonstrates that, in this instance also, prophecy has its first significance for the people to whom it was originally given. That view of prophecy which regards it as irrelevant for the original hearers or readers has long passed away in Christian scholarship, including Adventist scholarship.

Dan. 8 does have to do with the greatest crisis to overtake Daniel's people after the Babylonian captivity, but before the first advent — the murderous onslaught on Israel's worship by Antiochus Epiphanes. God has never left His people unwarned as to coming emergencies. He gave warnings concerning the Flood, the Egyptian bondage, the Babylonian captivity, and in this place He foretold the coming calamities under the Syrian megalomaniac. All that is as it should be. But because Daniel, as with the rest of prophecy, was written for others besides its first readers, its meaning likewise has value for later times. Daniel pictures all those who attack the people and worship of God — Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, Rome, Antichrist. The crisis in the days of the Maccabees is representative of such crises before and after. Rome pagan and papal attacked the sanctuary and people of God and substituted their own idolatrous worship systems. Satan is again to do this very thing in the last days according to Rev. 13. Dan. 8:10-14 has recurring significance. **We have admitted this traditionally, when asserting that the little horn not only applies to events under pagan Rome, but also under papal Rome — thereby we used the apotelesmatic principle without recognizing what it was.**

Thus Dan. 8:10-14 has to do with religious crisis and its resolution. Because it presents the onslaught of a godless power and its prolonged success, the question arises as to when God shall do something about the situation. And the answer must fit the question. It did so fit in its original application. In the nineteenth century and the early twentieth many of our Adventist leaders, embarrassed with the usual way of presenting Dan. 8, turned to a better way which took the context into account. **The battle over the “daily” was a battle to give the context its right place, and thereby to understand the answer of 8:14 in harmony with the question of 8:13. Those who opposed the new light did so because of extreme positions on Ellen G. White. Those who accepted the new view did so in spite of apparent conflict with clear statements in the Spirit of Prophecy which were ultimately resolved and seen as not necessarily in conflict at all.** But the fact remained that the new view was not the emphasis set forth in *Great Controversy*. The new view practically ignored the investigative judgment concept and spoke in terms of restoring the “daily” — the gospel of Christ which had been taken away by Antichrist. This attitude has been taken again and again since by thoughtful men in our ranks. Prescott, Daniells, Spicer, W.C. White, L.E. Froom, and many others came to an exposition of Dan. 8:14 which placed it in its context and gave chief weight to the thought of “restoration” rather than “cleansing.”

In doing this, our leaders obviously did the right thing. Dan. 8 is talking about a serious problem and its resolution. The problem concerns a wicked power destroying the worship, truth, and people of God. Thus the solution promised in 8:14 must have to do with all these things and not suddenly dart off on another unrelated tack. Dan. 8:14 does talk about restoration and vindication — and these are quite different from the **ritual** cleansing of Lev. 16, and from a process of investigating the sins of the saints. How could the latter ever be considered restoration or vindication?

DANIEL 8:14—THE HIGH POINT OF DANIEL’S SYMBOLISM

But having said all that, there is more that must be added to give the whole counsel of God on this chapter. Dan. 8:14 is the highest point of the symbolical presentations of Daniel. It is the peak of the final symbolic vision. Thereafter we have no more beasts or horns or metals. The rest of the book is in non-metaphorical, non-symbolic language. Thus 8:14 is the climax which the following chapters interpret. To apply 8:14 only to the days of the Maccabees is to miss the glory of the prophetic Word which, like its Author, spans past, present, and future. Dan. 8:14 is a victorious climax paralleling the “stone becoming a mountain” scene of 2, the Son of Man taking the kingdom in 7, the making an end of sin and bringing in of everlasting righteousness in 9, and the standing up of Michael to make His saints as the stars of heaven for ever and ever in 12.

Dan. 8:14 does indeed point to the final purification of the universe from sin and sinners which was prefigured in the ancient Day of Atonement, that passion-play of old which also came as a climax in Israel’s worship, and which once every 49 years ushered in the great jubilee of liberty and joy. (See article on Dan. 12, “The Connection Between Dan. 8:14 and Dan. 12-13.” — appendix.)

DANIEL, THE DAY OF ATONEMENT, AND 9:24

Already we have pointed out that five of the key terms of 9:24 occur only in one other place of Scripture — the Day of Atonement chapter. Both refer to transgression, sin, iniquity, atonement, and the Most Holy Place. But this relationship in Dan. 9 between verse 24 and the Day of Atonement finds yet other examples. Take, for instance, the evidence marshalled by perhaps the most recent scholarly commentary on the Old Testament apocalypse, that by

André Lacocque. He sees in Dan. 9 a Day of Atonement prayer, particularly fitting because of the close connection between the jubiliary division of time in verses 24-27 and the Day of Atonement. Here are some of his remarks:

For Th. Chary, the prayer which follows, beginning in v. 4, has a clear cultic character. It is presented as a collective lamentation for a day of fasting and public expiation. Its resemblance to all the other instances of this same category has been noted by every exegete: 1 Kings 8; Ezra 9:6-15; Neh. 9:6-37; 1 Bar. 1:15-3:8. ...⁷⁷ There are no Aramaisms and the style is synagogal (see the many majestic synonyms applied to God by the speaker). Furthermore, it became part of the official Jewish liturgy for the daily morning office and for days of fasting, particularly *Yom Kippur*.

Charles, who energetically militates against the Masoretic text on this point, and who proposes to replace כפר by מחה (see pp. 238, 241), has not seen the close relation between the jubiliary division of time in Dan. 9 and the Great Day of Forgiveness *Yom ha-kippurim*. Indeed, on the tenth day of the seventh month, in the Jubilee Year, the horn resounds, proclaiming freedom to every Israelite in bondage and restoring to their lands those who had been forced to flee them. The Jubilee shows that no man has ultimate authority over another man. There is no doubt that an eschatological accent here has been taken up by Daniel.

We should probably see the following expression, eternal justice — which has no parallel in Scripture — in the perspective indicated by Bevan: The words כפר and צדק and both **legal** terms, by the -atoning of sin and the -bringing in of everlasting righteousness is meant the termination of that controversy or suit (ריב) which God has with His people (see Isa. 27:9).⁷⁷

It should be pointed out that these statements do not reflect a novel or recent view. The learned Pusey wrote the following statement about a century earlier.

Sin was to be done away, hid out of sight, forgiven. The words, which Daniel had so often repeated in his deep intercessory prayer, **sins, iniquity, transgression**, the thought of which lay so heavy upon him, are now repeated to him in mercy, to assure him the more emphatically through that threefold repetition, that God would put them away as if they had not been. But the mere removal of sin is imperfect. The threefold complement is added; **to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up vision and prophecy, and to anoint a Holy of holies**. These were to be gifts of God at the close of that 70th week; to be given, as they had never been given before, and the righteousness, so given, to last on to eternity. The very delay is a token of its greatness. God's gifts are with usury. It was no common forgiveness of sins, the publication of which was to be delayed, according to the letter of the prophecy, at least half a thousand years. They were not the past sins of his people, such as had brought upon them the captivity. The words are quite in the abstract, **transgression, sins, iniquity**. The fulfilment would have fallen short of the prophecy, unless, not **their** sins only but, sin in the abstract has been remitted. They were not only to be remitted; they were to be replaced. Hitherto there had been continual sacrifice for sin, a symbolical remission of all sins on the Day of Atonement, wonderful for its completeness as a picture, but incomplete; even because that wonderful picture was, year by year, renewed. Hitherto there had been many atonements for man's several sins. God here speaks of one act, atoning not for particular sins, but for sin. Once, in the future, at the end of the 70 weeks, there should be an atoning for all iniquity, i.e. for all of it, past, present, or to come. **Then**, all sin

was to be atoned for, and He Who ended and forgave it, was to **bring in everlasting righteousness. Bring in! Everlasting!** Then it was never to be removed, never worn out, never to cease, not to pass with this passing world, but to abide thenceforth, coeternal with God, its Author and Giver. Righteousness had been promised before, as the gift of the times of the Messiah, it is what man, being made for God, yearned and yearns for.⁷⁸

The 490 years consist of ten jubilees (49 x 10) leading to the ultimate Jubilee of release and rest foretold by Isaiah in 61:1-3 and announced by Christ in Luke 4:19. The Jubilee was ushered in at the close of the Day of Atonement every forty-ninth year.

The prayer of Daniel, a Day of Atonement prayer, pleading for the righteousness of God to prevail over sin, iniquity, and transgression, soliciting the favour of God in the establishment of His kingdom represented by the sanctuary, is the key to the prophecy at the close of the chapter. The figure of the righteous Prince of the house of Judah, taking the sins of his people upon himself and interceding with God till visited and strengthened by Gabriel foreshadows Luke 22:43, 44, and the great atonement accomplished by the antitypical Prince of Judah. Him God set forth as a mercy seat, that all might be justified by His grace as a gift through the redemption of His blood.

But as shown in our SPA *Daniel*, 9:24-27 and 8:14 (the former is the interpretation of the latter) while fulfilled at Calvary, are consummated in the last judgment when sin legally abolished at the cross is made an end of forever, and everlasting righteousness, legally brought in at Calvary, is established for eternity. Then will all prophetic visions be consummated, and the tabernacling again of God with men will accomplish the prediction concerning the anointing of the Most Holy. See Rev. 21:1-3. All this constitutes the vindication of God's holiness, the cleansing of the sanctuary which typified His kingdom, the eradication of evil and evil-doers, and the conferment of immortality and eternal joy upon the courtyard penitents of earth.

THE MEANING OF "KIPPUR"

We wish to pause at this point and look again at the meaning of *kippur*. Not idly have scholars related *kippur* in Dan. 9:24 as the atonement of Lev. 16. In Israel's chief book of ritual, Leviticus, *kippur* occurs approximately half as many times in this dominant and central chapter of the book as in all the others combined. It must never be forgotten that the Day of Atonement signifies the day of **the atonement**. That day summed up the significance of atonement as did none other. One cannot rightly interpret *kippur* without recourse to Lev. 16.

The Day of Atonement was part of a festal complex marking the New Year. Most evangelical scholars have difficulty with some of the positions taken by S. Mowinckel, Oesterley, and some others on this topic, but on the other hand many have agreed with the central thesis. F.F. Bruce writes: "The New Year, the Day of Atonement and the Feast of Tabernacles originally belonged to one festal complex at which the kingship of the God of Israel was annually celebrated."⁷⁹

This agrees with the position long held and taught by exegetes that the sanctuary was a symbol of the kingdom of God. The ark was an obvious symbol of His throne, His right to rule, and His constitution. The interwoven angels and presiding cherubim pointed to God's heavenly armies which carried out His will in government.

The rite of the cleansing of the sanctuary in connection with the new year properly represented the righteousness and power of the King who must remove evil, and also His clemency towards those in covenant relationship with Him.

Unless we recognize that to the Hebrew mind, as some others, ~~to~~ “reign” is synonymous with ~~to~~ “judge” we will miss important nuances of Scripture where kingship is in focus. Says Mowinckel:

Occasionally the idea of Yahweh’s struggle and victory is combined with that of an act of **judgment**: the Lord comes to judge his enemies, either the gods or the whole earth (97.7f; 98.9; 99.4). But this is not as a rule, clearly worked out as a concrete judicial act with regular indictment and verdict (a forensic act). For to judge is in Hebrew just as much to rule, or to account for one’s enemies in battle, or to save one’s friends, as to pronounce judgment; the last is only one of many ways of judging. As a rule, it means setting conditions on earth in the right order; that is the meaning of Yahweh’s judgment as a king. But there was also the determination of events for the following year, which, for instance, both the Babylonians and the Jewish tradition in the Mishna speak of as one of the deity’s deeds on mounting the throne, and which both refer to the new year festival.⁸⁰

Mowinckel also sees a connection between the heavenly King’s victory and the Day of Atonement ceremonial. He declares:

There is still another aspect of the feast of harvest and Tabernacles, to which the enthronement psalms refer. In Ps. 93:5 we read:

Thy testimonies are very sure,
holiness becomes thine house,
O Yahweh, unto endless time.

In connexion with Yahweh’s victory over the powers of chaos, and His enthronement we hear that His temple has now received the holiness belonging to it. Holiness is the numinous quality, which the Temple must have in order to be an abode worthy of Yahweh, and effective for the purpose at which the cult there is aimed. The opposite is profaneness, in this connexion the same thing as impurity. The holiness which the Temple now possesses, is not (only) a consequence of Yahweh’s entry into it; according to the conception of the Old Testament, certain cultic measures are required in order to consecrate and cleanse it from impurity; cf. Ex. 19. That is the idea behind the great annual day of purification; even if the form in which we find it in Lev. 16, as a separate *yom kippurim*, five days before the feast of tabernacles, represents a later system, there can be no doubt that something like it, some re-inauguration, re-consecration of the Temple must have belonged to the preparations for the feast of Tabernacles even in earlier times.⁸¹

It has seemed to many that discussion of *kippur* has often been too vague. It was Klaus Koch who complained that though this root is prominent in the Old Testament, there has been practically no thorough work done upon it. In our English literature the situation is worse still, except perhaps for S.R. Driver’s article, “Expiation and Atonement — Hebrew” in *HERE*, and a few similar treatments.

When we count the verb usage and that of the substantives we have approximately 125 instances. At least thirty of these instances are in connection with the Day of Atonement.

One would think this was adequate material to work on in order to come to an accurate conclusion regarding the meaning of *kippur*, but linguists are still not agreed. While *BDB* and *KB* give ~~eo~~ver” as the fundamental root idea, many lexicographers prefer ~~w~~ipe away” or ~~r~~emove.” Thus elimination for the latter takes precedence over forgiveness. In cultic passages *kippur* is linked synonymously with ~~חטא~~ , ~~מהר~~ , ~~קדש~~ but never with ~~כמה~~ , ~~צכה~~ .

N.H. Young in his thesis turns from etymology to the specific cultic contexts and notes that in Lev. 16 ~~the~~ mere thirty-four verses contain every major prepositional construction of *kippur*,” but ~~a~~ person in the cultic texts is never the direct object of *kippur*.⁸² Yet:

Kippur in the ritual never has sin or transgression as such as the object, always the thing or a person who is polluted, in order to purify, to bring into relationship with Yahweh. ... The idea is that the performance of the atonement act upon the cult object works a benefit for the offerer ... the sanctuary and the people are in an intimate association. The purification of the person, or his forgiveness ... requires the removal of his polluting sin from the sanctuary.⁸³

Then Young summarizes:

The word *kippur* is then confessedly as a cultic technical term untranslatable: ~~at~~onement” is inadequate for ~~r~~econciliation” is not the primary thought; ~~p~~ropitiation” is misleading for God is the active subject of the verb not its object; ~~e~~xpiation” is not sufficiently variegated, sin is never the direct object of the verb. Yet all these ideas are involved, for when the priest, as representing Yahweh, performs the *kippur* ritual, sin is removed, wrath does cease, and relationships are restored.⁸⁴

It is when we turn to Azazel that the meaning of *kippur* becomes clearer. We do not propose to discuss this vexed question in detail but wish simply to say that the weight of scholarship has always seemed to be on the side that has viewed Azazel as a personal name for an evil being. This alone makes full sense of the parallel in 16:8 — ~~for~~ Yahweh” and ~~for~~ Azazel.” The atonement made over Azazel in verse 10 is shown by verses 21, 22 to mean the removal of sin to that power. Thus as Ahituv has declared ~~The~~ demonic identification would indicate that the original purpose of the ritual was to get rid of the evil by banishing it to its original source.”⁸⁵

In view of Lev. 16, we must understand *kippur* as signifying the eradication of sin by removal to its source in order that those in the covenant relationship who had been contaminated might stand forgiven before God.

With this background, we are now in a better position to understand the relationship between 9:24 and 8:14 in which the former is the explanation of the latter. It is God’s judgmental activity in finishing transgression and making an end of sin that accomplishes atonement. Let it be remembered that the root of the substantive in the clause about bringing in everlasting righteousness is the same root as the verb of 8:14. Everlasting righteousness is brought in through the eradication of sin — that is through God’s active dynamic judgment. While all have ever acknowledged that the root *tsadaq* has forensic connotation, not full weight has been given to this fact when exegeting 8:14 or 9:24.

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN DANIEL 8 AND DANIEL 11

But a missing key should now be offered. Knowing as we do that chapters 11 and 12 go over the same ground as chapter 8, we are duty bound to inquire what equivalents for 8:10-14 are there to be found. Does the parallelism between 8 and 11 particularly help us to better

understand the meaning of 8:14, and does it cast light on the breadth of meaning in *nitzdaq* of 8:14?

As we answer the question it should be remembered that many scholars ~~have~~ suggested that the temple is the hinge on which Daniel's view of history turns." "... the restoration of the temple is connected with the *eschaton* in 9:24 and 8:14."⁸⁶

Let us now turn to the relationship between the temple-prophecy of Dan. 8 and the temple-prophecy of Dan. 11. First we will observe the key verses in their contexts.

Out of one of them came forth a little horn, which grew exceedingly great toward the south, toward the east, and toward the glorious land, it grew great, even to the host of heaven; and some of the host of the stars it cast down to the ground, and trampled upon them. It magnified itself, even up to the Prince of the host; and the continual burnt offering was taken away from him, and the place of his sanctuary was overthrown. And the host was given over to it together with the continual burnt offering through transgression; and truth was cast down to the ground, and the horn acted and prospered. Then I heard a holy one speaking; and another holy one said to the one that spoke, ~~For~~ how long is the vision concerning the continual burnt offering, the transgression that makes desolate, and the giving over of the sanctuary and host to be trampled under foot?" And he said to him ~~For~~ two thousand and three hundred evenings and mornings; then the sanctuary shall be restored to its rightful state." (Dan. 8:9-14 RSV)

But he who comes against him shall do according to his own will, and none shall stand before him; and he shall stand in the glorious land, and all of it shall be in his power. ... Armies shall be utterly swept away before him and broken, and the prince of the covenant also. ... But his heart shall be set against the holy covenant. ... Forces from him shall appear and profane the temple and fortress, and shall take away the continual burnt offering. And they shall set up the abomination that makes desolate. ... And those among the people who are wise shall make many understand, though they shall fall by sword and flame, by captivity and plunder, for some days. ... until the time of the end. ... And the king shall do according to his will. ... He shall prosper till the indignation is accomplished; for what is determined shall be done. ... Yet he shall come to his end, with none to help him. (Dan. 11:16-45 RSV)

It is no peculiar quirk of Adventist interpretation that holds that the theme of each passage is identical, that the prophecy of Dan. 8 is enlarged in Dan. 11. in each instance we have a blasphemous, conquering power coming against the people of the holy covenant. The Prince of the covenant, His sanctuary, and the worshippers are described as being cast down, but in each instance the promise is given that such iniquity shall not triumph forever, inasmuch as God has determined to vindicate His people and truth, and pour out His indignation upon the idolatrous and persecuting oppressor. Such vindication, however, is not to take place till ~~the~~ "the time of the end" (Dan. 8:17; 11:35, 36) after 2300 days.

The point that should be particularly noticed is that the cleansing of the sanctuary (promised in Dan. 8:14 after the description of the sanctuary's profanation) is also the answer to the polluting of the sanctuary of strength mentioned in Dan. 11:31. By considering the significance of the Hebrew word for ~~pollute~~, and by studying its synonyms and antonyms, much light is cast upon the meaning of the word translated ~~cleansed~~ in Dan. 8:14. It cannot be overemphasized that Dan. 11:31 is saying in different words the same thing as Dan. 8:9-13, and that therefore a broader understanding of Dan. 8:14 may be secured through this second and enlarged description of the situation that makes ~~cleansing~~ necessary.

The Hebrew word for “pollute” in Dan. 11:31 is *chalal*, and its chief synonyms are *chaneph* and *tame*. (*Gaal* is another.) Each of these terms is translated “defile,” “pollute,” and “profane,” and each is found in connection with the sanctuary or the holy land to which the sanctuary belonged. Study of the following verses makes it clear that the three Hebrew words here stressed were sufficiently synonymous to be used interchangeably by one of Daniel’s near contemporaries, Jeremiah.

Ye defiled [*tame*] my land, and made mine heritage an abomination. (Jer. 2:7)

Shall not that land be greatly **polluted**? ... Thou has **polluted** [*chaneph*] the land with thy whoredoms and with thy wickedness. She **defiled** [*chaneph*] the land. (Jer. 3:1, 2, 9)

They have **defiled** [*chalal*] my land, they have filled mine inheritance with the carcasses of their detestable and abominable things. (Jer. 16:18)

The context shows that in each instance wickedness, particularly that form associated with substitute worship — idolatry, was viewed as “polluting,” “defiling,” “profaning,” the land God hallowed by the sanctuary that had once housed the symbol of His presence.

We would next inquire as to the antonyms of these words. What Hebrew terms suggest the undoing of the defilement and pollution suggested by *chalal*, *chaneph*, and *tame*?

Num. 35:33 and 34 employs two of the three Hebrew words under discussion, and also an antonym.

So ye shall not pollute [*chaneph*] the land wherein ye are: for blood it defileth the land: and the land cannot be cleansed [*kippur*] of the blood that is shed therein, but by the blood of him that shed it. Defile [*tame*] not therefore the land which ye shall inhabit.

These verses speak of the defiling of the land, as did the verses in Jeremiah. Two antonyms are suggested here for *chaneph* and *tame*, even *kippur* used in verse 33, and *taher* used throughout the whole Old Testament as the most common antonym for *tame*.

Key words of Lev. 16 are *kippur* and *taher*, the words just noted as being in certain contexts antonyms to the words expressing pollution and defilement. We would emphasize, therefore, that a conceptual tie-up between Dan. 8 and Lev. 16 does exist inasmuch as the former centres upon the sanctuary’s defilement and the latter upon its purification. So much is this the case that many scholars believe that manuscripts using *taher* rather than *tsadaq* in Dan. 8:14 may yet be found (see the *Interpreter’s Bible* on this verse). For the same reason, Gesenius, in referring to the translation of *tsadaq* as “cleansed,” makes the comment that this rendering “is not inapt”. No doubt he had in mind the conceptual associations existing between the various Hebrew terms mentioned in the preceding. The *Pulpit Commentary* says, “All the versions translate as if the word has been some derivative of *taher*.”

Why then does Dan. 8:14 not use the word *taher*, the typical word for the cleansing? The revelator’s use of Dan. 8 in his apocalyptic presentation of the great controversy between Christ and Satan (Rev. 12:4, 5 cf. Dan. 8:10, 11) suggests the answer. The question found in Dan. 8:13 is one that recurs throughout Scripture, and indeed it is one that has been voiced by human lips since sin began. It is an inquiry as to when God will arise and vindicate Himself, His people, and His truth by rewarding righteousness and punishing iniquity (see Ps. 13:1, 2; 94:3; Hab. 1:2; Rev. 6:10).

Thus the question in Dan. 8:13 is actually as follows in intent: “How long before the pollution of the sanctuary is atoned for, how long before its defilements are removed, its wrongs righted, its authority vindicated? How long is it to be before substitute systems of worship, idolatrous systems, shall be exposed and God and His people triumph? When will the power of the wicked be broken and the everlasting kingdom of righteousness be established?” The closing chapter of Daniel, with its description of the setting up of the eternal state, shows that such, indeed, were the thoughts in the mind of the inspired prophet.

Obviously we would expect in reply a term broad enough to meet all that is required by such a comprehensive question. J.P. Justesen’s article “*Meaning of Tsadaq*”⁸⁷ gives abundant evidence that only one Hebrew word involves all that this situation demanded. That word is *tsadaq*, and it is found in the niphal form in the reply of Dan. 8:14. *Tsadaq* includes all that is implied by *kippur* and *taher*, but goes beyond both to express vindication and salvation. When the psalmist requested that he be cleansed from sin he used *taher* (Ps. 51:2), and justification includes such cleansing (Isa. 53:11).

Instead of *taher*, however, we find in Dan. 8:14 a word that is more forensically weighted than ceremonially, and this is entirely appropriate when we recollect that Dan. 8:14 parallels both the judgment scene of Dan. 7:9-10, and the situation calling for judgment described in Dan. 11:16-45, especially verse 31. Only the judgment with its complete revelation of all the deeds of Christ and antichrist and their followers will vindicate God before the universe (Eph. 3:10; Rom. 3:4; Rev. 15:5; 16:5, 7).

Thus we find in chapters 11 and 12 the identical pattern of chapters 8 and 9. The latter first stress the problem and then offer the solution. The same is true of the former. Thus:

- 8:10-13 ----- The problem of the success of evil
- 8:14 ----- The promised solution by God’s judgment, intervention and restoration
- 9:2-19 ----- The problem of the success of evil
- 9:24-27 ----- The promised solution by God’s judgment, intervention and restoration
- 11:21-45a ----- The problem of the success of evil
- 11:45b -12:1-13 -- The promised solution by God’s judgment, intervention and restoration

JUDGMENT—THE THEME OF DANIEL

The theme of judgment permeates the book of Daniel. We repeat what we have said elsewhere, because only as we view 8:14 in the light of the whole book does its real meaning become apparent in all its richness.

The very title of the book is significant, as is so often the case with books of Scripture. Daniel means “God is judge,” and the pages of the book are so many elaborations of that truth. The book begins and ends with references to judgment — first the judgment on apostate Israel; finally the judgment on the wicked — represented by Babylon’s king of the north — and on the righteousness — represented by Daniel, who is to rest until the allocation of his eternal destiny (of. 12:3; Ps. 1:5).

In the heart of the book (7:9-13) we have one of the greatest judgment scenes of Scripture, in which God is portrayed as the Ancient of Days with the books of judgment open and the

multitudes of angels present. On each side of this dramatic picture we have other references to judgment. In chapters 4 and 5 Nebuchadnezzar, the proud boaster, is judged and humbled to animal status, and to Belshazzar his grandson came the message “You have been weighed in the balances and found wanting.” The two chapters following chapter 7 give the very time of the judgment to come, and the twelfth chapter spells out in detail its significance concerning rewards and punishments.

We should however keep in mind the broader meaning of **judge** and **judgment** to the Hebrews. The leaders of Israel such as Gideon, Samson, and Jephthah were infinitely more than what moderns mean by “judges.” They could well have been called saviours, deliverers, rulers. The primitive Hebrew root *din* means “to bring justice,” “to judge.” As the ideas of ruling and judging are in practice closely joined in the East, so also are they linked to linguistic usage. According to the lexicons, to judge anyone meant chiefly either (1) “to condemn,” “to punish the guilty” (Gen. 15:14; Job 36:31), or (2) “to defend the right of anyone,” “to cause him to obtain his right” (Gen. 30:6; Ps. 54:1 KJV). The noun is related to the Hebrew *Adonai* which means the Strong One, the Sovereign, or Controller. Thus also prominent in this book is the word **kingdom** (*malkuth*) occurring several times more often in Daniel than in all the other prophets combined. Related Hebrew concepts to *din* and *malkuth* are *tsadaq* and *mishpat*, pertaining to what is righteous and just (see Deut. 1:16; 16:18; Jer. 11:20).

Collating the significance of this linguistic evidence concerning the meaning of Daniel (who is named more than seventy times in the book), we find in it a testimony to God as King, Judge, Deliverer, Vindicator, Warrior — all particularly appropriate for this book. Every chapter of the book testifies to God in one of these aspects. He is seen delivering His threatened people, judging and punishing rebels however high their station, vindicating truth and its believers, controlling the affairs of nations until setting up His own earthly kingdom of everlasting righteousness.

We began this consideration of the theme of Daniel by considering the meaning of the name itself. The case is strengthened when we take into account also the meaning of the names of the earthly rulers found in the early chapters. Nebuchadnezzar means, “May Nabu protect the boundary,” while Belshazzar means, “May Bel protect the king.” Both these names suggest that the deities of heathen worship are sovereign in their protecting providence. Daniel’s name and message vindicate the true God and His worship by way of contrast.

The foregoing on the theme of vindication becomes exceedingly relevant as we consider the historical setting of Daniel. The beginning of the Babylonian exile marked the end of one era and the beginning of another. To the Israelites it seemed that the kingdom of God on earth had collapsed and that Yahweh had surrendered His people to the Gentiles.

From 586 BC the temple was no more. Prior to that, the ark of the covenant had been removed and hidden. Emblematic of the whole tragedy had been the withdrawal of the Shekinah from the temple and from Mount Zion (see Eze. 10). God had forsaken Israel — or so it seemed. What would the future hold? Did God intend to forget His rebel planet and particularly the covenant race that had so continually forgotten Him?

Says Keil:

The destruction of the kingdom of Judah and the deportation of the Jews into Babylonish captivity, not only put an end to the independence of the covenant people, but also to the continuance of that constitution of the kingdom of God which was

founded at Sinai; and that not only temporarily, but for ever, for in its integrity it was never restored. In his last address and warning to the people against their continued apostasy from the Lord their God, Moses had, among other severe chastisements that would fall upon them, threatened this as the last of the punishments with which God would visit them. This threatening was repeated by all the prophets; but at the same time, following the example of Moses, they further announced that the Lord would again receive into His favour His people driven into exile, if, humbled under their sufferings, they would turn again unto Him; that He would gather them together from the heathen lands, and bring them back to their own land, and renew them by His Spirit, and would then erect anew in all its glory the kingdom of David under the Messiah.

If the prophets before the captivity, therefore, connect the deliverance of Israel from Babylon and their return to Canaan immediately with the setting up of the kingdom of God in its glory, without giving any indication that between the end of the Babylonish exile and the appearance of the Messiah a long period would intervene, this uniting together of the two events is not to be explained only from the perspective and apotelesmatic character of the prophecy, but has its foundation in the very nature of the thing itself. ... The fact of the uniting together of the future glory of the kingdom of God under the Messiah with the deliverance of Israel from exile, has perfect historical veracity. The banishment of the covenant people from the land of the Lord and their subjection to the heathen, was not only the last of those judgments which God had threatened against His degenerate people, but it also continues till the perverse rebels are exterminated, and the penitents are turned with sincere hearts to God the Lord and are saved through Christ. Consequently the exile was for Israel the last space for repentance which God in His faithfulness to His covenant granted to them. Whoever is not brought by this severe chastisement to repentance and reformation, but continues opposed to the gracious will of God, on him falls the judgment of death; and only they who turn themselves to the Lord, their God and Saviour, will be saved, gathered from among the heathen, brought in within the bonds of the covenant of grace through Christ, and become partakers of the promised riches of grace in His kingdom. (*Daniel*, 9-10)

With these things in mind it is apparent why God should inspire the writing of such a book as Daniel. **Every chapter of the book promises ultimate vindication and deliverance for those who are faithful in the midst of heathenism. Each chapter contains the motif of trial and trouble climaxed by elevation and glory. Thus the good news that tribulation issues in blessing for those obedient to Yahweh is continually sounded forth.**

Most of the historical section of Daniel deals with Babylon and its attributes to intolerance, idolatry, pride, persecution, blasphemy. Thus the narratives prefigure the prophetic pictures of spiritual Babylon, which on a larger scale perpetuates such attributes. In the first half of the book we are given just one vignette from the days of the second world empire — just enough to show that the root of Babylonian principles existed in the later powers.

As the typical example, from the prophetic section of Daniel we note that chapter 7 has for its theme the heathen powers that tread down the land of Israel and its people. Special emphasis is given to the antichrist of the fourth kingdom, even him who was typified by Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, and the rulers of Medo-Persia. In this chapter the suffering saints, represented by the Son of man, inherit at last the everlasting kingdom — the reward for their fidelity during “a time, two times, and half a time” of tribulation. Thus the theme is the same as in the first half of Daniel — the saints are tested, the heathen apparently triumph, but God intervenes, vindicates His people in judgment, and elevates them to everlasting joy.

Thus the chapters all tell the same story with emphasis upon trial, vindication, and reward. The remaining prophetic chapters enlarge what has been depicted in Dan. 7, and the closing section of the book (chapter 12) recapitulates the themes and climaxes with promises of glory for those who, like Daniel, are faithful to the one true God (see verses 7, 10, 13, 1-3).

The evidence supports the thesis that Seventh-day Adventists have not been wrong in seeing in Dan. 8:14 a promise of the last judgment — a judgment mirrored in the Day of Atonement. When chapter 9 explains chapter 8 it is the eradication of sin and the establishing of everlasting righteousness which is its theme. The key term is *kippur*, an allusion to the Day of Atonement. Parallel passages such as 7:9-13 and 11:30-12:13 confirm the fact that the atonement of 9:24 involves the judgment work of God. This disposition of evil, bringing it back upon the head of its personal source as a result of the substitutionary and representative work of the Messiah validates the judgment accomplishing the restoration foretold in 8:14.

Thus our understanding of 8:14 was ahead of its time despite being also marked by some gross inaccuracies.

(Those who wish to pursue further this theme of judgment in Daniel and Revelation need to study the nature of apocalyptic literature in general. Theodicy and loyalty to the law of God are well-known themes even in non-biblical apocalyptic. In this generation Bible scholars have acknowledged that the judgment pictures so familiar to Christians — all have their origin in apocalyptic. For a judgment-bound generation, the study of Daniel and Revelation has become more relevant than ever before. The standard works of H.H. Rowley, S.B. Frost, D.S. Russell, R.H. Charles, etc., should be consulted.)

DANIEL 8:14 AS INTERPRETED BY SCRIPTURE ITSELF

An absolutely vital question, though one much neglected by us, is whether Scripture itself interprets Dan. 8:14, and if it does, in what manner?

We would suggest that readers might study the recent SPA commentary on Daniel written in the early seventies. See particularly the prefaces to Daniel 8, 9, and the sections on the theme of the book, its literary structure, and the relationship between the narratives and visions. See pages 160-182, 198-220, 25-29 and 294-300. We draw a few summary points from these pages.

Dan. 8:13-14 is the thematic heart of the book. It is the high point of the symbolism of Daniel, and all that follows till the end is explanation of the sanctuary vision, with particular emphasis on its “cleansing” or “vindicating.”

In 8:14 we have a once-used term in Scripture: *nitsdaq*, the niphal form of *tsadaq*. This word comprehends the theme of the whole book — vindication — and thus 8:13, 14 unites the visions to the narrative portions of the book (which also have vindication as their theme) where already the sanctuary has been made prominent. See Dan. 1:1, 2 and the tests over the law of the sanctuary in chapters three and six. The vindication of God, His people, His truth, is the burden of every chapter of this Old Testament apocalypse, but this vindication finds its symbolic embodiment in 8:14. The symbolism is perfectly appropriate because the sanctuary throughout Scripture is ever an image of the kingdom of God.

Thus not only in Dan. 8:13, 14 do we find the two-fold picture of God’s kingdom threatened and ravished and then that kingdom vindicated, but the same motif characterizes the whole book. This fact, plus the command from heaven that Gabriel make plain the vision about the

sanctuary's vindication (8:16), assures us that 8:14 finds its meaning made plain in Scripture itself.

Observe how the following chart makes it clear that 8:13, 14 finds parallels throughout not only Daniel's chapters but also other eschatological passages of Scripture. Vindication (theodicy) has long been recognized as the key motif of apocalyptic, and the Danielic ~~how~~ "how long?" is its characteristic expression. Thus in the concluding apocalypse of Scripture we find Dan. 8:13, 14 echoed as follows:

They cried out with a loud voice, ~~Θ~~ "Sovereign Lord, holy and true, how long before thou wilt judge and avenge our blood on those who dwell upon the earth?" (Rev. 6:10 RSV)

And the angel whom I saw standing on sea and land lifted up his right hand to heaven and swore by him who lives for ever and ever, who created heaven and what is in it, the earth and what is in it, and the sea and what is in it, that there should be no more delay. (Rev. 10:5, 6 RSV) (Compare also Dan. 12:6, 7.)

And he said with a loud voice, ~~F~~ "Fear God and give him glory, for the hour of his judgment has come. ..." (Rev. 14:7 RSV)

~~F~~ "For his judgments are true and just; he has judged the great harlot who corrupted the earth with her fornication, and he has avenged on her the blood of his servants." (Rev. 19:2 RSV)

Who shall not fear and glorify thy name, O Lord?
For thou alone art holy.
All nations shall come and worship thee
for thy judgments have been revealed." (Rev. 15:4)

And I heard the altar cry,
~~F~~ "Fear Lord God the Almighty,
true and just are thy judgments I" (Rev. 16:7)

These parallels show that God answers the cry of ~~H~~ "How long?" by intervening in judgment. He punishes the wicked and vindicates His own. Compare also Dan. 7:21, 22, 25, 26. **This is the meaning of the "cleansing" (vindicating) of the sanctuary.** See chart following.

DANIEL (GOD IS MY VINDICATOR): THEMATIC VERSES 8:13-14

God's King- 1:1-16 dom Threatened & Ravished (8:13)	2:1-43	3:1-21	6:1-21	7:1-8,17-25	8:1-13,20-25	9:1-20	11:1-44
God's King-1:17-21 dom Vindicated & Restored (8:14)	2:44-49	3:22-30	6:22-28	7:9-14,22-27	8:14,25	9:21-27	11:45-12:13
Wickedness Prospers Till Divine Judgment chapters 4; 5; 7:9-13; 8:14, 25; 9:27; 11:45-12:13.				NB. Horn makes war and pre- vails <i>until</i> ... judg- ment. v. 21.	Horn makes war and pre- vails <i>until</i> ... sanc- tuary is <i>nitsdaq</i> . v. 13. How long?	Sanctuary desolate <i>until</i> anointing of Most Holy Place. Everlasting righteous- ness brought in. Desolate <i>until</i> the decreed end.	Sanctuary and host trodden down <i>until</i> the time of the end. Stand in lot. 12:6 How long?

NEW TESTAMENT USE OF DANIEL 8:10-14

Dan. 8:13	Desolating power	treads underfoot	sanctuary	<i>until</i> sanctuary restored, vindicated.
Parallels in New Testament				
Matt. 24:15	Abomination of desolation	stands	in the holy	<i>until</i> Son of man comes to vindicate.
2 Thess. 2:3,4	Man of sin	sits	in the temple of God	<i>until</i> Lord Jesus slays him.
Rev. 11:2	Gentiles	tread underfoot	the holy city	<i>until</i> the kingdom of the world becomes the kingdom of our Lord.

DANIEL IN THE APOCALYPSE

Dan. 8:13	Dan. 8:14
Rev. 6:10 How long?	Rev. 14:7 Hour of His judgment.
Rev. 10:7 Delay monologue.	Rev. 14:14-20 Harvest and vintage.
Rev. 12:4 Stars cast to ground.	Rev. 16-18 Seven last plagues.
Rev. 13:6 Sanctuary blasphemed.	Rev. 20:7-9 Final attack of antichrist on sanctuary.
Rev. 13:7 Host trodden underfoot.	Rev. 20:11 to (cf. <i>Great Controversy</i> last 13 pages) Universe cleansed.

We have often overlooked the fact that Gabriel was commanded to explain to Daniel the meaning of the vindication of the sanctuary (8:14). Thus we should find in Gabriel's message of 9:24-27 just what we seek. Verse 24 is the summary statement preceding the detailed elucidation of the following three verses. This summary is the answer to Daniel's prayer for the Lord to do something about His desolate sanctuary. See 9:18. Its key terms include

transgression, sin, iniquity, atonement, most holy — which expressions are only found combined in one other passage of Scripture — Lev. 16. See verses 21, 2, 15, 16, 17, 33, 34. What then is the “cleansing” of the sanctuary? It is the making an end of sin, and the bringing in of everlasting righteousness. It is the making of atonement — that is, the wiping away of evil. Forensically, this took place at the cross, but its consummation is the last judgment which will cleanse the universe from sin and sinners. Here is the inspired Scriptural interpretation of Dan. 8:14. It does indeed point to the Day of Atonement fulfilled at Calvary; and soon to be “filled full” by the final judgment of God.

SUMMARY (*See also appendix 17*)

Let us pause to recapitulate. Dan. 9 is a prophecy akin to the second half of Isaiah — it grows out of the historical situation of the captivity and promises a redemption from that state which prefigures an even greater redemption. Anyone who reads Isa. 40-66 can see the transcendent significance of these predictions about the divine rescue from the pagan land of the north. Time and again the New Testament borrows from these chapters and applies them to the salvation in Christ. See, for example, Luke 4:19 and the closing chapters of the Apocalypse.

In Dan. 9, again we have Israel poised, waiting for deliverance from their captors. In Daniel himself, that righteous prince of the house of Judah, interceding for his people as their representative and taking their sin and guilt upon himself in confession, we see a figure of Christ who also was visited by an encouraging angel when bowed down with grief over His people.

The words of the prophecy of 9:24-27 contain repeated images of salvation in its broadest sense. No words of all Scripture are more comprehensive than verse 24. Ten times forty-nine spoke of the coming great Jubilee. The number seven spoke of rest. The Jubilee rest would be brought by Christ. Let us not forget that Christ Himself applied the Jubilee type to His own salvation when preaching at Nazareth. As Isa. 53 had spoken of the Servant of Yahweh being “cut off” so with this passage. One who is both a king and a priest (“Messiah the prince” means a prince who also is an anointed priest) would be “cut off” in order to bring a finish to sin and transgression. That cutting off would constitute an atonement for iniquity. This word finds its most prominent usage in Lev. 16. No other part of Scripture applies “atone” (*kippur*) so frequently as the record of the Day of Atonement. The invocation of the comprehensive ritualistic expressions for all kinds of evil — sin, transgression, iniquity (v. 24), is also an allusion to Lev. 16. See Lev. 16:21.

Is it coincidence that the Jubilee was ushered in by the Day of Atonement, or that the Day of Atonement annually was the prelude to the great feast of rejoicing — Tabernacles — which marked the close of the harvest? We think not. Dan. 9, springing from the historical situation of the redemption of Israel from Babylon to rest in the promised land, passes to a greater redemption and a greater rest. “To finish the transgression” does not merely mean the end of Israel’s rebellion which had resulted in their captivity, but the end of the sin of all mankind. “To bring in everlasting righteousness” does not mean merely the victorious acts of God in His deliverance of Israel through Cyrus, His anointed Shepherd, but also the grand eternal righteousness imputed to all who believe in Christ the true Sun and true Shepherd. “To anoint the most holy” does not point only to the restored temple after the return from the land of captivity, or the anointing of the heavenly temple for service at the ascension of Christ, but also to the time when God Himself shall tabernacle with men in the earth made new. See Rev. 21:1-3. “To seal up the vision and the prophecy” does not only encompass the fulfilment of all Old Testament prophecy about Messianic times accomplished at the first advent, but also the consummation of those prophecies by the Second Advent. Similarly “to

make atonement for iniquity” not only signifies God’s triumph over both the sin of Israel and their oppressors, but the final abolition of all sin from earth — ~~the~~ purification of the universe from sin and sinners.”

And all this, let it be kept in mind, is explanatory of 8:14 in fulfilment of the divine admonition to Gabriel in 8:17. Usually we have thought of Gabriel as explaining just the time element of 8:14 when he came, but the what of ~~the~~ cleansing of the sanctuary” (its vindication), is even more important. Only 9:24 explains the ~~what~~” of 8:14. To vindicate the sanctuary means to finish the transgression, make an end of sin, bring in atonement for sin and simultaneously everlasting righteousness for all who believe — and in addition, confirm all prophecy by accomplishment including the establishment of the new temple — first the Christian church, secondly the new earth with its New Jerusalem as the throne of God and the everlasting temple.

THE DIVINE PURPOSE IN THE 1844 MOVEMENT AND THE SDA CHURCH

Why did God raise up this church in 1844? Why did He permit our presentation of Bible truth to be still mixed with some error?

The world of the nineteenth century was settling comfortably into the expectation of a grand millennium which would abolish every problem. Respectability was becoming the substitute for Christianity in the Western world, and a growing emphasis on science began to dissolve all belief in the supernatural. The doctrine of evolution was about to divert the race away from Scripture and its doctrine of Creation. If the race could arrive by blind chance, what need was there for law, or grace?

At such an hour God raised up this people. It inherited evangelical Christianity’s heart — the affirmation of belief in the supernatural, faith in God who had intervened and who would yet intervene again. Those dynamic truths which sprang out of the judgment of the cross ~~at~~ the end of the world” (Heb. 9:26), the ~~last~~ days” (Heb. 1:1) came startlingly to life again. Christ at His death drew attention to what lay ~~within~~ the veil” (Matt. 27:51). He had spoken of His sufferings as the Judgment of the world. He had cleansed the sanctuary of Israel as one phase of judgment messages which thundered from every discourse of passion week upon all professing religion.

In the last days of Christ’s ministry every parable was a judgment parable, even His mighty works (such as cursing the fig tree and causing the leaders of Israel to flee from Him in the temple) spoke of judgment. So also with all His discourses, particularly the woes on the Pharisees and the prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the world. He spoke also of His coming again in glory. These were the themes revived by Adventism in the mid-nineteenth century — the supernatural intervening God, the God of judgment, the One who cleanses the sanctuary of religion, and opens the way ~~within~~ the veil” to the heavenly Most Holy above, the One coming again to judge the quick and the dead. And with this emphasis on judgment came the reminder of the indebtedness of all men to the law and the Lawgiver. The truth of responsibility to our Creator was stressed and symbolized by the revival of Sabbath observance. Thereby also was given a parable of the gospel — of the rest that comes by faith in a completed work of Another.

Our emphasis on the sanctuary was intended to lead to the clear presentation of ~~the~~ everlasting gospel” there prefigured. The central facts of the sanctuary were law and judgment, grace and mediation, as the central furniture was the ark and the mercy seat. The

truths of substitution, imputation, and representation were imaged in every day's ritual. Thereby the essence of the "good news" was acted out before the eyes of penitent sinners, giving them hope through the loving kindness of their covenant God.

Thus 1844 was intended as "restoration" — a revival of the truths that had been trampled underfoot or that were about to be. The history of the church has consisted of a series of "deaths" and "resurrections" — through the eras dominated by Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, Rome pagan, and Rome papal. After each era of darkness came a new morning of restoration. All such Old Testament mornings as the Exodus, the return from Babylon and the restoration of the temple, pointed to the triumph of the cross imaged in His own resurrection which "raised" all mankind and "restored them to favour with God." See 2 Cor. 5:14; Eph. 2:6; Rom. 5:18.

And this side of the cross have come similar restorations such as the Reformation, and the great Second Advent movement of the nineteenth century. Rev. 184-4 points to yet another at a time when Antichrist for his last time threatens the church with death (2 Thess. 2; Rev. 13). For this we long — without it our movement will die. Finally, that which has been fulfilled again and again will be consummated by the coming of Christ, eternal judgment, the purification of the universe from sin and sinners.

Only this understanding can explain why Ellen G. White applied "within the veil," "the shaking," "the sealing," "the opening of the temple of God in heaven," the signs in the sun, moon, and stars, the imminence of the end, the antitypical Day of Atonement and the "cleansing of the sanctuary" as she did. Seen in this context of God's continual revival of the significance of His judgment at the cross, and that glorious restoration of mankind through its Substitute, Surety, and Representative — 1844 and our incomplete expressions of glorious truths make sense.

God's intentions were not matched by our achievements. We have been no better than our fathers. It was the gospel, the everlasting gospel, we were meant to emphasize, but we speedily got caught up in Jewish ceremonies of legalism worse than the bonds around the risen Lazarus. Almost fifty years after our birth, when Ellen G. White heard the gospel at Minneapolis she said it was the first she had heard from human lips in forty-five years except in conversations between herself and her husband. Imagine — God's remnant, the last hope for the world, ignorant of the gospel for 45 years — no — for more, even until our own sad day.

We were meant to so teach the law of God that men would die to all hope of acceptance from their own best endeavours. We were intended so to show the infinite nature of its demands that men as beggars, stripped of the filthy rags of their own righteousness, would crawl to the cross with pleading lips and quivering hands outstretched. Instead of the perfectionist chimera of becoming just like Jesus, we were intended to tell men that the only perfect thing in this world was the imputed merits of Christ. Presenting men with the judgment, we should have made men cry out for that justification without which no men can see the Lord in peace.

A.T. Jones could say in the 1890's, "You remember how it was with us, brethren. We were teaching the second coming. But none of us wanted it — for we knew we weren't ready. We were afraid of the judgment because of our guilt." Or words to that effect. Ellen G. White in *Desire of Ages* 660, says that only through the cross can we "look with joy to His second coming," but we had inverted the telescope and Calvary was far away almost hidden by Sinai.

The New Testament in the book of Romans and elsewhere explains salvation in eschatological terms. Wrath, salvation, justification, etc., belong to ~~the~~ last things.” Scholar after scholar writing on Paul tells us that he put the Christian message into an apocalyptic framework by his selection of key eschatological categories. We were meant to echo that Pauline message, and underline it by our emphasis that the consummation was at hand.

We did well to stress the judgment and the fact that each one of us has to stand before the bar of God. We did well to stress the books of record, and God’s investigation of our standing and state. Who can appreciate the gospel of imputed righteousness until he sees himself naked and guilty before heaven’s court and ~~awful~~ Judge? The New Testament is emphatic that the hour of God’s judgment is come — it came with Christ. See John 3:18, 36; 12:48; 5:24, 25, 29. Adventism recovered the heart of that truth, but ~~jud~~“aized” it. We kept up our scaffolding and the building itself was never established. The peripheries were present in full strength, but the centre was missing. The spokes were lauded, but the hub lost through neglect.

The distinction between law and gospel was never made clear — the difference between law as a method and law as a standard was not understood. Justification was thought of as something punctiliar — for the first moment of Christian life, rather than the continuing experience of every Christian because he is already counted as ~~within~~ the veil” (Heb. 10:19,22). The great gulf fixed between the finished and perfect work of Christ on the cross **for** us, and the unfinished, imperfect (because to do with **us** in our sinnerhood) work of Christ **in** us was left hazy and undefined. So our people have perished for lack of knowledge. They have died while still in the pews. They have been afraid to witness lest their own lack of assurance add more burdens to their guilty neighbours. Only when we see in justification the anticipated verdict of the last judgment — already ours — only then comes freedom from sin, and power for witnessing.

Wherever the cross is preached, the judgment convenes. Says Ellen G. White in *Desire of Ages* 57, ~~In~~ their attitude toward Christ ... everyone passes judgment on himself.” This is one meaning of ~~the~~ hour of God’s judgment is come.” All who refuse the cross invite hell. Those who reject the ~~C~~“ome unto me” offered by the outstretched crucified arms will find in God the perfect Gentleman who never forces His will on any — not even His will of joy, gladness, and life everlasting. He will let us have our own way, saying to us in infinite sorrow, ~~Thy~~ will be done.” Because the consummation of all things is at hand, because all men, saints (i.e. penitent sinners) as well as impenitent sinners must stand in the last judgment before the All-seeing Eye of their Maker, ~~the~~ everlasting gospel” becomes sweeter than honey, and should make all who receive it to sing and shout and dance for joy. Only such are ready for the Second Advent. Only to them is the return of Christ a truly blessed hope.

God is teaching the universe even by our failures. The church, enfeebled and defective, though the object of His supreme regard, testifies to principalities and powers in heavenly places ~~the~~ manifold wisdom of God.” The two great realities: that the creature is worse than he has ever suspected, and the Creator better than we have ever hoped — these are displayed to the universe even through the church’s stumblings and fumbings. It’s sinners He came to save. It’s the sick He came to heal. He loves the sick and sinful remnant, and causes even its blemishes to praise Him.

But it is not God’s intention that the state of the church should be ever as now. He can give life to the dead, and strength to the palsied. If we will humble ourselves and seek His face as the church has had continually to do on each eve of revival, the greatest reformation the world

has ever known can take place. Clothed in the armour of the righteousness of Christ, the church may yet enter the final conflict, conquering and to conquer, —fair as the moon, bright as the sun, terrible as an army with banners.” Then shall the earth be lightened with heavenly glory, and hosts from among the Gentiles converted to God drawn by the brightness of the resurrection glory of the church. This can only be if we see the meaning of the Most Holy Place to which the angel of vision pointed (*EW* 254-255) — that the glory of God is His holiness and love which were reconciled in the cross of Christ and the Christ of the cross.

Before his death James White said to his wife: —feel assured there is a crisis before us. ... The glorious subject of Redemption should long ago have been more fully presented to the people....”⁸⁸ About a decade later Ellen G. White, addressing a council of presidents, said:

We must look more to the presentation of God’s love and mercy to move the hearts of the people. We must have a sense of both the justice and mercy of God. Those who can blend together the law of God and the mercy of God can reach any heart. For years I have seen that there is a broken link which has kept us from reaching hearts, this link is supplied by presenting the love and mercy of God.⁸⁹

Here, from James and Ellen White, is the key to revival and reformation which we have long sought in vain. Only when the realities symbolized by the ark and mercy seat of the Most Holy Place become central to our preaching and living — only when the law and the gospel are seen and proclaimed in their true relationship — only then will God’s purpose for this people be fulfilled to His glory and the blessing of untold millions.

Special note. Some have questioned our contention that the gospel in its purity is not well-known among us. We should suggest consideration of the following facts:

1. Had the gospel really been understood by us, our commission would long ago have been fulfilled, and the kingdom of glory would have come. Matt. 24:14.
2. This fact is underlined by the Ellen G. White statements that the revival of the gospel in 1888 was the beginning of the Loud Cry. Note her clear comments in *Selected Messages* 1:234.

—The law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith” (Gal. 3:24). In this scripture, the Holy Spirit through the apostle is speaking especially of the moral law. The law reveals sin to us, and causes us to feel our need of Christ and to flee unto Him for pardon and peace by exercising repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ.

An unwillingness to yield up preconceived opinions, and to accept this truth, lay at the foundation of a large share of the opposition manifested at Minneapolis against the Lord’s message through Brethren [E.J.] Waggoner and [A.T.] Jones. By exciting that opposition Satan succeeded in shutting away from our people, in a great measure, the special power of the Holy Spirit that God longed to impart to them. **The enemy prevented them from obtaining that efficiency which might have been theirs in carrying the truth to the world, as the apostles proclaimed it after the day of Pentecost. The light that is to lighten the whole earth with its glory was resisted, and by the action of our own brethren has been in a great degree kept away from the world.**

3. The Lord’s Servant also tells us that not one in a hundred in the church understand righteousness by faith. If we are tempted to think things are better now we should read

Testimonies 5:136, where we are told that in the final crisis most professing Adventists will apostatize.

4. *Gospel Workers* 161 assures us that wherever freedom from guilt is experienced Satan's power is broken. Who would say that power has been largely broken over most of our church members?
5. The statistics given at our Vienna General Conference regarding the appalling lack of witnessing by our church members (e.g., the average number of Bible studies given by SDAs in this country is one per year) indicates that the good news is not yet perceived as such.
6. Most polls of our people whether in schools or churches indicate that most lack assurance and are quite uncertain as to whether they would be ready if Jesus came today.
7. It is well-known among our key administrators that a large percentage of our ministry would gladly exchange their calling for another if they could. While this can be explained in part by general unsuitability of temperament or skills, another factor almost certainly is that many are not possessed by the gospel. Most sermons give good advice rather than good news. For those who know the latter the cry of the heart is always, ~~Woe~~ "Woe unto me if I preach not the gospel." A true gospel minister cannot be restrained from proclaiming the good news by anything other than physical incapacity or death.
8. Can any find from our official literature the evidence that justification has always been understood amongst us (even in this century) as a blessing continually applying to the believer, rather than just at his conversion? We submit that the vast majority of our discussions in print make justification only a punctiliar affair, and thus miss the glory of the gospel that the believe is ever without condemnation and accepted in the beloved, despite his failures. Only apostasy can remove justification. This is the testimony of both testaments, for even in Psalms we find the psalmist conscious that his failures were as numerous as the hairs of his head but claiming God's law to be his love and rejoicing. See Psalm 40. The psalmist was aware that he was accepted because of the divine covenant, not because of any inherent perfection.
9. The essence of righteousness by faith is the distinction between the perfect and completed work of Christ **for** us on which the believer's salvation depends, and the incomplete unfinished work of the Spirit **in** us — but where does traditional Adventist literature make this distinction plain? Where have we pointed out that the righteousness of justification is perfect but not inherent, that of sanctification inherent but not perfect, and that of glorification alone both perfect **and** inherent?
10. We instinctively shy away from such passages as Gal. 2:16-21; Rom. 10:4; Gal. 3:24; 2 Cor. 3 because we have not yet clearly seen the distinction between law as a method and law as a standard. Outdated attempts to apply some of these passages to the ceremonial law only indicate this confusion.

(Nothing in this summary statement is intended to deny the New Testament teaching that judgment is a consummation reality at the end of time, as well as a present existential matter as the gospel is proclaimed. We believe the Day of Atonement applies both to the judgment of realized eschatology and also to the last judgment, the first phase of the latter being a pre-advent judgment as Christ closes His priestly ministry. See Dan. 12:1.)

ENDNOTES FOR CHAPTER THREE

- ¹ E. Käsemann, "On the Topic of Primitive Christian Apocalyptic," *JThCH* 6, 1969, 133.
- ² W. Pannenberg, *Jesus—God and Man* (London, 1968), 217.
- ³ J.W. Bowman, *The Religion of Maturity* (Nashville, 1948), 235.
- ⁴ Karl Helm, *Jesus, the World's Perfecter* (Philadelphia, 1961), 142.
- ⁵ *TDNT* 1, 570.
- ⁶ John Bright, *The Kingdom of God* (New York, 1953), 182-186.
- ⁷ L. Gaston, *No Stone on Another* (London, 1970), 175.
- ⁸ *Ibid.*, 175.
- ⁹ André Lacocque, *The Book of Daniel* (Atlanta, 1979), 194.
- ¹⁰ Bertil Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament* (Cambridge, 1965) 129, 130.
- ¹¹ "From Defendant to Judge and Deliverer," *SNTSB* 3, 1952, 40.
- ¹² L. Gaston, 381.
- ¹³ Matthew Black, "The Son of Man in the Teaching of Jesus," *Expository Times* LX, 1948, 37.
- ¹⁴ A. Feuillet, "Le Fils de L'homme de Daniel et la tradition biblique," *Révue Biblique* LX, 1953, 197.
- ¹⁵ E. Heaton, Daniel, *Torch Bible Commentaries* (London, 1967), 35, 195, 197, 212.
- ¹⁶ S.B. Frost, *Old Testament Apocalyptic* (London, 1952), 183, 199.
- ¹⁷ *5T* 211; *GC* 415-416; *SDABC* 7:931.
 "The church of God upon earth are one with the church of God above. Believers on the earth, and those who have never fallen in heaven, are one church. . . . In the inner court of heaven they listen to the testimonies of witnesses for Christ in the outer court on earth." Signs of the Times, June 5, 1895, 21, 341.
- ¹⁸ From the second address by Ellen G. White, Sunday, Oct. 21, 1888. These words followed the reception by the delegates of a telegram from ailing GC president, G.I. Butler, admonishing all to "stand by the old landmarks." See Olsen's appendix in *Through Crisis to Victory*.
- ¹⁹ James White, *The Review & Herald*, 3, 1853, 176.
- ²⁰ Not many are aware that there were at least three "fixed date" disappointments for the Advent band within less than eighteen months. See James White, *A Word to the Little Flock*, 22. A fourth came in 1851 when some Adventists again expected the Advent.
- ²¹ Vincent Taylor, *St Mark* (London, 1952), 518.
- ²² We think that A.L. Moore has the edge on Beasley-Murray when he says: "Since there is no compelling reason to understand 'that day or that hour' as precise temporal terms, it is natural to take them, following the Old Testament background as references to the Last Judgment and the Parousia. Beasley-Murray's case would be helped if the demonstrative adjective were missing: indeed, his argument allows it to lapse when he says, 'If at the present time one were asked, 'Have you any idea when war will break out in Europe?' and the reply were given, 'I do not know the day or the hour'...' — whereas the point is that 'that day' carries Old Testament overtones which 'the day' in modern usage does not." A.L. Moore, *The Parousia in the New Testament*, Supplements to N. T. Vol. XIII (Leiden, 1966), 99, 100, 267.
- ²³ Henriksen's comment upon the parallel passage in Matthew is significant at least for indicating how a later Gospel writer understood Mark. He inquires: "Does He merely mean to say that no one knows when Jerusalem will be destroyed? Does that sound like a convincing explanation of v. 36 in the light of the sublime paragraph just quoted? In v. 37 . . . is the destruction of the face of the earth by means of the Flood a type merely of Jerusalem's fall, or is it a type of 'the passing away of heaven and earth' to which reference is made in v. 35? Not only the immediate context, but also 2 Peter 3:5-7 furnishes the answer. . . . Our Lord continues His discourse in ch. 25. . . . If the lofty language of 24:29-31 refers to nothing more momentous and final than Jerusalem's destruction in the year AD 70 then by the same process of reasoning the very similar words of 25:31-46 must be given this restricted interpretation. Observe the parallel: in both cases the Son of man appears in great glory, and the people ('his elect'—'all nations') are gathered before Him. But 25:46 proves without possibility of successful contradiction that the end of the age has been reached. . . . 'And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal.'" *Lectures on the Last Things* (Grand Rapids, 1951) 24.
- ²⁴ Cited by Beasley Murray, *Jesus and the Future, An Examination of the Criticism of the Eschatological Discourse, Mark 13, with Special Reference to the Little Apocalypse Theory* (London-New York, 1954) 199.
- ²⁵ C.H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom* (London, 21961), 51.
- ²⁶ Mark 12 and Matt. 23.
- ²⁷ Matt. 23:38.
- ²⁸ C.E.B. Cranfield, *The Gospel According to St Mark* (Cambridge, 1959) 402.

- ²⁹ R.A. Knox, *A New Testament Commentary* (vols., London, 1952), 1, 56.
- ³⁰ G.B. Caird, *The Apostolic Age* (London, 1958), 189.
- ³¹ *Ibid.*, 192.
- ³² *Ibid.*
- ³³ *Parousia*, 206.
- ³⁴ *Matthew*, 222.
- ³⁵ Richard W. Coffen, *Spectrum*, 8 (1), 21.
- ³⁶ Carl E. Amerding and W. Ward Gasque, eds., *Handbook of Biblical Prophecy* (Grand Rapids, 1977), 9.
- ³⁷ W.H. Simcox, *Revelation—Cambridge Greek Testament* (Cambridge, 1893), 40.
- ³⁸ F.F. Bruce, “The Revelation to St. John,” *A New Testament Commentary*, eds. G.C.D. Howley, F.F. Bruce, H.L. Ellison (London, 1969), 633.
- ³⁹ G.B. Caird, *Revelation* (London, 1966), 12.
- ⁴⁰ E.W. Hengstenberg, *The Revelation of St. John*, trans. P. Fairbairn (Edinburgh, 1851), 1, 47-49.
- ⁴¹ Friedrich Düsterdieck, *Handbook to the Revelation of John*, trans. Henry E. Jacobs (New York, 1887), 96.
- ⁴² O. Allis, *Prophecy and the Church* (Philadelphia, 1945), 25, 26, 27.
- ⁴³ W. Pannenberg, *Faith and Reality* (Philadelphia, 1977), 12.
- ⁴⁴ *Theologie des Alten Testaments, II* (Göttingen, 1960), 387, cited by Pannenberg, *op.cit.*, 13.
- ⁴⁵ C.H. Wright, *Daniel and the Prophecies* (London, 1906), 189.
- ⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 190, 268.
- ⁴⁷ G.R. Beasley-Murray, “Revelation,” *The New Bible Commentary*, Revised eds. D. Guthrie, J.A. Motyer, A.M. Stibbs, D.J. Wiseman (London, 1970), 1302.
- ⁴⁸ Moses Stuart, *Daniel* (Boston, 1859), 30, 31.
- ⁴⁹ P. Fairbairn, *The Interpretation of Prophecy* (Edinburgh, 1856), 5, 6.
- ⁵⁰ C.A. Auberlen, *The Prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation of St John* (Edinburgh, 1857) 126, 127, 128, 129.
- ⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136.
- ⁵² Taylor G. Bunch, “The Book of Daniel” (Mimeographed, 1950), 134-136.
- ⁵³ Letter from W.W. Prescott to W.C. White, April 25, 1910. E.G. White Estate.
- ⁵⁴ *Encyclopedia Judaica*, ed. L.I. Rabinowitz, Yearbook, 1974, 404.
- ⁵⁵ “Year,” *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Dictionary*, 1163.
- ⁵⁶ Letter from W.W. Prescott to W.C. White, April 26, 1910. E. G. White Estate.
- ⁵⁷ *SDABC* 4:834, 836, 837, 838.
- ⁵⁸ J. Litch, *Daniel and the Apocalypse* (Philadelphia, 1873), 170.
- ⁵⁹ 1919 Bible Conference records; 7/3/19, 55, 56, 57, 97, 101; 7/6/19, 82; 7/8/19, 72; 7/17/19, 49-51. GC Archives.
- ⁶⁰ N.F. Douty, *Another Look at Seventh-day Adventism* (Grand Rapids, 1962), 93-95.
- ⁶¹ Wrote Moses Stuart long ago: “The words **day** and **days** are often employed in a generic sense. Thus: ‘**h** the latter day;’ ‘**h** thy days are numbered;’ ‘**h** the day of the Lord;’ and other very frequent expressions of the like meaning. So is it also with the word **hour**. The sum of all is, that the specific designations of time, viz, **day**, **days**, **year**, **years**, etc., are often employed in the **generic** sense of time. In all such cases, *synecdoche*, i.e., a figure of speech where a part is taken for the whole and *vice versa*, is to be found; and no figure in rhetoric is more usual than this, in all languages whatever. (*Hints on the Interpretation of Prophecy*, [Andover, 1842], 71.)
- ⁶² The well-known commentator on Daniel, O. Heaton, son-in-law of C.H. Dodd, has written on this term as follows: “The RV mg. notes that the Hebrew word here is ‘justified,’ that is, vindicated, delivered from its heathen defilement. When St. Paul adopted the term in his teaching about justification by faith, he gave it wider meaning, but he did not depart fundamentally from the idea expressed in the present context, namely, the restoration to a normal and right condition of somebody or something put in the wrong. ...” (O. Heaton, *Daniel* [London, 1956], 196.) This statement is highly significant when we take into account Dan. 9:24 with its reference to “everlasting righteousness” i.e. “everlasting vindication.” The atonement for iniquity spoken of in that verse brings a legal righteousness, an acquittal, to all who believe. This is precisely Paul’s meaning in Rom 3:21-28 where he refers to Christ as “a mercy seat” who by His blood has restored the penitent to a right estate. Dan. 9:24 explains 8:14 by reference to the grand restoration accomplishment of the cross when the Messiah was “cut off” as an atonement for our sins, transgressions, and iniquities. The book of Revelation, as we shall see next chapter, takes the same fontal prophecy of Dan. 9:24 (and thus 8:14) and applies it also to atonement in consummation at the last judgment.
- ⁶³ Montgomery writes: “Anointing the Most Holy;’ ... The term is used always of sacrosanct things or places. ... This well-nigh universal use of ‘the holiest’ compels us to interpret the term as of either the temple or

especially the altar of burnt offerings; see the narrative of the rededication by Judas, 1 Mac. 4.” (*Daniel*, ICC [Edinburgh, 1927], 375.) 269

—But the best of all these terms is the last one: *and to anoint the Most Holy*. Now *to anoint* means *to consecrate*, to put into place and effectiveness. And *the Most Holy* is never used of a person. It does not refer to God: it refers to the Holy of Holies, or quite literally, *a Holiness of Holinesses*. . . . It refers to the Holy of Holies, the Innermost shrine of the temple. And, you see, this refers to cleansing of the sanctuary in ch. viii, 14, which immediately precedes the end.” (Geoffrey R. King, *Daniel, A Detailed Explanation of the Book* [London, 1966], 176, 177.)

—We must have some patience in examining the view honestly held by many scholars, that all these phrases about the finishing of **transgression** and **sin**, atoning for **iniquity** and bringing in of **everlasting righteousness** referring in the mind of the writer himself to what was accomplished in the temple courts at Jerusalem, when, after the terrible persecution by Antiochus, the Jews won their liberty by the grace of God, the temple was cleansed and rededicated, and its evil purged.” (Ronald S. Wallace, *The Lord is King* [Illinois, 1977], 165.)

—The Holy of Holies anointed. The innermost sanctuary of the Temple reconsecrated after its defilement by Epiphanes.” (M. Ford, *Daniel*, Anchor Bible, ed. Louis F. Hartman and Alexander A. Dillella [Andover, 1842], 244.)

—That the author of Dan. 9 is as well that final redactor of chapters 7 and 8-12 is attested to by several clues. Dan. 9:21 for instance presupposes 8:16, and 9:27b constitutes a parallel to 7:25, 8:14, 12:7.” (Andre Lacocque, *Hebrew Union College Annual*, ed. Sheldon N. Blank [Cincinnati, 1976], 47, 110.)

—In that case, the expression *“Holy of Holies”* not only designates the restored Temple, but also the faithful priesthood around whom is gathered the community of Israel. ‘ J. de Menasce turns up his nose at any timidity on this point: 1 Chron. 23:13 concerns *the* priestly consecration of Aaron and his sons.’ ” (Andre Lacocque, *The Book of Daniel* [Atlanta, 1979], 194.)

Lacocque sees the Day of Atonement not only in Dan. 9, but also in chapters 10 and 12. See pages 205, 209, 240. Thus 8:14, which he parallels to the 9:24-27 prophecy, is also a *Yom Kippur* reference.

See also Joseph A. Fitzmeyer, *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (London, 1977), 251, 253. See appendix, *“Dan. 9:24-27 Recognized as Containing Jubilee and Day of Atonement Allusions.”*

—The prospect of an *anointing of the most holy*, ‘ which is presented at the close, or rather of **a most Holy** (*שׂוֹמֵךְ*, without the article) is evidently a solemn act of worship, which is substantially equivalent to the restoration of the theocratic worship as a whole. It is the anointing with oil or theocratic consecration of the **sacrificial altar** of the New Covenant, of the Messianic community of the redeemed, the pure sanctuary, which shall no more be profaned, that, according to chap. 8:14 (cf. 7:25; 9:17), shall take the place of the desecrated and defiled altar of the Old Dispensation. . . . The prophecy under consideration has been twice fulfilled—at first externally and in a literal sense, by the actual restoration of the Old Testament services in the temple with their bloody offerings of animals, which came to pass three years after they had been interrupted by Antiochus Epiphanes in the Maccabean age (1 Macc. 4:54-59), and afterward in the antitype by the historical introduction of the more perfect sanctuary and worship of the New Covenant, which were likewise foretold by the prophet Zechariah (chap. 3:9) and whose sacrificial altar is Christ, having become such through the **cross** which He anointed and consecrated by His own exalted priestly sacrifice and blood.” (O. Zockler, *“Daniel,” Lange’s Commentary*, reprinted [Grand Rapids, 1960], 195, 196.)

—In 9:24 we are given a brief prophetic statement of what the eschatological restoration involves:

Seventy weeks of years are decreed concerning your people and your holy city, to finish transgression, to put an end to sin, and to atone for iniquity, to bring in everlasting righteousness, to seal both vision and prophet, and to anoint a most holy place.

—The termination of sin and the ushering in of righteousness give no specific information about the nature of the final kingdom. The only significant point for our problem is that the temple will be reconsecrated. The restoration of the temple is also said to mark the end-time in 8:14.

—The fact remains that the restoration of the temple is connected with the *eschaton* in 9:24 and 8:14.” (J. J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel* [Montana, 1977],

Special Note: The conclusions set forth in this summary on Dan. 8:14 are argued in the SPA *Daniel* commentary, and the reader is referred to that for the evidential details.

⁶⁴ Desmond Ford, *Daniel* (Nashville, 1978) 174-177.

⁶⁵ Excerpts from A.J. Ferch.

- ⁶⁶ G. Oosterwal, *—Praise God in His Sanctuary*,” unpublished manuscript, 1967, 9, 10, 12, 15, 16, 19, 20.
- ⁶⁷ G.F. Hasel, *—The ‘Little Horn,’ the Saints and the Sanctuary in Daniel 8*,” unpublished manuscript, 35. 1979.
- ⁶⁸ G.F. Hasel, *—Christ’s Atoning Ministry in Heaven*,” *Ministry* [1975 or 1976], 25-26.
- ⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 24-25.
- ⁷⁰ *—The Works of Flavius Josephus*,” *Antiquities of the Jews*, trans. by William Whiston (Baltimore, 1833), Book XII, Ch. VII, 250.
- ⁷¹ 1919 Bible Conference records. GC Archives.
- ⁷² Uriah Smith, *Daniel and Revelation* (Washington, D.C., 1897), 172.
- ⁷³ *Ibid.*
- ⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 174.
- ⁷⁵ I would like to emphasize that I certainly do not believe that the days of Antiochus Epiphanes exhaust Dan. 8, or that those times and the original application of the prophecy has the chief importance for us today. The New Testament, because of the failure of Israel, reinterprets the prophecies of Daniel and applies the little horn of Dan. 8 to Rome, and to Antichrist. See Matt. 24:5.
- When we study the New Testament usage of the prophecy in Dan. 8, we find the same pattern though an enlarged application. In Mark 13 and Matt. 24 we find the first half of the chapter follows the line-up of Dan. 8:10-13—oppression against the people of God. But the second half of the Olivet discourse parallels Dan. 8:14 (and Dan. 7:9-13) by presenting the victorious Son of Man coming in judgment to vindicate His saints. 2 Thess. 2 follows the same format. The first verses tell of the success of Antichrist in the sanctuary of God, but the second half tells of judgment and destruction for this wicked power and all who follow him. 2 Thess. 2, as Mark 13:14, draws from the apocalyptic sketch of Dan. 8 and its enlargement in Dan. 9, and pursues the same sequence of ideas—the victory of evil, but then the vindication of God and His people.
- Rev. 11 and the following chapters also embody the motifs of Dan. 8. Verse 13 of Dan. 8 is quoted in 11:2 and alluded to in 13:7, while Rev. 12:4 quotes Dan. 8:10. After Rev. 11 sets forth the victory of the power trampling upon the sanctuary it then moves into the theme of judgment upon the wicked and reward for the saints. See verses 18 and 19 as well as 11:11-13. After Rev. 2 pictures the dragon doing precisely what Daniel’s little horn did, it introduces the vindicating figure of Michael who gets the victory of antichrist and delivers the people of God. Rev. 12:7-9 should not be separated from the work of Michael in Dan. 12:1. Again in Rev. 13, the persecuting Antichrist is pictured in imagery borrowed from Dan. 7, 8, 9, but the following chapters set forth the judgment foretold by Dan. 7:9-13, 8:14 and 9:24, 27.
- Thus the New Testament in interpreting the prophecies of Daniel certainly points both to pagan Rome (the desolator of Jerusalem according to Matt. 24:15) and to Antichrist (2 Thess. 2 and Rev. 11, 12, 13), but it also gives the same emphasis to vindication through judgment on the wicked as Daniel. Thus the New Testament equivalents of Dan. 8:14 reinforce the contextual evidence of Dan. 8, that God’s judgment is not upon the saints, but upon their opposers.
- ⁷⁶ See our discussion of the apotelesmatic principle in chapter 5.
- ⁷⁷ André Lacocque, *The Book of Daniel* (Atlanta, 1979), 182, 192.
- ⁷⁸ .B. Pusey, *Lectures on Daniel the Prophet* (London, 1886), 194.
- ⁷⁹ F.F. Bruce, *Hebrews* (NICNT, Grand Rapids, 1964), 199.
- ⁸⁰ S. Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel’s Worship* (New York, 1967), 108.
- ⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 126.
- ⁸² *Op. cit.*, 66, 67.
- ⁸³ *Op. cit.*, 68, 69.
- ⁸⁴ N.H. Young, *—The Impact of the Jewish Day of Atonement on the Thought of the New Testament*,” unpublished PhD thesis (Manchester, 1973), 70.
- ⁸⁵ *—Aza’zel*,” *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 111, 1002, cited by Young, *op.cit.*, 74.
- ⁸⁶ J.J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel* (Harvard, 1977), 163, 165.
- ⁸⁷ J.P. Justesen, *—Meaning of Tsadaq*,” (AUSS, 1964), 2, 53-61.
- ⁸⁸ E.G. White, *—A Sketch of Experience*,” Pamphlet 168: *In Memoriam: A Sketch of the Last Sickness and Death of Elder James White* (1881) (Mrs. White’s Address)
- ⁸⁹ E.G. White, Council of Presidents Meeting 5, March 3, 1891, GC Archives.

CHAPTER FOUR

The Book Of Revelation And The Day Of Atonement

OUTLINE OF CHAPTER FOUR

The Book of Revelation and the Day of Atonement	Page
Summary Of Chapter	285
The Kingdom And Judgment In Fulfillment (The Gospels) And The Kingdom And Judgment In Consummation (The Apocalypse)	287
The Daniel 9:24-27 Atonement Prophecy.....	288
Fulfilled At The Cross.....	288
Consummated At The Coming	289
Sanctuary Imagery In Revelation	290
The Lamb As Judge And King	290
The Day Of Atonement In Revelation	291
The Day Of Atonement And 1 Enoch.....	298
The Day Of Atonement And Revelation 13	298
The Future To Recapitulate The Cross Event—Making An End Of Sin.....	299
Endnotes for Chapter Four	300

Appendices particularly relevant to this chapter:

25. A. Farrer on the Day of Atonement and Dan. 8:14 in Revelation
26. Dan. 9:24-27 and the Olivet Discourse

Summary of Chapter

Hebrews presented the Cross-Resurrection-Ascension event as the fulfilment of the Day of Atonement.

Revelation presents the Judgment-Advent event as the consummation of the Day of Atonement. The seventh seal, the seventh trumpet, and the seven last plagues abound in *Yom Kippur* imagery.

THE KINGDOM AND JUDGMENT IN FULFILLMENT (The Gospels) AND THE KINGDOM AND JUDGMENT IN CONSUMMATION (The Apocalypse)

The Apocalypse, as with all prior apocalyptic, has for its theme - judgment. But that theme is spelled out with the judgment of the Cross as its background. Everything in this book is related to Christ. Even evil is set forth as a parody of the things of our Lord. As for the kingdom to come, it is represented as but the consummation of the kingdom Jesus had already inaugurated by His life and death.

Judgment and consummation are correlates, and the full significance of Old Testament pictures of the kingdom can only be found in this closing book of the canonical scriptures. While the Old Testament ever fused the two advents as one, after the Christ event the two phases of the kingdom become distinct though not separate.

The events of the consummation are set forth in language reminiscent of words and phrases we find in the Gospels and the Epistles. The “it is done” of Rev. 16:17 echoes the “it is finished” of the Cross. “The former things are passed away,” declares Rev. 21:5, setting its seal to 2 Cor. 5:17, “old things are passed away.” “Behold, I make all things new” (Rev. 21:5), and “there is a new creation” (2 Cor. 5:17) are similarly parallel. The “rivers of living water” spoken of by Christ become material in Rev. 22:1, and the light which knows no darkness (Jn. 8:12) also. See Rev. 22:5. **This relationship between fulfilment in the days of the first advent, and consummation with the second is vital for our understanding of the use made of the Day of Atonement in the Atonement.**

The wrath of God, which according to John and Paul, now rests on the unbelieving, becomes a climactic reality in the Apocalypse. Note the following:

“For God did not send his Son into the world to condemn the world, but to save the world through him. Whoever believes in the Son has eternal life, but whoever rejects the Son will not see life, for God’s wrath remains on him.” (John 3:17, 36 NIV)

The wrath of God is being revealed from heaven against all the godlessness and wickedness of men who suppress the truth by their wickedness. (Rom. 1:18 NIV)

“He, too, will drink of the wine of God’s fury, which has been poured full strength into the cup of his wrath. He will be tormented with burning sulfur in the presence of the holy angels and of the Lamb. And the smoke of their torment rises for ever and ever. There is no rest day or night for those who worship the beast and his image, or for anyone who receives the mark of his name.” (Rev. 14:10, 11 NIV)

I saw in heaven another great and marvellous sign: seven angels with the seven last plagues — last, because with them God’s wrath is completed. (Rev. 15:1 NIV)

Then I heard a loud voice from the temple saying to the seven angels, “Go, pour out the seven bowls of God’s wrath on the earth.” (Rev. 16:1 NIV)

One of the seven angels who had the seven bowls came and said to me, “Come, I will show you the punishment of the great prostitute, who sits on many waters.” (Rev. 17:1 NIV)

Therefore in one day her plagues will overtake her:
 death, mourning and famine.
 She will be consumed by fire,
 for mighty is the Lord God who judges her. (Rev. 18:8 NIV)
 “For true and just are his judgments.
 He has condemned the great prostitute,
 who corrupted the earth by her adulteries.
 He has avenged on her the blood of his servants.”

But the beast was captured, and with him the false prophet who had performed the miraculous signs on his behalf. With these signs he had deluded those who had received the mark of the beast and worshiped his image. The two of them were thrown alive into the fiery lake of burning sulfur. The rest of them were killed with the sword that came out of the mouth of the rider on the horse, and all the birds gorged themselves on their flesh. (Rev. 19:2, 20, 21 NIV)

Then death and Hades were thrown into the lake of fire. The lake of fire is the second death. If anyone’s name was not found written in the book of life, he was thrown into the lake of fire. (Rev. 20:14, 15 NIV)

John’s Gospel affirms a present judgment. “The hour is coming and now is ...” fits both judgment and resurrection. All are judged in the present by their attitude to Christ. The synoptics by the parables are saying the same. Jeremias in his classic on the parables, Dodd, and others have clearly perceived this.

Not only Christ’s words, but His deeds proclaimed the present judgment. His destruction of the fruitless fig-tree, His kingly entrance into Jerusalem, His cleansing of the temple — all speak of the final judgment.¹ W. Stahlin is quoted by Jeremias thus: “The overwhelming number of Jesus’ symbolic actions serve to proclaim the fulfilment of the eschata” (*Parables*, p. 228).

THE DANIEL 9:24-27 ATONEMENT PROPHECY

Fulfilled at the Cross

The key Old Testament book on the *eschaton* is Daniel from which Christ took His title as King and Judge — the “Son of Man,” and to understand the full implications of Christ’s words and acts about judgment, we must attend to the Old Testament prophecy which He was fulfilling. Seventh-day Adventists have always linked the books of Daniel and Revelation. There are excellent grounds for doing so, and some of the best do not appear on the surface. **During the last century many have seen that the Olivet discourse is both a *peshet* [commentary] on the consummation pictures in Daniel, and also the seed-plot of the final Apocalypse.** The repeated echoes of Judgment in Daniel were taken up by Jesus and then by the seer of Patmos. We recall the words of Karl Helm that “at least in its main features Jesus accepts the vision of the future of the world given by Daniel.”² In illustration of the truth of this, observe how our Lord based His second advent sermon on the eschatology of the Old Testament prophet.

Excurses on the Usage of Daniel by the Olivet Discourse

Markan passages compared with parallels in Daniel.

MARK 13

“... when these things are all to be accomplished?” v. 4.

“... the end ...” vv. 7, 13

“... this must take place ...” v. 7.

“... you will be hated by all for my name’s sake. But he who endures to the end will be saved” v. 13.

“... the desolating sacrilege set up where it ought not to be ...” v. 14

“... let him that readeth understand ...” v. 14.

“... such tribulation as has not been from from the beginning of the creation which God created until now ...” v. 19

“... if the Lord had not shortened the days ...” v. 20

“False Christs and false prophets will arise and show signs and wonders ...” v. 22.

“... the Son of man coming in clouds with great power and glory.” V. 26.

“... these great buildings [the sanctuary].” v. 2.

“And the gospel must first be published among the nations.” V. 10.

“... he shall gather his elect from the four winds.” V. 27.

DANIEL

“... all these things would be accomplished.” 12:7.

“... the time of the end.” 8:17; 9:26; 11:40; 12:4, 13

“... what will be ...” 2:28

“... they shall fall by sword and flame, by captivity and plunder, for some days ... to refine and cleanse them and to make them white, until the time of the end. ...” 11:33, 35.

“... your people shall be delivered ...” 12:1.

“... the transgression that makes desolate ...” 8:13.

“... upon the wing of abominations shall come one who makes desolate ...” 9:27.

“... the abomination that makes desolate.” 11:31.

“... the abomination that makes desolate ...” 12:11.

Daniel uses the thought of understanding over a score of times. See particularly 8:15, 16, 17; 9:2, 22, 23; 10:1; 11:33; 12:8.

“And there shall be a time of trouble, such as never has been since there was a nation. ...” 12:1.

“Seventy weeks of years are decreed concerning your people ...” 9:24.

“He shall give no heed to the gods of his fathers.” 11:37.

“... behold, with the clouds of heaven there came one like a son of man ... And to him was given dominion and glory and kingdom. ...” 7:13.

“... then the sanctuary shall be restored to its rightful estate.” 8:14.

“... shall destroy the city and the sanctuary.” 9:26.

“... they that turn many to righteousness.” 12:3.

“Many that sleep ... shall awake, some to everlasting life.” 12:2.

Consummated at the Coming

It is vital to our understanding of Old Testament apocalyptic to see that the prophecy of Dan. 9:24-27, which has usually been applied by us as a church to the first advent of Christ only, was applied by our Lord to His second coming. The above chart should make

that clear. In support, we cite scholars who have recognized the relationship.³ Others have seen that this New Testament enlargement of Dan. 9:24-27 is itself enlarged in the Apocalypse. Note the words of Milligan:

The Apocalypse is moulded by that great discourse of our Lord upon “the last things” which has been preserved for us in the first three gospels. The parallelism between the two is to a certain extent acknowledged by all inquirers, and is indeed in many respects so obvious that it can hardly escape the notice of even the ordinary reader. Let anyone compare, for example, the account of the opening of the sixth seal in Rev. 6:12-17 with the description of the end in Matt. 24:29, 30, and he will see that the one is almost a transcript of the other. Or let the three series of apocalyptic visions, — the Seals, the Trumpets, and the Bowls, be compared with the other parts of the discourse, and it will be found that, speaking generally, they are filled with the same thoughts, — with wars, pestilences, famines, earthquakes, signs in sun and moon and stars, false teachers doing wonders and trying to deceive the very elect, the elect preserved, angels sent forth to gather them with the great sound of a trumpet, the victorious progress of the Gospel, the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven, the final deliverance of the good, and the just judgment of the wicked. These things reveal in a way not to be mistaken a very intimate relation between the last prophecy of Christ and the Revelation of St. John.⁴

Thus Revelation is Dan. 9:24-27 re-interpreted and writ large for this era, especially the “atonement for iniquity” mentioned in verse 24.

SANCTUARY IMAGERY IN REVELATION

Are there new images in Revelation expressing the old theme of Judgment — images not prominent in Daniel and the Olivet discourse? Yes. While both Daniel and Matt. 24, Mark 13, Luke 21 revolve around the Sanctuary, they do not draw heavily upon details of the sanctuary ritual, but the opposite is true of Revelation. Both the daily ritual and the yearly are mirrored in the Apocalypse, and frequently in connection with judgment. Such scholars as P. Carrington, D.T. Niles, A. Farrer, and the author of the recent Anchor commentary on Revelation repeatedly stress this fact. **And as Sir Isaac Newton recognized centuries ago, it is the festal complex of the seventh month which is particularly prominent.**

THE LAMB AS JUDGE AND KING

Of course the chief sanctuary image in the Apocalypse is the Passover Lamb. Christ is represented thus twenty-eight times. The Passover represented both redemption and judgment, and so does the Lamb. Though the most prominent symbol of our Lord in this book, outside the Apocalypse the New Testament does not use the lamb symbol frequently. See John 1:29, 36; 1 Peter 1:19; Acts 8:32; 1 Cor. 5:7. These latter passages use *amnos*, probably because the LXX uses it in Isa. 53:7, but it does not appear in Revelation. Nevertheless, the significance of the lamb motif remains the same, plus the additional apocalyptic stress on the lamb as Conqueror or Judge so well known to inter-testamental literature. Possibly the change to *arnion* is in order to indicate the addition. **The Lamb is now a Lamb who judges, and by His wrath eradicates sin and sinners.**

If the central role of Christ in John’s visions differs from that in his gospel, why is Christ set forth in sacrificial symbolism at all? The answer must embrace several facets of truth. All Jesus does subsequent to His sacrifice is done in view of that grand event, and is vitally connected thereto. Christ appears as Judge because Calvary has been despised. Secondly, all that Jesus does subsequent to His death is but the consummation of His prior achievement,

and is in no sense a real contrast. Calvary too was judgment. John 12:31. Thirdly, God would have us remember that Christ is still the same compassionate Son of Man. He who ministers in the heavens is our Saviour, and since we are now justified by His blood, “much more shall we be saved by Him from the wrath of God. For if while we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, now that we are reconciled, shall we be saved by his life” Rom 5:9, 10. This transition from reconciliation to wrath is the identical transition represented by the passage from the festival of Passover to that of the Day of Atonement.

THE DAY OF ATONEMENT IN REVELATION

The significant thing about the Day of Atonement allusions in Revelation is that they are in the context of judgment and the wrath of God, so far as the Apocalypse is concerned.

These allusions are found particularly in the account of the seventh seal just prior to the description of the blowing of the trumpets of judgment; the seventh trumpet; and in the introduction to the seven last plagues — all three settings having to do with the final eradication of evil by Christ’s closing ministry of judgment.

Then, last of all, the great Assize chapter (Rev. 20), and the picture of the New Jerusalem in chapter 21 as an enlarged Holy of holies, also draw upon the Day of Atonement. See 21:11 for a reference to the Shekinah in antitype.

A city shaped like a cube is difficult to conceive, but the point may be that it corresponds to the cube-shaped Holy of Holies in the temple. According to v. 22 there is to be no temple in the city. All the inhabitants have free access to God. Under the Jewish regime only the high priest could enter the Holy of Holies and that only once a year; but Christ has destroyed the veil of separation which kept men out and has opened a new and living way by which all are invited to approach. This is one of the main themes of Hebrews and it may be that a similar thought finds pictorial expression here.

The twelve jewels worn by the high priest alone are now the very foundation of the city. The city itself is as sacred as the Holy of Holies and all the inhabitants are „named the priests of the Lord“ (Isa. 61:6); cf. Rev. 1:6, 21. John Bunyan in his commentary on this chapter (*The New Jerusalem*) suggested that the paving of pure gold derived from the temple, whose floor was overlaid with gold (1 Kings 6:30).⁵

The allusions to the Day of Atonement in Revelation are not merely incidental but extended. For example, in Rev. 14:20, the expression “without the city” signifies the same as “without the camp” in Heb. 13:11, and like it, points to the Day of Atonement. But this reference belongs to a lengthy chain of symbols about the judgments of God at the last time. Rev. 14:9-11 contains the most fearful warning in all of Scripture about the wrath of God, and itself is the climax of three messages about judgment. Immediately after these verses we have apocalyptic sketches of Christ’s second coming, and the harvest of both the righteous and the wicked. The latter are said to suffer “without the city,” just as the carcass of the slain goat on the Day of Atonement was burned outside the camp.

This destruction of the wicked “outside the city” is followed by the scene of the seven angels, dressed in priestly attire like that of the High Priest on the Day of Atonement, emerging from the temple carrying the vials of divine wrath. Then, as if to underline the intent of the whole chapter, the closing words are: “... and no man was able to enter into the temple, till the seven plagues of the seven angels were fulfilled.” This also is reminiscent of the Day of Atonement

when no man, not even a priest, could enter the sanctuary while the High Priest performed his closing ministry for the year. See Lev. 16:17.

When we come to Rev. 20 which closes the sequence of “wrath” scenes, there is another parallel to the “without the city” of 14:20. The devil is now chained “without the city” in the desolate wilderness of earth for 1000 years. Commentators have seen in this an allusion to the Azazel ceremony of Leviticus 16.⁶ Thus from chapter 14 to chapter 20 the account of divine judgment is interwoven with allusions to the Day of Atonement.⁷

One writer who has incorporated this theme of the presence of the festal year in the Apocalypse is D.T. Niles. His outline is representative of that of other scholars such as Carrington and Farrer, except that he includes the later ceremonial of the feast of Lights (Dedication). If we ask as to why Niles should include a festivity not found in Lev. 23, the answer is that Niles recognizes in Revelation allusions to the ancient conflict with Antiochus Epiphanes, and also the joyous time of the rededication of the sanctuary which followed that crisis. He is not alone in this recognition. As far back in the era of scientific exegesis as the days of Moses Stuart this position was taken. Because Niles adequately comprehends the views of many in the area of Revelation’s use of the sacred year, we give his summary.

The Jewish festal year represented a continuous movement of the history of Israel from the celebration of its deliverance from Egypt up to the fulfilment of its destiny according to God’s promise to Abraham. God had said to Abraham, “I will bless you, ... so that you will be a blessing ... and by you all the families of the earth will bless themselves.”

1. **Passover:** The festive year began with the feast of the Passover. Before the feast itself was a period of preparation, at least a month, in which roads and bridges were repaired for the benefit of pilgrims. Also, on the day before the Passover, a search was made in each house to discover and throw out any leaven that happened to be left. This search was made with lit candles. Then, on the day of Passover itself, was held the Passover meal.

The letters of John to the seven churches was concerned with this period of preparation. The churches must be got ready for the feast. The Lord is now searching out with lamps the leaven in their midst. Soon He will come and knock at the door. “If any man open” He says, “I will come in and sup with him and he with Me.” He will come as both guest and host, He who is also the Passover lamb.

2. **Pentecost:** The period from the Passover to Pentecost, seven weeks afterward, was one season. The chief events of the season were related to the birth of spring and the gathering of first fruits from the fields. The spring of Israel began with their deliverance from Egypt, which act of God Israel celebrated by the paschal lamb. Then came Pentecost, which was a thanksgiving festival for the harvest of first fruits. On this day was also celebrated the giving of the Law on Mount Sinai.

The next section of the book of Revelation opens with the vision of the Paschal Lamb but, as the story proceeds, it is not the Lamb that is slain but His followers. It is their blood which, as in the Passover rite, is poured at the base of the altar. But Passover ends with Pentecost. Moses brought the tablets of the Law, Jesus breaks the seals of the scroll of Life; and when the seals are broken the sons of God are revealed. They are the first fruits of the new age.

3. **New Year:** The people of Israel had a strong and stormy history. They drank the cup of bitterness to its dregs in their exile in Babylon. But they came back, and under Ezra and Nehemiah a new day dawned for them. Ezra read to them the Law of God and they rededicated themselves to Him. The festival of New Year celebrated this new day on the new-moon day of the seventh month. Trumpets sounded on this day in Jerusalem all day long. It was also a memorial of that day when, under Joshua, their fathers took possession of the land of their inheritance, when at the blowing of trumpets the walls of Jericho fell.

The message of the book of Revelation too moves from Pentecost to New Year. The prayer “How long” is heard again, the prayer of the people in exile. But soon the trumpets are sounding, the open scroll is read, Law and prophecy bear witness, and the kingdom comes. “Awake, O sleeper, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give you light.”

4. **Day of Atonement:** New Year ushered in a period of fasting, on the tenth day of which came the day of Atonement. Israel never forgot that in spite of their dedication to the Law, they had broken it again and again. At Mount Sinai itself, they had worshipped the golden calf, and Moses had to make atonement for their sin. Thus the day of Atonement became the fitting sequel to the feast of the New Year. It also stood between New Year and the feast of Tabernacles. Tabernacles celebrated the close of the harvest season, but before the joy of the harvest must come the time of repentance and atonement. The harvest will also be the harvest of tares which is gathered and burned.

So the final section of John’s visions opens with the vision of Him who came to atone. The dragon is out to destroy Him. But though the period when wheat and tares grow together seems long, and those who bear the mark of the Lamb, the harvest certainly comes. Then the wheat is gathered and the tares burned. Also, at the end of the harvest season the grapes are gathered and trodden in the wine press.

5. **Tabernacles:** This feast was the feast of the end of harvest. It announced the great certainty of the future, when Israel shall have completed its journey through the wilderness and the nations of the world would be its harvest fruit unto the Lord. But the feast was celebrated in temporary booths where the people dwelt, for that was still their present situation, as it was their situation on their journey through the wilderness. The Hallel sung at the feast was concerned with the salvation yet to come. “Oh work then now salvation, Jehovah” was what they sang.

“On that day,” wrote the Prophet Zechariah, referring to the feast of Tabernacles, “the pots in the house of the Lord shall be as the bowls before the altar; ... so that all who sacrifice may come and take them and boil the flesh of the sacrifice in them.” These bowls dominate the events which, at this point of his message, John portrays. The Hallel is heard — the song of Moses and of the Lamb — and then the bowls are emptied over the earth. The last sacrifice is the burning of evil.

6. **Dedication:** So the pilgrimage comes to its end. The wilderness and the exile are left behind. There is a final conflict. And then it is the New Day. When Judas Maccabaeus rededicated the altar after setting his people free, and restored the worship of the Lord in the temple, it did seem that the New Day had dawned. Israel celebrated this day as the feast of Lights. They celebrated it on the day (December 25) when the sun after its long winter sojourn began its return journey in the heavens.

John closes his book too, with the dawn of the New Day. The great hallelujah is heard as the nations are gathered in Zion. The final battle is fought and victory decisively won. The last judgment is over and the eternal city is established.

This Jewish festal year running from Passover to Dedication is fulfilled in the Christian story. At the Dedication, the old temple was restored for worship, at Christmas the new temple was set in the midst of men. God had become flesh. The chief rite in the celebration of the Dedication festival was the lighting of the sevenfold lamp; the opening vision in John's message is the Christ as He stands in the midst of His church. The feast of Dedication closed the Jewish festal year; Christmas begins the festal year for the Christian Church.⁸

Note that in this application of the feasts, Niles sees in the Day of Atonement symbolism of both Calvary and the Judgment harvest. When J. Massyngherde Ford and P. Carrington come to judgment scenes they speak similarly. For example, Carrington writes:

Just as the Seven Trumpets were modelled upon a feature of the Temple ceremonial, so were the Golden Bowls. The first act in the daily sacrifice was to kill the Lamb and catch its blood in a Golden Bowl and dash it against the sides of the Altar; but we have seen that at this point St. John has in his mind the sin-offering made by the High Priest or for the whole nation. We have already had a reference to it in the phrase **Outside the City**, and as the same thought is found in the **Epistle to the Hebrews**, the thought of the death of Jesus as a sin-offering for the nation must have been well established.

The Day of Atonement was the grand example of such a sacrifice. It had three main points:

1. Blood was sprinkled seven times towards the veil of the Holy of Holies.
2. Blood was smeared on the four horns of the Altar.
3. The whole of what remained was poured at the foot of the Altar.

We can see that the pouring out of Seven Bowls is based upon this ritual, though the effect is both simplified and magnified.

It is also reversed; for this Blood, instead of bringing reconciliation, brings rejection and vengeance. Instead of being sprinkled seven times towards the veil, it is poured seven times on the Land. Instead of the appearance of the High Priest with the blood of reconciliation, we have Seven Angels with the Blood of Vengeance.⁹

J.M. Ford concurs with this exposition. The comments of Austin Farrer should also be noticed on the passage of 11:19 where the temple of God is opened in heaven.¹⁰

Let us now consider two typical passages, observing their connection with judgment — judgment reflected by *Yom Kippur* imagery. We draw from our own recent commentary on Revelation:

The heptads of the seals, trumpets, and bowls are each marked by “cancelled conclusions,” say F.F. Bruce and A.M. Farrer. “... the final and irrevocable judgment, which we expect to be executed in the last member of each heptad, is regularly deferred — in confirmation of the Bible's uniform witness to God's reluctance to press His „strange work“ to a full end.” (F.F. Bruce, “The Rev. to John,” *New Testament Commentary*, 629.)

Thus instead of the kingdom of God being ushered in with glory we meet with silence. The interlude of chapter seven is over, but there is a solemn pause. This is in contrast to the voices and thunders from God's throne (4:5); the songs of the four living creatures and the elders, angels and of all creation (4:11; 5:12, 13); the cry of the martyrs (6:10); the great shout of the redeemed multitude (7:12); and the angel's response (7:12). Says Bruce, "All heaven breathlessly awaits the final act of divine judgment." This silence of expectation (Hab. 2:20) is also the silence of prayer. Revelation constantly alludes to both the daily temple ritual and the yearly sacred calendar.

"The end of the daily sacrifice was signalled by the blowing of trumpets. As soon as the sacrificial lamb was thrown upon the altar of burnt offering, the trumpets were blown. However, the sacrifice could not be made nor the trumpets blown until the assigned priest had offered incense upon the golden altar in the holy place. During the time the priest was in the holy place, the people in the court waited quietly and prayed for the coming of the Messiah. When the priest reappeared the sacrifice proceeded; the trumpets were blown and the sacrifice ended." (Douglas Ezell, *Revelations of Revelation*, 48-49.)

Niles speaks similarly. "Thereupon fell a great silence like the half-hour silence which intervenes between the blood offering and the offering of incense in the daily liturgy." (D.T. Niles, *As Seeing the Invisible*, 63.) Particularly does silence remind us of the Day of Atonement, the only complete sabbath of the year, the most solemn time of judgment prior to the rejoicing of Tabernacles. Isaac Williams says of the "Silence in Heaven," "It is the day of the Atonement, the priest has gone into the holy place, and „no man in the tabernacle till he come out.“" (I. Williams, *Revelation*, 132.) [sic]

Rev. 8:2-6:

"Then I saw the seven angels who stand before God, and seven trumpets were given to them. And another angel came and stood at the altar with a golden censer; and he was given much incense to mingle with the prayers of all the saints upon the golden altar before the throne; and the smoke of the incense rose with the prayers of the saints from the hand of the angel before God. Then the angel took the censer and filled it with fire from the altar and threw it on the earth; and there were peals of thunder, voices, flashes of lightning and an earthquake."

It is vital that we remember that John records his visions as they came to him in time, and not as he may have understood their historical significance. The literary format of Revelation must be distinguished from its chronological import. The seventh seal unfolds in the seven trumpets (See W. Milligan, *Revelation*, 133.) and the seventh trumpet unfolds in the third woe — the seven last plagues. This does not mean that the seven trumpets in their fulfilment succeed the sixth seal in time. The context shows this to be impossible, for the sixth seal brings to view the end of the world. With the seventh trumpet, and the seven last plagues, the situation is different, for we read that the seventh trumpet encompasses the wrath of God, and the plagues are said to be the fulfilling of that wrath. They are specially marked out as the "last" plagues, while the seven trumpets include earlier judgments. See Rev. 15:1.

Verses 2-6 of this chapter should be compared with 15:5-8. The latter pictures the close of the temple ministry. No man can be in the sanctuary for it is now the time of Judgment, the anti-typical Day of Atonement. Next come the seven last plagues by which the divine wrath is ended. The situation is very similar here at the beginning of

the trumpets, as there at the beginning of the plagues. But note this exception. These judgments invite men to repent, whereas the judgments of the last plagues fall when the time for repentance is over.

In Rev. 8:2, **the golden censer with much incense and the subsequent casting down to earth of the censer with fire is reminiscent of the Day of Atonement.** (Dr. N.H. Young in his unpublished thesis “The Impact of the Jewish Day of Atonement Upon the Thought of the New Testament,” says: “The only day that the specially compounded daily incense was offered in a censer as well as on the golden altar was the Day of Atonement; on no other occasion was it permitted to burn this special incense in a censer. This explains John’s conflation of the altar and censer in the incense offering which he mentions in Rev. 8:3. The reference to trumpets at the introduction of the chapter is a further indication that we are in the midst of Day of Atonement imagery, for trumpets were the means of announcing New Year and the coming judgment of the Day of Atonement. Even more pertinent, on the Day of Atonement itself trumpets proclaimed the Year of Jubilee, the day of release and restoration (cf. the seventh trumpet Rev. 11:15ff). Thus the prayers of the people of God for salvation are answered by an act of divine judgment and deliverance, and this is portrayed by John by means of Day of Atonement symbols.” pp. 367-368.) **To Israel, that day was the close of the year’s probation.** Whoever did not humble himself before the Lord by abstinence from all work, by prayer, penitence, and fasting, was cut off. On this day the believing Israelite was sealed. **The blowing of trumpets at the beginning of the month had called the people to penitence, but at the close of Yom Kippur all was joy. In the year of Jubilee, the trumpets were blown at the end of this judgment day to mark the period of deliverance and rejoicing.**

The symbolism in the seventh seal of the casting down of the censer of fire indicates a cessation of pleading, and the beginning of judgment. Christ said He came to cast fire on the earth. Those who did not respond to His “Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden” became recipients of His terrible woes. Matt. 11:20-24; 23:1-39.

Calvary was the Day of Atonement fulfilled. See Heb. 9 and 10, and Rom. 3:25. But Judgment Day is the Day of Atonement consummated. The trumpet judgments are a preview of the final judgment, and thus uses the same imagery as is connected with the plagues in 15:7, 8. Those who reject the Atonement of Christ are required to make their own in that Day. That Atonement is the second death — a separation from God as real as Christ experienced at Golgotha. The four horns of the golden altar mentioned in 9:13 are also an allusion to the Day of Atonement. Compare Ex. 30:10. R. Way, E. Giller, and B. Brinsmead say in their work *The Consummation*: “The prelude to the trumpets comprises of peals of thunder, loud noises, flashes of lightning, and the earthquake” (8:5), all symbols of the consummative judgment. This awesome display is vitally connected with two other similar demonstrations in history: God’s visit to Sinai (Ex. 19:16-18); and Christ’s crucifixion (Matt. 27:51).” (R. Way, E. Giller, and B. Brinsmead, “*The Consummation*,” an unpublished manuscript, 147, n.d.)

In this passage of Rev. 8:2-6, the prayers of all saints are seen as the force which moves the omnipotence of God. The prayers are those of 6:10, calling for the vindication of righteousness, and the intervention of the righteous Judge.

Rev. 11:19:

“Then God’s temple in heaven was opened, and the ark of his covenant was seen within his temple; and there were flashes of lightning, voices, peals of thunder, an earthquake, and heavy hail.”

The parallel between the last part of this verse, and the climax to the seals (6:12ff), and plagues (16:18-21), should be observed. It is obvious that these climaxes point to the same moment — the last signs of judgment at the coming of Christ. The ark is the symbol of God’s justice. It reminds all of that law given at Sinai amid lightning, thunder and earthquake. Its demands are now met in penalty by those who have refused the vicarious sufferings of the Lamb of God.

At Christ’s death, after the shout of victory, an earthquake marked the rending of the temple veil and the revelation of the place once sacred to the ark. Rev. 16:17 points to the repetition of the Calvary cry, “It is finished.” The intercessory ministry based on the merits of the sacrifice of the cross terminates, and the door of mercy is shut just a little while prior to the judgment plagues of the seventh trumpet. We are thus intended to mark the parallel between Christ’s enduring the wrath of God on our behalf, and the fate of the impenitent who must drink that wrath for themselves. Both events are symbolized by Day of Atonement imagery. The ark reminds the universe that righteousness is the Foundation, pillar, and bulwark of all enduring existence. Its mercy seat points to the union of love and mercy with justice, that all the penitent might find forgiveness and transformation.

On the Day of Atonement, the sprinkled blood of the ark’s cover brought a new beginning for each believer, and every fifty years that event marked the beginning of the Jubilee with its freedom for slaves, remission of debts, restoration of property, and universal rejoicing.

How appropriate that the ark which followed the trumpets at the time of the compassing and downfall of Jericho should be seen here as the world topples, and the heavenly Canaan appears. As the blowing of trumpets ushered in the Day of Atonement, the Jubilee, and the opening of Canaan, so now the prophetic trumpet chain leads us to the final disposition of sin, and the consummation of the joys and privileges of the kingdom of God. As with every coronation in Israel, so in this symbolic portrayal, trumpet peals announce the universal revelation of Christ as King of kings. The Day of Atonement belonged to the enthronement festival of Israel.

As Christ, who was the gospel incarnate, drew attention to the Most Holy Place by His death at the close of the Jewish age, so should the church, His body, point to it in these last days. The Most Holy Place, containing the law and the mercy seat with its sprinkled blood, symbolically summarizes the everlasting gospel. That gospel is the glorious solution to the problem of how God could be just, and yet be the justifier of the sinner; how He could reconcile law and mercy. The rent veil [symbolizing the sacrificial body of Christ] and the blood drops answer the “how.” Now because of Christ our Mercy-seat, God can be “faithful and just” in forgiving sin. The law has been honoured, not slighted, by the cross, and the repenting sinner has legal right to forgiveness through the loving provision of Heaven. See Rom. 3:25-26; Heb. 10:19-20; 1 Jn. 1:9. Furthermore, the church of today should point to the Most Holy Place of the heavenly sanctuary, because it is the place of judgment. On the Day of Atonement, through the ministry of

the High Priest, all Israel experienced the sealing of destiny. *Yom Kippur* meant the parting of the ways for professed believers — the penitent were numbered with Yahweh, but the impenitent with Azazel. Everything depended on the relationship to the blood of the High Priest. And today, before probation's close, the preaching of the everlasting gospel reins all men up before the cross of Christ and all are judged according to their responses to God's unspeakable gift.¹¹

These conclusions were set forth in the *Ministry* journal nearly twenty years ago. They were incorporated years later in a manuscript sent to SPA and subsequently printed. Because the original format of the sixties may still have something to say to us, and as evidence that this resolution of the Hebrews 9 problem is no Johnny-come-lately to meet the recent issues, we offer it in full.¹²

THE DAY OF ATONEMENT AND 1 ENOCH

Our comments, in the Appendix just referred to, on the imagery of the seal and the mark as reflecting the lots of the Day of Atonement could be considerably enlarged. John either drew from non-canonical Jewish apocalyptic writings or the common background of tradition, including Old Testament Scripture, as he set forth Satan as the Azazel judged for eternity.

It is in 1 Enoch 9f that we read of the eschatological crisis issuing in the binding of Azazel and his being cast into the desert. 1 Enoch 55:3ff speaks of demons being consigned into the chasm of the abyss. Comparison of Rev. 20 with 1 Enoch shows many features in common that are linked with the final disposition of sin and Azazel. Both present the last judgment, the abyss sealing, the binding with chains, the inability to deceive the nations, and the final descent of fire which yields a purified earth.

1 Enoch 10:4 unites the motifs of the wilderness and the wilderness demon Azazel thus reflecting Lev. 16. In 1 Enoch 9:20ff it is Azazel who is first judged before being consigned to the fiery abyss. Even record books such as those of Rev. 20:12 are prominent in 1 Enoch. See 47:3; 103:1ff; 104:7; 108:3.

After reviewing the foregoing, N.H. Young writes on the same theme of sealing to which Sir Isaac Newton referred centuries ago:

There is a possibility that behind John's dichotomy — between those who are of the mark of the beast and those who have refused it (those sealed by God), between those of Satan and those of Christ, between those found in the Book of Life and those in the Book of Doom — is again the imagery of the two lots of Lev. 16. This type of exegesis is found in Philo and Origen and, in the apocalyptic key, in Qumran. In an early second century document, which may have originated in Essene circles (*The Apocalypse of Abraham*), we find the imagery again used, and in an apocalyptic form similar to 1 Enoch.

The thought of the faithfulness of God's people in a time of testing is very similar to *Apoc. Ab.* ... In the *Apoc. Ab.* the situation is a complex one: there is Azazel, those allotted to him (predestined), those who leave his portion (by conversion to Judaism), and those who come to him from the Lord's lot (apostasy).¹³

THE DAY OF ATONEMENT AND REVELATION 13

This eschatological division between those sealed for God and those marked for Satan seems to echo the eschatological crisis of the cross when men had to cast their vote for either Christ

or Barabbas. This latter event has also been linked with the Day of Atonement procedure when one goat was offered in the sacrifice and the other released into the desert.¹⁴ Compare E.G. White's comments on the choice of the Jews for Barabbas.¹⁵

Early in this chapter we noticed that the theme of Revelation is that of judgment, and that this theme was the very hallmark of apocalyptic literature beginning with Daniel. Next we observed that Dan. 9:24-27, which in its prophecy of the cross used the key words of Lev. 16 (see 9:24) as well as terms expressive of judgment (there are at least seven in these four verses — determined, cut off, destroy, decree, etc.), were expanded by Christ in His sermon on the judgment of the world. Then again, we have indicated that commentators have seen in Revelation an expansion of the Olivet discourse as surely as the latter was an expansion of Dan. 9:24-27. Thus Daniel fused into one picture the judgment of the cross and the judgment of the world. The Day of Atonement is the imagery he used to do this. Similarly, Christ took the motifs of His atonement predicted in Dan. 9:26 and applied them to the world's passion at the era of judgment.

THE FUTURE TO RECAPITULATE THE CROSS EVENT—MAKING AN END OF SIN

Hendrikus Berkhof says:

In all synoptic Gospels statements about the future are summarized right before the Passion story. The themes dealt with are watchfulness, oppression, decrease of love, flight, and finally spectacular natural phenomena and the coming of the Son of Man in glory. It is conspicuous that all these themes recur in the following chapters, which deal with Christ's suffering, death, and resurrection. ... The meaning is obviously that the future will show — on a larger, and eventually worldwide scale — a repetition of what has happened in the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus.¹⁶

It is not at all strange therefore that the Day of Atonement should be prominent in the book which has more to say on the end of the world than any other Scripture. In Revelation, Christ atones for sin in the original sense of *kippur*¹⁷ — getting rid of sin by returning it upon the head of its author, in order that His-people might have full joyous covenant union with Him. The judgment scenes of Revelation, climaxing in condemnation and extermination for the beast, the false prophet, the harlot, the dragon and all the wicked represented by them thus present to us the Day of Atonement in consummation. It is "the final purification of the universe from sin and sinners."¹⁸ It is fully true, as Ellen White wrote long ago — we are living in the closing up of the great Day of Atonement.¹⁹

ENDNOTES FOR CHAPTER FOUR

¹ In Old Testament times, the experience of the Sanctuary symbolized the state of the Kingdom of God on earth. The destruction of the temple by the Babylonians represented the apparent victory of the heathen over God's kingdom as on previous occasions its pollution spoke of the suspension of Israel's fidelity to God.

Hezekiah, Josiah, and Nehemiah all cleansed the temple as the nation rededicated itself to Yahweh. Christ's action in the temple courts both at the beginning and end of His ministry prefigured His work as Judge, and spoke of His mission in eschatological terms. Consider McKelvey's comments:

The entry of Jesus into Jerusalem is interpreted by all four evangelists as the fulfilment of the eschatological hope of the coming of the Messiah to Zion. Matthew and John actually quote Zech. 9:9; Luke uses the title „king.“ Mark, who is more restrained, also brings out the messianic character of the event. This is clear from the greeting „Son of David“ in his preceding narrative (10:27f), the reference to the Mount of Olives, the prescience of Jesus concerning the whereabouts and borrowing of the colt, the note that the animal was unriden (i.e. new and therefore particularly suited for a special purpose), the act of homage in strewing the garments (cf. 2 Kings 9:13), and the designation „he who comes“ (ὁ ἐρχόμενος), if not also the salutation **hosanna**. Indeed, it is the second evangelist who accords the entry its fullest possible significance inasmuch as he treats it as an event in its own right and not (like Matthew and Luke) as the prelude to the cleansing. He states that Jesus entered Jerusalem, went into the temple, looked around, and then returned to Bethany from which the procession had set out; the temple is not cleansed till the following day. Matthew for his part emphasizes the eschatological nature of the entry by prefacing the words of Zech. 9:9 with a prophecy from Isa. 62:11 concerning the vindication of Jerusalem (21:5).

We shall probably be closest to the mind of Jesus if we say that He meant the entry to be a dramatic affirmation, an acted parable, of the coming of the kingdom of God. Jesus' ministry in Jerusalem is all of a piece with His ministry in Galilee. He is doing now what He has been doing all along; proclaiming the coming of the kingdom and calling upon Israel to repent (Mark 1:14f; Matt. 11:20-4 par.)

After narrating the cleansing Mark returns, obviously by way of explanation, to the incident of the fig-tree, noting that it had withered to its very roots (11:20ff). Finally, he records the question of authority (11:27-33; cf. pars.). Coming after the story of the fig-tree, which goes along with the cleansing, the question can refer only to what Jesus did in the temple (so Mark and Matt.). The parable of the disinheritor and destruction of the unfaithful and wicked husbandmen is probably to be included in the Marcan interpretation of the cleansing since it immediately follows the question on authority, and continues the judgment theme implied by the use of Jer. 7:11 at the cleansing.

Thus Jesus is depicted as cleansing the temple and consecrating it anew, as it were, so that He, the Lord of the temple, may use it. Matthew describes the purged court as the scene of such eschatological actions as the opening of the eyes of the blind and the making of the lame to walk (21:14ff).

The cleansing of the temple is a prophetic act, like the entry into Jerusalem. It points to the coming of the kingdom of God. The kingdom is correlative to Israel's destiny as the people of God. (R.J. McKelvey, *The New Temple* [London, 1969], 59-60, 61, 63, 66.)

² Karl Helm, *Jesus, The World's Perfector* (Philadelphia, 1961), 142.

³ See appendix, "Dan. 9:24 and the Olivet Discourse."

⁴ William Milligan, *Lectures on the Apocalypse* (London, 1892), 42-43.

⁵ T.F. Glasson, *The Revelation of John* (Cambridge, 1965), 118.

⁶ See *The Expositor's Greek New Testament* on Rev. 20:1-3.

⁷ We have only referred to obvious instances. Commentators have seen others. For example, the *Anchor Bible* on Rev. 17 comments as follows:

The harlot here has two characteristics. She holds a golden cup (vs. 4) and she has a name of mystery upon her forehead (vs. 5). One recalls that the sacred utensils were made of gold. Simon the high priest is depicted with the cup of libation in Sir 50:14-15; the occasion is probably the Day of Atonement, and the wine is described as "the blood of the grape" (RSV). In the picture of the adulteress what one may have is a parody of the high priest on the Day of Atonement wearing the vestments specially reserved for that occasion and holding the libation offering. However, instead of the sacred name upon his brow the "priest-harlot" bears the name Babylon, mother of harlots and the

abominations of the earth, a title illustrating Ezek. 16:43-45 (RSV), where Yahweh speaks of the lewdness of Jerusalem.

The irony is heightened because the symbol of the high priestly mitre, like the sacrifices, represented the forgiveness of certain sins. (J.M. Ford, Revelation, the *Anchor Bible* (Garden City, 1975), 288.)

⁸ D.T. Niles, *As Seeing the Invisible* (New York, 1961), 109-112.

⁹ P. Carrington, *The Meaning of the Revelation* (London, 1931), 261-262.

¹⁰ See appendix, "A. Farrer on the Day of Atonement and Dan. 8:14 in Revelation."

¹¹ Desmond Ford, "Commentary on Revelation," unpublished manuscript, 203, 204, 205, 268-270.

¹² See appendix on "The Day of Atonement in the Apocalypse."

¹³ N.H. Young, "The Impact of the Jewish Day of Atonement upon New Testament Thoughts," unpublished PhD thesis (Manchester, 1973), 363, 365.

¹⁴ See H. Koster, *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den Apostolischen Vätern* (Berlin, 1957), 156.

¹⁵ See *Desire of Ages*, 739; and *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* 5:1105.

¹⁶ H. Berkhof, *Well-founded Hope* (Richmond, 1969), 23, 24.

¹⁷ See *TDNT* 3:302. Originally *kippur* meant to "wipe away" or "eradicate."

¹⁸ *PP* 358.

¹⁹ *5T*, 472.

CHAPTER FIVE

Rehearsal And Resolution Of The Problem, And The Practical Implications

OUTLINE OF CHAPTER FIVE

Rehearsal and Resolution of the Problem, and the Practical Implications	Page
The Problem Rehearsed	307
Investigative Judgment Texts	309
Recent Gains For Adventist Eschatology.....	314
Dan. 8:14—The Seed-Bed Of New Testament Eschatology	316
The Apotelesmatic Principle	318
Definition And Exponents Of The Apotelesmatic Principle	319
The Apotelesmatic Principle In Daniel	323
Daniel 9:24 As Apotelesmatic	329
Inaugurated (Realized) And Consummated Eschatology	332
Practical Implications.....	341
Endnotes For Chapter Five.....	346

Appendices particularly relevant to this chapter:

28. Quotations on Inaugurated Eschatology
29. The Practical Implications of the New Testament Gospel
30. The Biblical Doctrine of Judgment
31. The Relationship Between Inaugurated Eschatology (First Advent) and Consummated Eschatology (Second Advent).

THE PROBLEM REHEARSED

During the proof-text era of Adventism (until the establishment of our seminary), popular presentations of the sanctuary doctrine usually included the following positions:

1. The sanctuary on earth with its two apartments represented a heavenly sanctuary which, though larger, also had two apartments with a partition between.
2. “Within the veil” meant within the first veil, as our Lord was in the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary until 1844.
3. During His priestly ministry, our sins are recorded in the books as we confess them.
4. The year-day principle applied makes 1798 the beginning of the time of the end, and 1844 the beginning of the judgment. This principle is a clear Biblical datum.
5. This judgment is only upon the professed followers of Christ to see whether they are worthy of eternal life.
6. When the investigative judgment is over, Christ will close His ministry above and return to earth after the seven last plagues.
7. Dan. 7:9-13 is a picture of God’s investigation of the sins of the saints.
8. Dan. 8:14 also refers to the judgment of the saints.
9. Matt. 25:1-13 is a parabolic prophecy of the 1844 movement, and the shut door is that of the sanctuary’s first apartment.
10. Rev. 14:7 is a prophecy of the investigative judgment.
11. Christ could not have come before 1844.
12. Salvation depends not only upon justification, but also upon having enough sanctification — preferably reflecting the image of Jesus fully.

Since the beginning of scientific exegesis among Seventh-day Adventists — that exegesis which takes into account the original languages, historical and literary settings, and the light cast by archaeology, etc. upon Scripture — all of the above positions have been repeatedly challenged by Adventist scholars, and several of them at least, repudiated by a majority of those who are specialists in the particular area of Scripture concerned. The proclamation of the sanctuary doctrine has become very much muted both in the church and to the public. Scholarly defence of all the above positions is lacking — we print profusely, but not upon the topic regarded as foundational to our message.

Typical perhaps of our uncertainty is the fact that the challenge offered by former Adventists to give half their publications to Adventist scholars who wished to defend the traditional positions, or half the time of radio broadcasts without cost for the same purpose has not been accepted. E.S. Ballenger, former acquaintance of Ellen G. White, and once the educational secretary in California for the church wrote as follows:

There is one outstanding fact that confirms me in the course I am following: That is, no representative of the denomination has attempted to show me wherein I have misrepresented you in your practices or teachings. You have not only neglected to do this but you have refused to sit down and talk with me in order to correct what you may consider mistakes in our publications.

Furthermore we have repeatedly offered, and continue to offer, as much as one-half of our paper for an unlimited time to any recognized representative of the denomination to

point out to our readers any or all of the false teachings you think you have discovered; and no one has accepted our offer. Through the liberality of a group of our friends we offered to pay for a series of broadcasts and give you one-half of the time without expense if you would discuss our viewpoints over the radio. This liberal offer was declined.

If you were invited to defend the Sabbath, baptism, or the nature of man in any of the leading denominational papers, would you refuse the offer?¹

One of the reasons for the reluctance of Adventist scholars to accept such challenges is our increased understanding of our early history. Whereas once it was assumed that the doctrine of the investigative judgment came just after the disappointment, we now know it was nearly fifteen years before it was thoroughly embraced, and that as late as the early fifties James White did not accept it. Similarly, though once we denied teaching that probation for the world closed in 1844, or that Ellen and James White so believed, it has become impossible to maintain that denial. Again, while a former GC president, G.I. Butler, could claim that we had never withdrawn statements from our early publications, the evidence of later years has shown his error.

But the chief reason for the slowing down of enthusiasm in the promulgation of traditional sanctuary positions is that growing specialist knowledge of Scripture using the original languages has demonstrated that certain key positions are untenable exegetically. Thus men such as Dr. Loasby could repeatedly affirm in his classes that the traditional sanctuary doctrine was one built on sand. Today we have term-paper after term-paper, being prepared at Andrews, siding against the earlier positions. For example, recent studies there on “within the veil” deny that the term could mean within the first veil. Other studies point out that the first apartment of the sanctuary was a temporary symbol of the old covenant age and the era of the types and shadows, while the second apartment pointed to the substance — heaven itself, which Christ entered after the cross in fulfilment of the Day of Atonement type.²

Some things can now be said with certainty, and most of our scholars who have worked in these areas would be in agreement on the following issues.

1. Hebrews does not teach our traditional sanctuary doctrine.
2. Hebrews teaches that Christ went into the Most Holy at His ascension, to the right hand of God.
3. Hebrews teaches that the first apartment was a symbol of the typical era, and nowhere affirms that it has heavenly significance as regards a phase of ministry.
4. The cleansing of the sanctuary in Heb. 9:23 refers to what Christ accomplished by His death, and had already been accomplished when the epistle was written.
5. The Bible nowhere demonstrates that a day stands for a year in symbolic prophecies.
6. Daniel 9 does not use the year-day principle. It makes no reference to days.
7. The context of Dan. 8:10-14 says nothing about the sins of the saints defiling the heavenly sanctuary, but it says much about a wicked power on earth casting down the earthly sanctuary. As might be expected, the *קִיּוּם* of promise in 8:14 is “vindicate,” “justify,” or “restore” — none of which comes from the ceremonial of Lev. 16.
8. Only Antiochus Epiphanes fulfils the chief specifications of Daniel 8’s little horn, and the vile person of Daniel 11. All other fulfilments, such as pagan and papal Rome, are fulfilments in principle rather than in detail.

9. Dan. 8:14 is a reply to a question about the continuation of the success of a wicked power — not a warning about an investigative judgment of the sins of the saints.
10. Dan. 7:9-13 is a judgment scene whose focus is the little horn, not the saints.
11. Rev. 14:7 speaks of a judgment upon Babylon, not the saints.
12. The New Testament nowhere anticipates twenty centuries between the two advents, but anticipates Christ's imminent return in the century the gospels and epistles were written.
13. Nothing in either the New or the Old Testament teaches that the sanctuary is defiled only when we confess our sins.
14. Blood from the offerings of the common people never went into the first apartment. Blood being taken in there at all was a very rare event.
15. The New Testament does not teach that Christ is now bearing sin in the heavenly sanctuary as the earthly priest has been presented by Adventists as doing in the typical sanctuary.
16. It is quite impossible to be dogmatic about the precise dates of prophetic fulfilments.
17. There is no certain evidence that October 22 was the tenth day of the seventh month in 1844.
18. When our pioneers, including Ellen G. White, applied Matt. 25:1-13 to the 1844 movement, and equated Christ's entrance into the Most Holy with the coming of the Bridegroom on October 22, 1844, they took a position that is quite indefensible exegetically. [See chapter six of this manuscript on this and the following point].
19. Our pioneers, including Ellen White, erred regarding "the shut door," and maintained their error till approximately 1851.
20. There are no clear scriptures that teach the investigative judgment.

INVESTIGATIVE JUDGMENT TEXTS

We wish to enlarge upon the last point, as this has not been done heretofore in this manuscript.

It is not legitimate to establish a fundamental doctrine upon either types or symbolic prophecies. This is generally recognized among exegetes today, including Adventist exegetes. Both types and prophecies may be used in addition when clear didactic statements or Scripture have been found to teach what is considered true on the topic under consideration.

Again and again in our books, Acts 3:19-20 is used as basic evidence for the investigative judgment. Let us note the text in several versions:

Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord; And he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you. (Acts 3:19-20, King James Version).

Repent therefore, and turn again, that your sins may be blotted out, that times of refreshing may come from the presence of the Lord, and that he may send the Christ appointed for you, Jesus. (Acts 3:19-20, Revised Standard Version).

Repent, then, and turn to God, so that your sins may be wiped out, that times of refreshing may come from the Lord, and that he may send the Christ, who has been appointed for you — even Jesus. (Acts 3:19-20, New International Version).

Repent then and turn to God, so that your sins may be wiped out. Then the Lord may grant you a time of recovery and send you the Messiah he has already appointed, that is, Jesus. (Acts 3:19-20, New English Bible).

It will be observed that the King James Version rendering is not correct. The Greek *hopos* found also in Matt. 22:15; Luke 24:20; Matt. 6:2, 4, 5, 16, 18; Acts 9:2, etc. when used adverbially means “in what manner or way,” “by what means;” as a conjunction it signifies “that” or “in order that.” Only the Catholic Douay (among versions we are familiar with) agrees with the King James Version. However, we are not dependent upon reasoning from the original. Comparison with Acts 2:38 in the previous chapter makes the meaning indelibly clear. Note:

Acts 2:38

Repent
and be baptised
unto the remission of your sins
and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy
Ghost

Acts 3:19-20

Repent
and turn again (be converted)
that your sins may be blotted out
that so there may come seasons of refreshing
from the presence of the Lord

Observe that the blotting out of sins is the same as the forgiveness of sins. To attempt to distinguish between these two is quite artificial, and nowhere supported in Scripture. See Psalms 51:1, 2.

Peter was talking to Jews right before him, not long after the resurrection of Christ. He was promising a present blessing, not one to be delayed for thousands of years. The verbs all signify events that should then take place, the repenting, the turning, the blotting out, the coming of refreshing. A typical statement from the commentators is the following:

Although Peter seems to allow some excuse for ignorance, yet only sincere repentance could blot out the crime of rejecting the Messiah and make possible His return in blessing. The phrases of 19-21 must be interpreted in the light of the many prophecies of blessings on Israel and the nations in the coming kingdom. It would be absurdly anachronistic to suppose that Peter was applying them to the church by a spiritualizing method.³

The text makes it clear that there was still time for Israel to repent and to take the gospel to the world that Jesus might return in their day. But there is nothing here about the investigative judgment. The blotting out spoken of is identical with forgiveness to be bestowed immediately upon repentance. Close attention to the passage shows that the blotting out of sins is more intimately connected with the preceding phrase rather than the following. Adventist expositors have reversed this, and ignored the original as well as passing by the parallel with 2:38. Repenting and turning again was to bring forgiveness or blotting out of sins and then as a result the gift of the Spirit would be bestowed leading to that universal spread of the gospel which would herald the Lord's return.

Some Adventist writers, because of awareness of the Greek *hopos* have either refrained from using this passage as a proof text, or used it with caution. Even Uriah Smith employed it rhetorically rather than with dogmatism. See *Daniel and the Revelation*, page 385, revised edition; page 365 earlier editions. The revised edition gives as one reference for Smith's use of the text page 656, where it is used elliptically for church revivals among non-Adventist churches of the nineteenth century. We wish to stress that a fair use of the text will connect

the blotting out of sins with repentance and conversion in Peter's day, rather than with a judgment just before the coming of Jesus.

1 Peter 4:17 is a prominent proof text for the investigative judgment. Let us notice it in several versions.

For the time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God: and if it first begin at us, what shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel of God? (1 Peter 4:17, King James Version).

For the time has come for judgment to begin with the household of God; and if it begins with us, what will be the end of those who do not obey the gospel of God? (1 Peter 4:17, Revised Standard Version).

For it is time for judgment to begin with the family of God; and if it begins with us, what will the outcome be for those who do not obey the gospel of God? (1 Peter 4:17, New International Version).

The time has come for the judgment to begin; it is beginning with God's own household. And if it is starting with you, how will it end for those who refuse to obey the gospel of God? (1 Peter 4:17, New English Bible).

It should be observed that the topic central to the last half of 1 Peter 4 is the fiery trial inevitable for believers. As with 3:14, persecution seems to have flared up in Peter's day. Again, we look at a typical exposition of the meaning of this passage:

The concept that judgment begins at the house of God derives from such passages as Amos 3:2; Jer. 7:8-15; 25:29f; Ezek. 9:6. It implies that the persecutions and afflictions of Christians are part of the displeasure of God at sin, but they come upon them rather to refine away the evil than to condemn (cf. 1:6f). Similar teaching is found in John 15:2; 1 Cor. 11:31f; 2 Thess. 1:3-8. Because of these disciplinary acts of God the righteous is saved with difficulty ... i.e. the path to life is arduous. ...⁴

There is no possible way of legitimately using 1 Peter 4:17 as a basis for the Adventist doctrine of the investigative judgment. Peter was talking of a time that had already come, not one that would come nearly two thousand years later.

Luke 20:35 is also used to support the investigative judgment. It reads as follows:

But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage. (Luke 20:35, King James Version).

But those who are accounted worthy to attain to that age and to the resurrection from the dead neither marry nor are given in marriage. (Luke 20:35, Revised Standard Version).

But those who are considered worthy of taking part in that age and in the resurrection from the dead will neither marry nor be given in marriage. (Luke 20:35, New International Version).

But those who have been judged worthy of a place in the other world and of the resurrection from the dead, do not marry. (Luke 20:35, New English Bible).

The text says precisely nothing about whether the “accounting worthy” is done for all in the same split second of time, or whether it is an attenuated affair requiring over 130 years.

No one reading this text would thereby come up with our concept of the investigative judgment. As one reads on and comes to verse 37 it becomes clear that God already had decided in the days of Jesus regarding some saints at least who were to be saved. Several are named, and we could add to that list the ones raised from the grave at the death and resurrection of Christ and who ascended with Him without the benefit of an investigative judgment.

Rev. 11:18 is another text used by some to support the investigative judgment. It reads as follows:

The nations raged, but thy wrath came, and the time for the dead to be judged, For rewarding thy servants, the prophets and saints, and those who fear thy name, both small and great, and for destroying the destroyers of the earth. (Rev. 11:18, Revised Standard Version).

But this text is part of the seventh trumpet, the third woe that accompanies Christ’s taking over of the kingdoms of the world. The third woe is the same as the seven last plagues. “Thy wrath is come” has to do with the wrath threatened in 14:9-11 and described in chapters 15 and 16. This time is well beyond 1844 and the verse cannot be legitimately applied to the investigative judgment.

We have noticed earlier that Rev. 14:7 is explained by the later Revelation passages referring to “hour” and “judgment.” key passages include 6:9-11; 14:18-20; 16:5, 7; 17:1; 16:8, 10, 20; 19:2, 11; 20:11-15. **Never does John in his gospel, epistles, or apocalypse use “judgment” other than negatively with reference to the wicked.** Those that believe on Christ do not come into the condemnation of the judgment. Rev. 14:7 thus parallels Dan. 7:9, 10, having the wicked as its focus, and offering vindication to the saints. James White so understood these passages. See *Advent Review*, August 1850. And so have the great majority of commentators from time immemorial.

All considerations of this topic must include the texts which distinctly assert God’s awareness even as to who will be saved. See 2 Tim. 2:19; John 10:14; Luke 23:43; Matt. 22:32. In addition, the New Testament stress on a completed atonement and the impossibility of condemnation for any trusting in the merits of Christ must be given its due importance. See Heb. 1:3; Rom. 5: 6-11; 8:33, 34; 1 John 4:17; John 5:24. The Christian is not like a schoolboy fearfully anticipating an examination. There is One who has undergone that examination in his stead, and provided he trusts in Him, the successful outcome of that prior test will be placed to the believer’s account.

It is most certainly true that the professed Christian must stand before the judgment bar of God. Clear texts such as 2 Cor. 5:10 and Rom. 14:10 so affirm. But he stands there only in the person of His Representative — never physically himself before the visible glory of God. This is part of the good news of the gospel. Thus Col. 1:20-22:

And through him to reconcile to himself all things, whether things on earth or things in heaven, by making peace through his blood, shed on the cross. Once you were alienated from God and were enemies in your minds because of your evil behaviour. But now he has reconciled you by Christ’s physical body through death to present you holy in his

sight, without blemish and free from accusation. (Col. 1:20-22, New International Version).

Enoch, Abel, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, the penitent thief, the resurrected multitude all testify to God's intimate knowledge of each of us, and of our destiny. See Heb. 11:4, 5, and the following list of worthies who are to be perfected at the same time as ourselves, according to the conclusion of the chapter.

But does not God do this work of investigative judgment for the sake of the angels? and for men? No, the angels themselves are familiar with the thoughts and intents of our hearts,⁵ and what benefit can an invisible judgment bring to the great mass of sleeping mankind? True it is that the judgment spoken of in Scripture vindicates God's righteousness to the universe in the sense of making public His righteous decisions. But this transpires in the split second division of the living at the advent and the subsequent resurrections. See 2 Tim. 4:1. It is God's righteous allotting of destiny to all — to men and angels — and the bestowing of the eternal awards, which indeed vindicates Him — that is, demonstrates His being worthy of all trust. Rom. 3:3; Eph. 3:9, 10. No invisible judgment can add to that. The cross itself was God's chief vindication. See Rom. 3:26.

Certainly the Scripture teaches a judgment for all men, but it is one that holds no terror for the true believer. Like Paul, he can say:

I have fought the good fight, I have finished the race, I have kept the faith. Henceforth there is laid up for me the crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, will award to me on that Day, and not only to me but also to all who have loved his appearing. (2 Tim. 4:7-8, Revised Standard Version).

But it is not enough to say that. It is just as certain that while the great judgment has its public revelation at the coming of Christ, destinies are judged and sealed while Christ is still high priest above. This is the truth of the pre-advent judgment. At every point of His intercession Christ knows whether professed believers are truly abiding in Him. While they trust Him as Saviour, a trust manifested by loyalty and obedience, He represents them before the Father and their destiny is never in doubt.⁶

We must ever keep in mind 1 Cor. 4:4 which speaks of a pre-advent judging of us all by our Lord; Rev. 22:11 that points to a time when destinies are fixed before the *parousia*, and 2 Tim. 4:1; 1 Cor. 4:5; Matt. 25:31, 31; 13:24-30, 36-43, 47-50; Jn. 12:44, 48; Heb. 9:27, 29; Acts 10:42; 1 Pet. 4:5; 1 Cor. 3:13, which tell of the public disclosure (at the last day) of our standing before God. Key terms in this last set of texts include "manifestation," "reveal," "at the end of the world," "in the last day."

See also 2 Thess. 1:5-10 and compare Rom. 2:5-8, 16. These latter passages make it clear that both those who have been patiently continuing in well doing, and those who do not obey the truth; those that need rest from persecution, and those that persecute — both groups are revealed for what they are at the actual appearance of Christ in glory. Because the saints are to join Christ in judging even angels they must themselves be judged first — that is, found in Christ at the close of their probation.

As for the blotting out of names (Rev. 3:5), this was a fact in John's day, and is carried on throughout all Christ's priestly ministry. Compare Matt. 10:32, 33 and Luke 12:8, 9. But when probation closes, all whose names are found in the book of life are sealed for glory because they have not surrendered the perfect merits of Christ imputed to them through faith

and manifested by holy living. When we understand the New Testament meaning of justification as God's final verdict granted us in advance, then we will sing for joy and gladly testify to all of His saving grace.

RECENT GAINS FOR ADVENTIST ESCHATOLOGY

We wish now to turn to positive gains for Adventism by exegesis in recent times. Most of these have been documented in other places of this manuscript.

1. The twentieth century has witnessed a startling renewal of interest in apocalyptic, that it, such literature as Daniel and Revelation.

G.E. Ladd writes:

We are witnessing a renaissance of interest in apocalyptic literature and its theology. A little over a decade ago, one of Germany's most influential New Testament scholars, Ernst Kasemann, published an essay entitled "*The Beginnings of Christian Theology*." Kasemann bases his argument on a form-critical analysis of the Gospel of Matthew and posits a theological movement after Easter in which the primitive Jewish Christians interpreted the meaning of Jesus' resurrection in terms of Jewish apocalyptic. Jesus was not an apocalypticist; He preached "immediate nearness of God." Furthermore, the preaching of Jesus cannot really be described as theology. Primitive Jewish-Christian apocalyptic thus became "the mother of all Christian theology." "The heart of primitive Christian apocalyptic ... is the enthronement of God and of His Christ as the eschatological Son of Man." "Its central motif was the hope of the epiphany of the Son of Man coming to His enthronement; and it is a question whether Christian theology can ever make do, or be legitimate, without this motif which arose from the experience of Easter and determined the Easter faith."

Freedman goes so far as to say, "The discovery and subsequent demonstration that the controlling factor in the literature of the New Testament is apocalyptic" is one of the developments of modern scholarship.

Renewed interest in apocalyptic has been expressed not only by New Testament scholars but also by the systematic theologian, Wolfhart Pannenberg. In obvious reaction to the prevailing existentialist theology, Pannenberg has argued that revelation occurs in history. It takes place indirectly and partially in the events of history, and fully in the whole of history as that whole is embodied in the end of history. Pannenberg discovers the full revelation in the eschatological event of the resurrection of the dead which can be understood only in the context of Jewish apocalyptic. The event of the resurrection has already occurred proleptically in the resurrection of Jesus. Thus apocalyptic is made the vehicle for the understanding of revelation.

The growing interest in apocalyptic in America is illustrated by the fact that an entire issue in *Interpretation* was devoted to four essays on this subject. William A. Beardslee first surveys the main characteristics of apocalyptic and then discusses the role apocalyptic thinking plays in the thought of Schweitzer, Buri, Kasemann, Pannenberg, and Altizer. Beardslee points out that while a renewed historical study of apocalyptic is now getting under way, there remain many unsolved problems.

Amos N. Wilder discusses the "*Rhetoric of Ancient and Modern Apocalyptic*." Paul D. Hanson writes on "*Old Testament Apocalyptic Re-Examined*," in which he argues that Jewish apocalyptic has its roots in Old Testament prophecy.

The issue concludes with a statement by a systematic theologian, Carl E. Braaten, “*The Significance of Apocalypticism for Systematic Theology*.” He insists that “there is no unapocalyptic Jesus,” and argues that we must “cheerfully ... acknowledge the apocalypticism of Jesus and ... make it the point of departure for systematic theology today.” Braaten sees the fundamental element in apocalyptic to be its doctrine of the two ages, and he insists that a Christian interpretation of history is impossible without the dualistic element in apocalyptic, namely, the dialectical differentiation of all reality into this present evil age and the new world of promise to come. Here are embodied the principles of negation and transcendence: negation of the structures of this present evil age by the transcendent power of the age to come. Braaten has now brilliantly worked out this thesis in his book, *Christ and Counter-Christ*.

The revival of interest in apocalyptic in Germany is accentuated by the recent book by Klaus Koch, *Ratlos vor der Apokalypik*, translated into English with the title *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic*. Koch surveys the situation in England as well as in Germany and bemoans the numerous efforts to “save Jesus from apocalyptic.” He goes on to show that the problem of apocalyptic is the problem of Jesus. Koch insists that apocalyptic is one of the main links that joins together the two Testaments; and that Jesus must be understood against the background of apocalyptic.

The debt of the New Testament to Jewish apocalyptic has been expounded most vividly by Oscar Cullman in his book *Christ and Time*. Cullman proves that the New Testament Gospel has as its background the Jewish concept which conceives of redemption taking place on a linear time line which divides time into the two ages: the present age and the coming age. For Judaism, the mid-point in the time line is the transition point from the present age to the future. Cullman argues that the difference between Christianity and Judaism is that Christianity sees the mid-point no longer at the end of this age but in the historical mission of Jesus.

It is difficult to see how anyone can successfully challenge this position.

Cullmann’s thesis seems unassailable. The basic structure of New Testament theology is the same as that of Jewish apocalyptic.⁷

2. Many scholars now recognize in Dan. 8:14 an eschatological promise, rather than merely a reference to a Maccabean event.
3. Many have seen that there is a strong connection between Dan. 7:9-13, 8:14 and 9:24.
4. In our generation has come the acknowledgement that much of Christ’s teaching was based on the prophecies of Daniel, and that the Olivet discourse is an enlargement of Dan. 9:24-27 — a prophecy itself now seen as reflecting Day of Atonement concepts.
5. Only in this century has come the clear recognition of the nature of New Testament eschatology — that the New Testament points to eschatology as having two moments — one of inauguration and one of consummation. Thus eschatological data has an application to the first advent as well as to the second. For example, Christ could apply the jubilee type to what He was doing at His first coming, and John could speak of judgment and eternal life as already having occurred with Christ’s redemption. Similarly Paul can apply resurrection, ascension, the eschatological gift of the Spirit, the judgment decree of justification to the here and now as well as to events connected with Christ’s return. Therefore, to say as Adventists

must say, that the Day of Atonement applies both to the judgment of the cross and the final judgment is an entirely acceptable procedure.

6. Many non-Adventist scholars have seen that the book of Revelation applies the Day of Atonement in connection with the last judgment. These same scholars believe that the Day of Atonement, as presented in Hebrews, is applied to the cross.

7. Practically all New Testament exegetes now admit that the New Testament does not teach the Greek view of the soul.

8. Practically all New Testament exegetes now admit that Revelation 20 teaches two literal resurrections, one at each end of the millennium. This is a tacit admission that there must be some type of pre-advent judgment decision.

DAN. 8:14—THE SEED-BED OF NEW TESTAMENT ESCHATOLOGY

Thus we can say on reviewing both the negatives and the positives that, **despite errors in peripheral matters, our basic thrust and emphasis that Dan. 8:14 is an eschatological message regarding judgment has the best of modern scholarship to support it. This position of ours is the heart of our proclamation that the literal, visible, audible, return of Christ is, coupled with the everlasting gospel, God's special message for our day. Never was any message in all ages more relevant than that. For a generation that has become despairing of the future, careless as regards behaviour in the present, and nonchalant about the past — a gospel-based warning about the imminence of judgment is specially pertinent.**

The prophecy of Dan. 8:14 uses the imagery of the Old Testament sanctuary — that symbol of the kingdom of God — to set forth its teaching on eschatological judgment. That same imagery is reproduced in the synoptic gospels, the epistles, and the Apocalypse — all draw on Dan. 8:10-14 to set forth their warnings about the ultimate crisis for the world. Dan. 8:13, 14 is the seed-bed of all New testament eschatology and vital for the last generation to understand.

Note the following graph showing first the threat by Antichrist and then the judgment answer.

Dan 8:14	The transgression of desolation	tramples underfoot	the sanctuary
Matt 24:15	The abomination of desolation	stands	in the holy place
2 Thess 2:3, 4	The man of sin	sits	in the temple of God
Rev 11:2	The Gentiles	tread underfoot	the holy city
Dan 8:14	Then shall the sanctuary be vindicated		
Matt 24:30	Then shall they see the sign of the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven (Son of man is a title signifying vindication and is borrowed from Dan. 7).		
2 Thess 2:8, 12	... whom the Lord shall consume with ... the brightness of His coming ... That they might all be judged who believed not the truth ...		
Rev 11:15, 18	And the seventh angel sounded ... thy wrath is come ... and the time of the dead that they should be judged.		

The theme occurs again and again in Revelation. Revelation 13 sets forth Antichrist doing what was prophesied in Daniel 8, and then chapter 14 predicts and describes the same. The terrible victories of Antichrist in chapter 13 are followed by a series of judgment passages in chapters 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20. Thus the main content of the Apocalypse is an expansion of Dan. 8:13, 14.

In recent times, modern scholarship has seen in Matt. 24:15; Mark 13:14; 2 Thess. 2:3, 4; and Revelation 13, the essence of the Biblical picture of the “last things” on earth, prior to the “last things” of judgment and immortality. To see the coincidence between the position of the Spirit of Prophecy and that of some non-Adventist New Testament exegetes consider the following on Matthew 24:15.

When Protestantism shall stretch her hand across the gulf to grasp the hand of Roman power, when she shall reach over the abyss to clasp hands with spiritualism, when, under the influence of this threefold union, our country shall repudiate every principle of its Constitution as a Protestant and republican government, and shall make provision for the propagation of papal falsehoods and delusions, then we may know that the time has come for the marvellous working of Satan and that the end is near.

As the approach of the Roman armies was a sign to the disciples of the impending destruction of Jerusalem, so may this apostasy be a sign to us that the limit of God’s forbearance is reached, that the measure of our nation’s iniquity is full, and that the angel of Mercy is about to take her flight, never to return.⁸

Some form of infidelity and impiety will be established by Law even in the Christian church, as our Lord Himself foretells (Matt. 24:15)

So will it be in the last times. The church itself will be betrayed by some in high places in her ministry, and by means of their timid and treacherous concessions and compromises it will be polluted by a form of worship which will make it execrable in the sight of God and will cause all good men to weep and hide their faces in shame and sorrow, and to forsake the courts of the sanctuary.⁹

We encounter „the abomination of desolation“ in Daniel in passages dealing with persecutions and oppression. ... Bearing the context in mind, both in the Gospels and in Daniel (which was interpreted eschatologically), it seems probable that the symbol in question refers to some form of blasphemy which will characterize the last days. ... Devastation will be ... associated with it.¹⁰

The „abomination of desolation“ is a formula indicating an overthrow of God’s religion, a desecration of what is holy, and a dissipation and corruption of His order of worship by some great God-opposing power. This description is evidently applicable with more or less exactness to several crises in history including “antichrist.”¹¹

The last generation will have to pay the full debt that has been accumulated.

Nevertheless, all this is only the beginning. Something else will be much more fearful. God will leave the Temple (Luke 13:35 par.) and the „abomination of desolation“ will appear (Mark 13:14 par.). What is meant by this expression taken from Dan. 11:31; 12:11? Here Mark has the remarkable *constructio ad sensum* (Gk) ὅταν δὲ ἴδῃτε τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως ἐστηκότα (with a masculine not a neuter participle) ὅπου οὐ δέει. Matthew took the masculine to be a grammatical mistake and therefore changed

it to the neuter ἐστὸς (24:15), but its presence shows that the earliest tradition interpreted the Danielic „abomination of desolation“ as referring to a person, to the false Christ. He will reveal himself ὅπου οὐ δεῖ, in the sanctuary. False prophets will glorify him (Mark 13:22 par.). But his time is limited. In the end the Temple will fall in ruins, and not one stone will be left standing on another (Mark 13:2). The fall of the Temple will at the same time be the signal for the intervention of God: within three days the new Temple will rise (14:58 par.).

The abomination of desolation in the holy place, demanding worship and reverence, glorified by false prophets through word and miracle — that is the last great temptation.

This is the last and final catastrophe in history that Jesus sees coming. He was certain that the kingdom of God comes through suffering and only through suffering.¹²

It is impressive to see Jeremias saying in essence what a little old Adventist lady of negligible education said a hundred years ago. **Observe that Ellen G. White does with Dan. 8:13, 14 what she elsewhere does with both Daniel 11 and Revelation 11 — applies such verses, not merely to times gone by such as prior to 1844, but to the future crisis.**

THE APOTELESMATIC PRINCIPLE

How can exegetes, including our own Ellen G. White, take prophecies which they consider to have applied to the past and project them also into the future? How can the abomination of desolation apply to Antiochus Epiphanes, pagan and papal Rome, and also the final manifestation of Antichrist yet ahead of us? How can Ellen G. White apply the prophecy of Dan. 8:13 to AD 70, the Middle Ages, and the fulfilment of the last crisis sketched in Revelation 13?¹³

It should not be considered that Ellen G. White's application of the key figure of Daniel 8 to the future is some strange exception to her usual application of prophecy. *Great Controversy* 624ff does the same with 2 Thess. 2 (which is based on Dan. 8:10-14) and applies that scripture to the final counterfeit by Satan when he appears to Christendom as Christ. Our own *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* on 2 Thess 2 also does this, as do the classical non-Adventist commentaries on that passage.

The answer to this problem is also the answer to our other key problem in the area of the sanctuary. It can be given in a single phrase — the apotelesmatic principle. This principle affirms that a prophecy fulfilled, or fulfilled in part, or unfulfilled at the appointed time, may have a later or recurring, or consummated fulfilment. The ultimate fulfilment is the most comprehensive in scope, though details of the original forecast may be limited to the first fulfilment. Prophetic types such as the Passover and the Day of Atonement also may be applied by inspired writers on the apotelesmatic principle.

This proposed key to our sanctuary problems is so important that we wish to spell it out in some detail, following the same lines presented at the New Orleans SBL Convention, Nov. 18-21, 1978. We give our conclusions first in order that all might see the relevance of what follows.

Certain of the prophecies of Daniel, like many other prophecies of the Old Testament, apply in **principle** to later eras than the one first addressed. The main idea, rather than precise details (such as 2300 evening-mornings) is what has a recurring fulfilment. Daniel 8 gives God's ideal plan for Israel after the restoration. Had Israel been faithful in proclaiming her gospel to the world to prepare it for the coming of the Messiah, that Messiah would have been

confronted at His coming by the eschatological tyrant Antichrist. Antichrist would have been successful in his initial warfare against God's people and truth for 2300 days, but then Christ would have brought him to his end, with none to help him. Having broken Antichrist "without hand" the kingdom of the Rock of Ages would have become God's holy mountain filling the whole earth for eternity.

Israel was not faithful, and the Dan. 8 prophecy had a limited fulfilment in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes, another in pagan Rome, another in papal Rome, and yet will have final fulfilment in Satan's manifestation just before the millennium and at its end. But in each era judgment has come. Antiochus came to his end, pagan Rome was destroyed, the Papacy lost its power with the Reformation, and the last Antichrist will be destroyed by the brightness of Christ's coming. These successive judgments were predicted by "then shall the sanctuary be justified." Every era of revival of the truths symbolized in the sanctuary may claim to be a fulfilment of Dan. 8:14. As our own *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* points out, the Reformers saw the prophecy as applying to their day.

But the key applications of Dan. 8:14 belong to the great Day of Atonement. When Dan. 9:24-27 explains 8:14 it does so in the language of *Yom Kippur*. *Yom Kippur* pointed to Christ's forensic abolition of sin at the cross, and the final empirical eradication at the last judgment.

The final application of the Day of Atonement could have come in 1844, had all who united in the initial proclamation of the God-given message been faithful. Instead of Dan. 8:14 finding its ultimate and complete fulfilment in 1844 itself, that year but marks the beginning of the final consummation.

Let us now consider the apotelesmatic principle, and the evidence for it.

DEFINITION AND EXPONENTS OF THE APOTELESMATIC PRINCIPLE

The apotelesmatic principle is a convenient term for referring to the concept that a particular prophecy in outline or as regards a dominant feature may have more than one application in time. This view is certainly no novel invention. Bacon had it in mind when he spoke of "germinant fulfilment" centuries ago.¹⁴ We could say in regard to it what can be said in innumerable areas — that people have been using it for ages whether they knew it or not — just as most with oral powers have used rhetoric whether familiar with that word or not, and engaged in polemics and dialectics though those terms to many users were unknown.

Seventh-day Adventists are no strangers to the apotelesmatic principle though the term is not common in their literature and only rarely has it been used in connection with the prophecies of Daniel.

Some scholars have spoken of an **apotelesmatic** accomplishment of the prophecy, by which is meant that a partial or preliminary fulfilment may take place in one age, then long afterward a much more complete fulfilment. For instance, Christ's prophecy in the "little apocalypse" of Matthew 24 seems to apply primarily to the destruction of Jerusalem under Titus, while its full and final accomplishment will be seen in the destruction of the nations of the world at the second coming.¹⁵

The *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* sets forth the principle in its discussion of certain prophecies:

Those that have a dual application — first, to a local, historical situation; second, to the Messiah and to His kingdom. It is the prophecies of this fourth category that are most likely to be misunderstood and thus misapplied. Often this is because of a failure to realize that certain prophecies **do** have a dual aspect.

The Scriptures abound with illustrations of prophecies having dual application. The promise to Abraham of a „seed“ (Gen. 12:7; 13:15; 22:18) clearly pointed forward to Christ (Matt. 1:1; Gal. 3:16), but met also a real and true fulfilment in the birth of Isaac (Gen. 13:16; 15:4, 5, 13; 17:7, 16, 19-21; 18:10; 21:3). In fact, the earlier fulfilment in Isaac was a type of, and preparatory to, the ultimate fulfilment in Christ. A similar promise made to David was manifestly a prophecy concerning Christ (2 Sam. 7:12, 13; Matt. 1:1; Acts 2:30), yet it applied also to the birth of Solomon (1 Kings 8:20).

When Moses was about to lay down his duties as leader, and the people wondered who would take his place, he made the inspired prediction, „God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me“ (Deut. 18:15). The context makes evident that this promise had an immediate application to the prophetic leadership of Israel in the years following the death of Moses (Deut. 18:18; cf. Ex. 20:19; Deut. 5:25-27; see also Num. 27:18-23; Deut. 34:9, 10; Hosea 12:10, 13), yet inspiration declares that „there arose not a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses“ (Deut. 34:10 cf. Num. 12:6-8). Christ alone could fully meet the conditions set forth in Moses“ prediction (see John 1:21; 6:14; 7:40).

In a similar way the paschal lamb stood first for the literal, historical deliverance of Israel from Egypt, and later for the spiritual deliverance of all God’s people from sin through the Messiah (1 Cor. 5:7). The rock smitten in the wilderness provided literal water for a thirsty people, and accordingly became a type of the Rock, Christ Jesus, who would offer the water of life freely to all men (John 4:10; 7:37; 1 Cor. 10:4). In like manner, the manna that fell from heaven provided bread to satisfy the hunger of Israel, but Jesus declared long afterward that He was „the true bread from heaven“ (John 6:31-33). The high priest Joshua was crowned with literal crowns, in prophetic anticipation of the coronation of Christ as priest and king (Zech. 6:9-13; 9:9).

Referring to the deliverance of Israel from bondage, Hosea spoke of God calling His „son out of Egypt“ (Hosea 11:1), yet Matthew sees in the words of Hosea a prophecy of Christ (Matt. 2:15). Jeremiah’s reference to „Rachel weeping for her children“ (Jer. 31:10, 11, 15, 16, 20) originally applied to the Babylonian captivity, as the context clearly reveals, but the evangelist finds it prophetic of Herod’s slaughter of the infants of Bethlehem (Matt. 2:18). Isaiah vividly portrayed the spiritual state of Israel in his day (Isa. 6:9, 10; 29:13), but Christ declared these words prophetic of His generation (Matt. 13:14, 15; 15:7-9), saying, „Well did Esaias prophesy of you.“ Paul’s exegesis of historical incidents and prophetic statements recorded in the Old Testament conforms to the pattern set by Christ and the evangelists. In fact, he interprets many passages in such a way as might not always be evident from the Old Testament alone (see Acts 13:32, 33; 2 Cor. 8:15; Gal. 3:13, 16; 4:22-31; 1 Tim. 5:17, 18; Heb. 1:5-8; 10:5). The New Testament writers thus constantly unfold, explain, and interpret the prophetic statements of the Old Testament.

These, and numerous other illustrations that might be given, make evident that Scriptural statements later seen to be prophetic of Christ were often full of literal and more immediate meaning to the people who first heard them and witnessed the events

described. Their dim vision may, indeed, have confined the inspired statements to their own day. But later, holy prophets guided by inspiration saw in those very statements further prophetic meaning (Luke 24:25-27, 32; John 16:13; 1 Peter 1:10-12). It was often only when Christ or the Holy Spirit „opened ... their understanding“ that men of Christian times began to „understand the [Old Testament] scriptures“ in their fullness (Luke 24:45). Previously, like their unbelieving countrymen, they overlooked many prophecies that point to the first advent, and misapplied others that refer exclusively to the second (*Desire of Ages*, 30, 777).

It is apparent, furthermore, that certain Old Testament prophecies pointing forward to the coming of the Messiah and to the establishment of His kingdom apply in part to the first advent, and in part to the second. Thus in His first sermon at Nazareth, Christ quoted Isa. 61:1-3 as being fulfilled „this day“ (Luke 4:16-21), yet significantly omitted reference to „the day of vengeance of our God“ (Isa. 61:2) — for the simple reason that the „day of vengeance“ comes only with the second advent. Elijah’s appointed ministry of turning the hearts of Israel to their heavenly Father (1 Kings 18:36-40) is used by later prophets as a type of the work of John the Baptist (Isa. 40:3; Mal. 3:1; 4:5, 6; John 1:23; Matt. 11:9-17; 17:10-13; Mark 9:11-13; Luke 7:24-27). But the prediction of Elijah’s appearance „before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord“ (Mal. 4:5) is also to be fulfilled again in our time (3*T*, 62). At Pentecost, Peter pointed to Joel 2:28-32 as being fulfilled that day (Acts 2:16-21); but Joel’s words are to find a second fulfilment in our day (*Early Writings*, 142; *Acts of the Apostles*, 54, 55). Similarly, certain of the predictions of Matthew 24 pointed forward both to the destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70 and to the end of time (*Desire of Ages*, 628; *Great Controversy*, 22, 25).¹⁶

The apotelesmatic principle is more widely known perhaps among non-Adventists. Ramm speaks of the “possibility of **multiple fulfilment**.” And Berkhof writes:

The fulfilment of some of the most important prophecies is germinant, i.e., they are fulfilled by instalments, each fulfilment being a pledge of that which is to follow.

Hence while it is a mistake to speak of a double or treble sense of prophecy, it is perfectly correct to speak of a two or threefold fulfilment. It is quite evident, e.g., that Joel’s prophecy in 2:28-32 was not completely fulfilled on the day of Pentecost. Notice also the predictions respecting the coming of the Son of Man in Matthew 24.

Peter Beyerhaus has written:

The prophetic texts constitute a peculiar literary species. They very seldom convey an unequivocal message that can be collected from their plain wording. Rather we have to distinguish carefully between the historical application at the time of the author, the employment of metaphorical imagery, sometimes taken from the contemporary world of religions, and the really prophetic prediction that sometimes even finds its fulfilment in different events at different stages of salvation history.

Thus prophetic texts often consist of different transparent levels, which in our natural perspective have merged into one single and therefore highly enigmatic level. This gives them to the rationalistic mind an obscured appearance; the features of the multi-level visions mingle and cannot easily be distinguished.¹⁷

Even old classics such as T.H. Horne’s *Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of Holy Scriptures* employ the principle.¹⁸

The natural question is “Does Scripture itself validate such a principle?” In answer a few illustrations come readily to mind, such as (1) Day of the Lord prophecies; (2) Certain Messianic prophecies such as Isa. 7:14; Isaiah 11, 35, 61; Ps. 72; etc.; (3) Old Testament passages about the kingdom of God which do not distinguish between the fulfilment at the first advent and the consummation at the second and third comings of Christ; (4) The Old Testament prophecies regarding the outpouring of the Spirit, the coming of Elijah the prophet, etc.

Another question which automatically rises is with reference to the practice of Ellen G. White. Does she also use this principle? We offer a few quotations in this regard.

When he referred to the destruction of Jerusalem, his prophetic words reached beyond that event to the final conflagration in that day when the Lord shall rise out of His place to punish the world for their iniquity, when the earth shall disclose her blood and shall no more cover her slain. This entire discourse was given, not for the disciples only, but for those who would live in the last scenes of earth’s history.

The same deceptions practiced prior to the destruction of Jerusalem have been practiced through the ages, and will be practiced again.

As one of the signs of Jerusalem’s destruction, Christ had said, “Many false prophets shall arise and shall deceive many.” False prophets did arise, deceiving the people, and leading great numbers into the desert. Magicians and sorcerers, claiming miraculous power, drew the people after them into the mountain solitudes. But this prophecy was spoken also to the last days. This sign is given as the sign of the second advent.¹⁹

The prophecies which were fulfilled in the outpouring of the former rain at the opening of the gospel are again to be fulfilled in the latter rain at its close.

The Second Angel’s Message of Revelation 14 was first preached in the summer of 1844, and it then had a more direct application to the churches in the United States. ... But the message of the second angel did not reach its complete fulfilment in 1844.²⁰

Her dual application of Revelation 11 is especially interesting.²¹

Typical of Adventist scholars today who would affirm the validity of this hermeneutical principle is Kenneth Strand. Note that he supports his own stand by quoting Ellen G. White and Thiele.

The particular type of “philosophy of history” which I have in mind correlates in a certain sense with both preterist and continuous-historical interpretation, but it does so in a way **that allows for repeated historical fulfilments** beyond the writer’s own time or beyond any other specific time in history. From a certain viewpoint, this approach may be considered **essentially a variation of the continuous-historical mode of interpreting the book of Revelation**. As a striking example of the approach I quote a few paragraphs from Ellen G. White, *Acts of the Apostles*, 585-589. ...

Although this author nowhere gives a verse-by-verse exposition of the book of Revelation, allusions she makes in various places in her extensive religious writings reveal that the “philosophy-of-history” approach indicated by the foregoing quotation is by no means limited to the messages to the seven churches. For example, an ascription of praise from Revelation 5 is applied in her writings at least five different ways or to

five different occasions, as Edwin R. Thiele has pointed out. Other examples could be afforded as well.²²

The late W.E. Read took an identical position as shown by his article “Data on the Four Words in Daniel 9:24.” The following are his comments:

It is true that when our Lord died at Calvary, He put an end to “sin offerings,” but in Dan. 9:24, used as it is in intimate relation to “iniquity,” it would be better to regard it as “sin” as such, and not as the remedy for dealing with “sin.”

This is how it has been regarded by some translators as can be seen in the following remarks of Ellen G. White, which are to the point in this connection:

“**Sin** must be **destroyed** as **evil** ruinous to the universe” *Christ’s Object Lessons*, 123.

“An end will be made of sin” *Patriarchs and Prophets*, 347.

“Its **utter extermination**” *Great Controversy*, 504.

“There will be **the total eradication of sin**” *Patriarchs and Prophets*, 33.

“The restoration from the **defilement** of sin will be complete” *Testimonies*, 8:312.

The expression “everlasting righteousness” can be understood in at least two ways:

a. To that of the righteousness of Christ the Messiah

By this we mean that “righteousness,” His own, that is now made available to every individual who accepts Him as Saviour and Redeemer. We have **none** of our own. The only way we can obtain it is by receiving it as a free gift from the Lord Himself. This is His priceless gift to us and we receive it as we receive Him. See Ellen G. White on Daniel 9:24, *Testimonies*, 7:149.

“Man will learn ... of the everlasting righteousness which the Messiah has brought in through His sacrifice.” 7:149.

b. To that of the righteousness of the New Heaven and New Earth

There can be no doubt but that there is a wider application of the term, used in its moral sense — which we might call internal, but also in its factual sense, which might be called external. Let us look at 2 Peter 3:13.

“We ... look for new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth **righteousness**.”

See also *Adventist Home*, 540; *Early Writings*, 295; *Thoughts From the Mount of Blessings*, 17 or 20.

This corresponds to the eternity of the Messianic kingdom as seen in the book of Daniel. “The kingdom of God ... shall stand forever” (2:44); “the saints ... shall possess the kingdom forever; even for ever and ever” (7:18); “the saints of the Most High ... whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom” (7:27). [Unpublished art.]

THE APOTELESMATIC PRINCIPLE IN DANIEL

As regards other apocalyptic prophecies, both the New Testament and the Spirit of Prophecy apply these in an apotelesmatic sense also.

John in Rev. 11:2 apparently has in mind Dan. 8:10-14; 9:27; Luke 21:24 and Matt. 13:14-Matt. 24:15, which is to say that he views the prophecy of Daniel as having been fulfilled in AD 70 and again to be fulfilled in church history. Similarly Paul in 2 Thess. 2 takes Daniel's prophecies about the desecration of the temple and sees such prophecies as transcending Antiochus Epiphanes and Titus. Later prophets therefore have not hesitated to apply Daniel's words to more than one occasion. The most recent illustration is E. G. White in Letter 103, 1904:

We have no time to lose. Troublous times are before us. The world is stirred with the spirit of war. Soon the scenes of trouble spoken of in the prophecies will take place. The prophecy in the eleventh (chapter) of Daniel has nearly reached its complete fulfilment. Much of the history that has taken place in fulfilment of this prophecy will be repeated.²³

“God's work is the same in all time, although there are different degrees of development.” (*Patriarchs and Prophets*, 373) History and prophecy thus illustrate each other.

The close relationship between the historical setting and the subsequent visions helps us to grasp the divine intent and to see the rationale for the apotelesmatic principle. Daniel 1 opens with the sanctuary being trodden underfoot and its host scattered. The four great monarchies brought to view in chapters 2 and 7 all repeat this sacrilege and the Antichrist who springs from the fourth empire re-enacts the same. Finally in the New Testament apocalypse we find the ultimate fulfilment when Satan, the great Antichrist, leads his hosts against the holy city (but with this difference — his venture fails). Again we would point out that this concept also — the close relationship between the narrative setting of Daniel and his prophecies — is well known to exegetes.

A great many little things links the two parts together as a unity. ... According to chapter 4, it is when Nebuchadnezzar forgets that his kingdom and glory are God-given that he loses his dominion, not only over men, but over birds and beasts as well, and is reduced to the level of the beasts.

The same emphasis on self-magnification is found in the later visions of Daniel.

Thus in chapter 8 we read repeatedly of the animals and their horns that they magnified themselves. Similarly, chapter 11. ... As for the beasts in chapter 7, it is self-evident that they ... are in rebellion against God and have seized power for themselves. This connection between man's rebellious self-sufficiency and animal life is found also in the Psalms. ... Ps. 73:21f ... 39:21 (Hooker, *The Son of Man in Mark* 15-6.)

These stories have hardly been sufficiently appreciated. ... Each one has its definite theme, and each is composed with notable dramatic art. ... The bk. is founded four-square on the centuries-old belief that „God is king, be the earth never so unquiet.“ But its contribution to religion lies in its formulation of faith „in the kingdom of God,“ that men should „know that the Highest rules in the kingdom of men“ 4:22[ff].

To this there is added the corollary, arising from the logic of faith rather than of intellect, of God's necessary vindication of His cause in the world. This may take place in the way of human catastrophes, as in the judgments upon Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar. Or else the godlessness of the world drives the faith and patience of the saints to the breaking-point, and the transcendental action of God is demanded; this theme appears in oh. 2, where the successive kingdoms of the world are represented as breaking down in a moment before the „Stone cut without hands.“ **In this scene there**

is the kernel of the Apocalyptic of the later chapters, the reason why an apocalyptic series could be composed as a supplement to the Stories. (Montgomery, ICC: *Daniel*, 100-102, emphasis supplied.)

These four events have, besides their historical value, a prophetic import; they show how the world-rulers, when they misuse their power for self-idolatry and in opposition to the Lord and His servants, will be humbled and cast down by God, while, on the contrary, the true confessors of His name will be wonderfully protected and upheld. For the sake of presenting this prophetic meaning, Daniel has recorded these events and incidents in his prophetic book.²⁴

What objection can there be to the employment of the apotelesmatic principle? Some might suggest there is danger in so applying it that Antiochus Epiphanes is seen as a partial fulfilment of chapters 8 and 11 thereby lessening our traditional stress on Rome. In reply I would suggest that far from detracting from our case I believe it strengthens it. By conceding to our critics that Antiochus is present and then adding “but also” we do that which they themselves for the most part do in exegeting Matt. 2.

In this connection we include comments written twenty years ago on this topic.²⁵

During the last 2000 years, interpreters of Daniel 8 have fallen mainly into four groups, according to their application of the little horn. The largest group numerically has held that the prophecy concerning the little horn was solely fulfilled in Antiochus Epiphanes. This view is not only the oldest, but it remains as the most prominent among modern commentators. Long before Christ, pious Jews so applied the prophecy (1 Maccabees 1:20-64; 1 Maccabees 4:36-60), and today the great bulk of twentieth century works on the subject reaffirm this position. A typical exegesis is that given in *The Interpreter's Bible*:

“The vision now narrows down to an account of Antiochus Epiphanes. He is a **little horn** as in 7:8, but once on the throne he quickly **waxed exceeding great**, manifesting his military power particularly in campaigns against Egypt in the **south** and against Persia in the **east**, and becoming involved, to the sorrow of the Jews, in Palestinian affairs. He is **out of one of them** because he was of Seleucid stock.” (G. Kennedy, “Exposition of Daniel,” *The Interpreter's Bible*, VI, 473.)

A second group of interpreters have declared that only Mohammedanism fulfils the prophetic picture (Thomas Scott, *The Holy Bible, containing the Old and New Testaments, according to the Authorized Version, with Explanatory Notes, Practical Observations, and Copious Marginal References*, comment on Dan. 8:23, 25; George Stanley Faber, *The Sacred Calendar of Prophecy*, 1,134-35). Very few interpreters take this position today.

The third group, ably represented by Bishop Thomas Newton and most of the nineteenth century expositions, pointed the finger at Rome, stating that the prophecy is too comprehensive to find fulfilment in the local history of the second century B.C. Newton declared:

“Antiochus Epiphanes at first sight doth indeed in some features very much resemble the **little horn**; but upon a nearer view and examination it will evidently appear, that in other parts there is no manner of similitude or correspondence between them.” (Thomas Newton, *Dissertation on the Prophecies*, 247.)

He continues:

“Antiochus Epiphanes was indeed the son of Antiochus the Great, king of Syria; and he is said to be the **little horn**; because he rose from small beginnings to the kingdom, having been many years an hostage at Rome. But then his kingdom was nothing more than a continuation of one of the four kingdoms; it cannot possibly be reckoned as a fifth kingdom springing up among the four; and the little horn is plainly some power different and distinct from the four former horns. Is not this, therefore, more applicable to the Romans, who were a new and different power, who rose from small beginnings to an exceeding great empire, who first subdued Macedon and Greece, the capital kingdom of the goat, and from thence spread and enlarged their conquests over the rest?” (*Ibid.*, 249.)

The last group of interpreters, and they are considerable in number, have affirmed that Dan. 8 is a prophecy of double application, pointing to Antiochus only as the type of the antichrist. Concerning the view of this group, Bishop Newton wrote:

“This *little horn* [italics in the original] is by the generality of interpreters, both Jewish and Christian, ancient and modern, supposed to mean Antiochus Epiphanes, king of Syria, who was a great enemy and cruel persecutor of the Jews. ... With Jerome agree most of the ancient fathers, and modern divines and commentators; but then *they all allow that Antiochus Epiphanes was a type of antichrist*” [italics not in the original]. (*Ibid.*, 247.)

These interpreters hold to the double application of certain types of prophecies or as some have expressed it, “the germinant fulfilment of prophecy.” *The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* refers to this method of interpretation in the following quotation:

“Though the prophet looked at events about him, he also could see far beyond his own day. In a mysterious way known only to God the prophet’s words were sometimes intended to meet their fulfilment in the then far-distant future. At times they had an import, not only for the age in which the prophet lived, but also for a day far future; in other words, they had a dual application. ...

“The student of the Bible who hopes to secure from it the greatest help will first proceed to reconstruct the historical context of each passage. He will listen to the prophet speaking to Israel of old and endeavour to understand what his words meant to the people who originally heard them. But he will listen also for the further import the prophet’s words may have for later times, particularly, our time. Indeed, this secondary application is for us today the more significant. But it is only against the background of the original historical context of the message that its meaning and value for us can be established with certainty.” (Francis D. Nichol led], *The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, IV, 37.8.)

Reviewing these four positions from the standpoint of the twentieth century, certain facts stand out:

1. The Mohammedan view has gone largely into eclipse.
2. It must be acknowledged that apart from Seventh-day Adventists there are not a large number who hold to the third view.

3. For an unbiased reader to study the historical references to Antiochus Epiphanes in 1 Maccabees and Josephus and then read the prophecy of Dan. 8, the usual result would be that it would correlate the prophecy with the history. Consider the passages referred to in the footnote below (See Josephus *Antiquities* x 226-281, Loeb [11.7, Whiston]; xii, 248-256, Loeb [54, Whiston]; xii. 316-326, Loeb [7.6, 7, Whiston].) as well as the following quotations:

“And after that Antiochus had smitten Egypt, he returned again in the hundred forty and third year, and went up against Israel and Jerusalem with a great multitude, and entered proudly into the sanctuary, and took away the golden altar, and the candlestick of light, and all the vessels thereof, and the table of the shewbread. ... And when he had taken all away, he went into his own land, having made a great massacre, and spoken very proudly. ... Thus they shed innocent blood on every side of the sanctuary, and defiled it: ... Her sanctuary was laid waste like a wilderness. ... In the hundred forty and fifth year, they set up the abomination of desolation upon the altar. ... (1 Maccabees 1:20-64.)

“Then said Judas and his brethren, Behold, our enemies are discomfited: let us go up to cleanse and dedicate the sanctuary. Upon this all the host assembled themselves together, and went up into Mount Sion. ... Then Judas appointed certain men to fight against those that were there in the fortress, until he had cleansed the sanctuary. So he chose priests of blameless conversation, such as had pleasure in the law: Who cleansed the sanctuary, and bare out the defiled stones into an unclean place. ... Thus was there very great gladness among the people, for that the reproach of the heathen was put away. ... At that time they builded up the Mount Sion with high walls and strong towers round about, lest the Gentiles should come and tread it down, as they had done before.” (1 Maccabees 4:36-60.)

4. Unless bound by rigidly preconceived ideas, the average evangelical today with a sound knowledge of history and of prophetic exegesis would find it intellectually easier to accept view number four than any of the others. The following reasons are offered in support of this affirmation:

- a. As an evangelical he accepts the words of Christ in Matthew 24:15 regarding Daniel’s prophecy and therefore must believe that the significance of the book was not exhausted by Old Testament times. (See Chapter V of this thesis.)
- b. View three probably will be rejected because it would imply that the believers from Daniel’s day to the first advent had no sure word of prophecy to light the dark places of their experiences and that therefore the events in connection with Antiochus Epiphanes only by pure coincidence coincided with the prophecy. Amos 3:7 is to the point on this matter.

Patrick Fairbairn has expressed well the argument that Daniel’s prophecies had a particular application for the believers living in the period from the return from Babylon till the first advent.

“For, during the whole of the post-Babylonian period, the theocratic constitution existed in a kind of anomalous and shattered condition. The original ark of the covenant, the centre of the whole polity, was gone, and the Shekinah, and the answering by Urim and Thummim, and even the kingly rule and government, though it had been secured by covenant in perpetuity to the house of David. It was

to contend, at fearful odds, with the difficulties of their position, as compared with former times, when the members of the ancient covenant had to pass through deep waters shorn of these distinctive badges of a proper covenant relationship. Yet this was not all; for during that period all sensible tokens of God's immediate presence were wanting. There was no longer any vision; the spirit of prophecy was silent; and with a closed record, and destitute of any miraculous agency, the people were left to hold on their course, as they best could, with no more than the settled and ordinary means of grace placed at their command.

“Taking, then, into account the entire circumstances of the period between the return from Babylon and the coming of Christ, is it to be wondered at? (i.e. the necessity for some special support and consolation, p. 106.) Might it not rather be expected, from the whole character of God's dealings with His people, that His foreseeing and watchful guardianship should make some suitable provision for such a time of need? It would have been precisely such a provision, if, along with the prophecies pointing the eye of hope to Messiah's appearance and kingdom, there were also furnished to the hand of faith a more than usually explicit pro-intimation of the changes and vicissitudes that should arise during the intervening period; in particular, during that portion of it when the conflict with sin and error was to be the hottest. For this would, in great measure, compensate for the failure of the prophetic office, through which, in earlier times, direction was given in emergencies, and a sensible connection maintained between the providence of God and the events which befell His people. ... And, finally, if such a provision, by means of prophetic delineations, was to be made, Daniel, of all the prophets during the captivity, or immediately subsequent to it (as Hengstenberg has already noted), was precisely the one fitted for the purpose.” (Patrick Fairbairn, *Prophecy Viewed in Respect to its Distinctive Nature, Its Special Function and Proper Interpretation*, 107-108.)

- c. The view that accepts Dan. 8 as having an initial application to Antiochus and a further application to Rome is harmonious with the usual treatment by evangelicals of certain other double-fulfilment passages of Scripture. Among those could be mentioned most of the Old Testament references to the Day of the Lord, Isaiah 7:14 and specifically the descriptions in Isaiah and Ezekiel of the king of Babylon and the prince of Tyre. Isaiah 14:11-20 and Ezekiel 28:12-19 have long been recognized as Scriptures with a double application, having their origin with reference to earthly rulers who were types of the Prince of darkness.

Seventh-day Adventists, as evangelicals, would do well to consider the reasoning of the large group of conservative scholars (See Christopher Wordsworth, *Commentary on the Holy Bible*, comment on Dan. 8:11; Edward J. Young, on Daniel 11:36-45, in *The New Bible Commentary*, ed. by F. Davidson, A.M. Stibbs, and E.F. Kovan.) who have seen in Daniel 8 definite allusions to the work of Antiochus, but who have also recognized that the former was only a type of the antichrist, and that the latter alone fulfils all the specifications of these verses. Such a view explains the “coincidence” of the events of Maccabean times harmonizing with the prophecy, and also explains the failure of interpreters clinging solely to Antiochus to adequately account for certain features of the vision — such as the 2300 days, which never has been satisfactorily juggled to fit the times of the restoration of the Jewish sanctuary by the Maccabean heroes. (See *Questions on Doctrine*, 327-333.) To take this stand would avoid the “either/or” reasoning of those scholars who have contended for Antiochus rather than Rome and

vice versa. It is certainly to the glory of God to affirm that God's foreknowledge embraced the crisis that came to believers before the first advent as well as the longer and more significant oppression during the Christian era. This view would see in Antiochus the main application for the Jewish church between Daniel's time and Christ; but for the Christian church, Daniel 8, in its most exhaustive application, finds its significance in its portrayal of Rome — pagan and papal, and the final fling of Satan, himself the great Antichrist. [We have added to this twenty-year-old statement the last two clauses.]

DANIEL 9:24 AS APOTELESMATIC

Some may object to the position taken on Dan. 9:24 as being also apotelesmatic, applying both to the Cross and the Judgment. But as before, here again we think such usage removes from our critics many prominent objections to our interpretation of Dan. 8:14. They can rightly ask: Why go to Leviticus to explain Dan. 8:14 when Gabriel was told to make it clear? Why do Adventists use a mistranslation such as "cleansed" for the basis of their judgment doctrine? Why do Adventists ignore the context of Dan. 8:14 which speaks not of the sins of the saints but the defiling by a wicked power? etc.

If we grant that Gabriel was indeed given the commission to make Daniel understand the vision where else shall we look for his explanation of 8:14 apart from his words found in the later chapters and particularly in the purported explanation found in 9:24? Do we not understand the judgment day to be the complete unfolding of the atonement made on the cross making an end of sin and bringing in everlasting righteousness, fulfilling all prophetic vision and ushering in the holy reign of God whereby this earth becomes His anointed temple for eternity?

Interpreters over the ages can be divided into three groups regarding Dan. 9:24. One group has contended that it finds its fulfilment at the cross alone. Another group has said that it finds its fulfilment in the very last days in connection with the kingdom of glory. A third group of interpreters have declared that the verse applies to both events in harmony with the Old Testament prophetic principle of merging the kingdom of grace and the kingdom of glory into a single picture.

Seventh-day Adventists face two major difficulties in their interpretation of Dan. 8:14. The first is that most commentaries see in the little horn a prophecy of Antiochus Epiphanes. And the second problem is that they seem to interpret Dan. 8:14 arbitrarily by turning elsewhere in Scripture, away from the book of Daniel, for an exegesis of this passage. If the present suggestion is correct that Gabriel did indeed make Daniel to understand the vision, and did indeed explain the cleansing of the sanctuary as he was ordered to do by Christ, then we have solved both of these problems at a stroke. If Dan. 9:24 is commentary on Dan. 8:14, then it is obvious that the little horn of chapter eight cannot be restricted to a minor power that functioned and ceased more than a hundred years before Christ was born. And second, if Dan. 9:24 is explanatory of Dan. 8:14, we are relieved of the accusation of inventing and devising an arbitrary interpretation.

Does Dan. 9:24, on the face of it, seem to interpret "then shall the sanctuary be cleansed"? We have always pointed out that preceding this verse there are references to the vision of Dan. 8. For example, we read of "the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning" and also "I am now come forth to give thee skill and understanding," and again, "understand the matter, and consider the vision." Here are definite statements that link the following verses with the explanation that was begun in the eighth chapter. Furthermore, we

have also emphasized that Dan. 9:24-27 is concerned with the issue of time. While in Dan. 8 the angel had explained the powers mentioned in the vision he had said nothing about the time except that the prophecy of verse 14 was a true matter. But here in chapter 9, taking up the threads, he alludes to the issue of time.

Glancing now at verse 24, is there anything there that does indeed harmonize with our understanding of what the cleansing of the “sanctuary” involves? Undoubtedly there is. Here is a statement saying that sin is to be finished. Verse 24 used the same expressions for sin found in the Day of Atonement description in Lev. 16:21; namely, “transgressions,” “sins,” and “iniquities.” The verse declares that all are to be finished and ended. Then on the positive side, the verse continues by saying that “everlasting righteousness” is to be brought in. This term “everlasting” is used elsewhere in the book of Daniel in connection with the kingdom of glory. (See the second and seventh chapters.) This verse also affirms that all vision and prophecy will be sealed up; in other words, it will be fulfilled, completed — which could only be at the end of time. And finally the prophecy alludes to “the anointing of the most Holy,” an expression that is used throughout Scripture in connection with God taking up His place among His people. The anointing of the tabernacle is a symbol of God coming to make His residence among His people, and points finally to what is described in the 21st chapter of Revelation when “the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them” (verse 3). A well-known exegete has written as follows on Dan. 9:24:

If ever there was an exegetical crux, this is it. Jerome was already acquainted with nine interpretations. ... The six statements of Dan. 9:24 cover the sum total of the purpose of God with men, covering the perfect consummation of the Messiah’s work that will be achieved when the second coming and the judgment have transpired.²⁶

It is difficult for us to see that Dan. 9:24 could have a secondary application to the kingdom of glory because we are so used to stressing its application to the ushering in of the kingdom of grace at the cross, but the article, “Unity and Variety in New Testament Faith,” by George Eldon Ladd (see page 508) shows the Biblical basis on which it may be done.

It is also helpful to remember that the prophetic wording of the Apocalypse concerning the last message of the world alludes to the typical history of Israel and her removal from ancient Babylon to restore the sanctuary. Such passages as “come out of her my people” and “the hour of his judgment is come,” etc., are quotations from the book of Jeremiah concerning typical Israel’s experience at the time of the restoration. The events at the beginning of the 2300 days are typical of the events at the close. This is why Dan. 9:24 can apply both to the kingdom of grace and the kingdom of glory. The beginning of the 2300 days marks the call for all the honest in heart to forsake Babylon and rally around the sanctuary of God and the holy law therein. In the book *Prophets and Kings*, 677, 678, Ellen White tells us clearly that the work of the exiles in rebuilding the sanctuary was typical of the work of the saints who repair the breach in the wall of God’s law in the last days.

Not only is it true that the events at the beginning of the 2300 days parallel the events at the close of the 2300 days, but events at the close of the first section of the 2300 days (that is, the 490-year period), also parallel the events that will take place at the end of time. Toward the close of the seventy weeks the professed religious people of the age united with the state to crucify the Sinless One, who was proclaiming the law and gospel of God. The loud cry (triumphant entry) of Christ’s ministry was rejected, the nation grieved away the Holy Spirit, and was left desolate. Christ Himself experienced “a little time of trouble” in Gethsemane when the death decree had been made against Him, and then the longer “time of trouble”

through the official trials and ensuing cross. God's judgments against sin were manifested at Calvary in the plagues of darkness, earthquake, and thirst, etc. But then came ultimate deliverance. A parallel may here be traced between the experience of Christ and that of the final generation of the church. Such books as *The Great Controversy* and *The Desire of Ages* frequently allude to this parallel. The article "The Companions of the Lamb," in *Our Firm Foundation*, Vol. 2, 403, spells out this topic in some detail.

Thus there are good grounds for assuming that verse 24 of Daniel 9 applies both to the first section of the 2300 days (that is, the 490-year period, closing in A.D. 34) and then as regards the most significant events mentioned, the abolition of sin and the bringing in of everlasting righteousness — these apply also to the end of the age — Christ's final work in heaven and earth.

A.T. Jones taught this long ago (see *The Consecrated Way*). We use his name as an illustration that this interpretation of Dan. 9:24 is not a novel one. It is not "new light." Second, we should note that Ellen White uses the language of this verse and applies it to the future consummation of all things (see *Selected Messages*, 1:374).

Further confirmation of this thesis is found in the fact that the final prophecy of Daniel (chapters 10-12) is yet another enlargement of Daniel 8. Most commentators on the book assert this to be the case. In the last prophecy of Daniel the same conflict of the ages presented in the vision given in Daniel 8, is expanded, and in literal rather than symbolic terms. Can we find anything in this final chapter that has to do with finishing the transgression, making an end of sins, making reconciliation for iniquity, and bringing in everlasting righteousness, etc.? Indeed, we can. The twelfth chapter of Daniel is a very clear elaboration of what is meant by the "cleansing" of the sanctuary. We have reference to investigation of God's book in order that those found therein as righteous might be delivered at the coming of the Lord (Dan. 12:1). We are distinctly told that the righteous (symbolized by Daniel) will stand in their lot at the end of the days (v. 13); that is, stand in the judgment at the end of the 2300 days. The translators recognized this allusion to the judgment as is shown by their placing of Psalm 1:5 in the margin. This twelfth chapter of Daniel brings to view the complete abolition of sin, the reward of the righteous who are to shine as the brightness of the firmament and as the stars forever and ever, and the fate of the wicked who will be exposed to shame and everlasting contempt. In fact, the twelfth chapter of Daniel, when linked with the last verse of the preceding chapter, pictures the fate and disposition of all men who have ever lived. We have the living wicked and the living righteous brought to view, and the dead wicked and the dead righteous.

While Dan. 12:2 has often been used as pointing only to a partial resurrection, it is far more likely that it is a summary statement concerning the two resurrections of Revelation 20. Christ's quotation from these verses endorses this position (see John 5:28, 29). Such famous Hebrew scholars as Tregelles so interpreted Dan. 12:2 on the basis of the original Hebrew. "Many" in this verse means the same as "the many" in Romans 5. If this is the case, Dan. 12:2 brings to view the reward of the living righteous while Dan. 11:45 speaks about the end of the antichrist and his host, that is, it presents the fate of the living wicked. Thus the work of the judgment and its outcome is clearly explained in this final prophecy of Daniel, and it is this that constitutes the cleansing of the sanctuary. Note carefully the following statement from *Patriarchs and Prophets* regarding the significance of the Day of Atonement:

Thus in the ministration of the tabernacle, and of the temple that afterward took its place, the people were taught each day the great truths relative to Christ's death and

ministration, and once each year their minds were carried forward **to the closing events of the great controversy between Christ and Satan, the final purification of the universe from sin and sinners.**²⁷

Let it be particularly noticed that Ellen White does not limit the cleansing of the sanctuary to the investigative judgment merely, but shows that the cleansing of the sanctuary has to do with the final disposition of evil and the ushering in of everlasting righteousness throughout the universe.

Should it not be seen as significant that the only passages in the Bible that refer to sins, iniquities, transgression, atonement, sanctuary — all in one place — are Lev. 16 and Dan. 9:24? Should we not be grateful that non-Adventist scholars have seen the parallel nature of Dan. 7:9-13; 8:14 and Dan. 9:24?

At the very beginning of Scripture the Lord gave us a pattern prophecy which enshrined in itself most of the usual characteristics of inspired prediction. Gen. 3:15 is Christocentric yet historically conditioned; it is symbolic but includes not only literal fulfilment but spiritual; it had an immediate application in the warfare between Cain and Abel and their followers but finds complete consummation only in Christ's victory at the Cross and His second and third coming. This illustrates the apotelesmatic principle at its best. See Rom. 16; Heb. 2; Rev. 12:7-17, 20.

Once the principle is grasped we will readily understand why many excellent scholars can be listed under each separate school of interpreters — preterism, historicism, futurism, idealism. All are right in what they affirm and wrong in what they deny.

To say that a passage means just this and nothing more, that you must not attach any broader meaning to the words of it than we have in the past, is saying that which is not actuated by the Spirit of God.²⁸

So much for the apotelesmatic principle as applied to prophecy. There is a broader application of the principle which is now a commonplace for New Testament scholars. We alluded to it in the foregoing, but now wish to spell it out in some detail. The whole vexed problem of New Testament eschatology and especially the *Parusieverzögerung* (the delay of the second advent) has led to the present awareness that the Old Testament prophecies about the Kingdom of God also have apotelesmatic fulfilment.

INAUGURATED (REALIZED) AND CONSUMMATED ESCHATOLOGY

A review of over a century's research in eschatology shows the pendulum tendency operating. To start with, the prim Victorian era in England, and the Continent with its optimistic sister *Weltanschauung* (World-view), could not view apocalyptic eschatology with anything other than raised eyebrows. An age which boldly affirmed:

God's in His heaven
And all's right with the world

could see little meaning in apocalyptic nightmares. Then came Albert Schweitzer interpreting Jesus in harmony with his understanding of the *Sitz im Leben* (life-situation) of Palestine in the first century. The result was Christ as an apocalyptic deluded figure, obsessed with the imminent end of the world. The pendulum did not cease to move at this point. Thirty years later it was being strongly contended that the idea of a parousia preceded by signs had been

wrongly distilled from Christ's teachings by an apocalyptically-minded church, contrary to Christ's personal beliefs. The *Eschaton* had already come in Christ, and that was that.²⁹

Thus the viewpoint changed as personalities like Harnack, Schweitzer, and moderns such as C.H. Dodd gave place each to the other and dominated the theological scene, at least in certain geographical areas. Thus in answer to the question: "Did Jesus hold apocalyptic views?" the answer comes "No" (Harnack); "Yes" (Schweitzer); "No" (Dodd); "Yes" (Bultmann);³⁰ ... and so on, according to which scholar answers the question. The Spirit of the Age is at fault, and if spirits could be clothed, the dress of this particular one would best be described as chameleon. More ways than one exist for eviscerating apocalyptic, and not the least persuasive is the suggestion that Christ's mythological expectations for the future are merely incidental, and it is His timeless existential demand that should be recognized and proclaimed.³¹

We need reminding still that we cannot have the same thing both ways. The cake refuses to remain present with us, though eaten. Thus while some would insist that Christ cherished apocalyptic concepts by reminding us that He must have been a child of His time, others assure us that His authentic *logia* are recognizable only if dissimilar to those of His contemporaries. We shall have to be content with the facts presented in the Gospels if we wish to arrive at a conclusion that will be accurate still when cosmologies and *Weltanschauungen* change again. We are reminded of Dean Inge's saying that "he who marries the Spirit of the Age will soon be a widower."³² Attitudes to eschatology have had some revision since 1945³³ but this should not influence us either.

The modern position is best summarized by the terms "realized" (or inaugurated) and "consummated." New Testament scholars see eschatology as having these two aspects. The kingdom of God came with Christ at His first advent — this is realized eschatology. With Christ came judgment, justification, eternal life, the abolition of death, the destruction of Satan, the last hour, etc. All the terms men had applied to the empirical end apply also to the new age ushered in by our Lord. But Christ also looked to a future consummation. That which has been realized in Him is yet to be consummated by the last Judgment and the Second Advent. As one of our own publications has summarized the matter:

The kingdom about which Jesus spoke is to be looked at from two points of view. Jesus talked about the kingdom as if it had already arrived. He said, for example, "The kingdom of God is in the midst of you" (Luke 17:21), and He spoke of the kingdom as if it were at present growing. Such parables as that of the mustard seed and the leaven illustrate this latter aspect.

But Jesus also spoke of the kingdom as future. He said that He would set up His kingdom. He said, "I shall not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God comes." Luke 22:18

The kingdom is viewed both as present and future. These two aspects are closely associated. Those who enter into the kingdom about which Jesus spoke here are present subjects of God's kingdom, and these are the ones for whom He will come when He sets up His kingdom in the future.

When Jesus came, the kingdom came, and men here and now may enter into this kingdom. But the kingdom is also still future, and it will be revealed, when Jesus comes the second time, for those who have entered the present kingdom here and now. Thus the future kingdom is, in a sense, continuous with the present kingdom, and it is also

discontinuous, in that the second advent is the watershed between the present and the future kingdom.³⁴

Oscar Cullman did much to mould the present understanding by his *Christ and Time*. We quote him and some of his contemporaries in an Appendix.³⁵ Perhaps more clearly than most George Eldon Ladd has spelled out the relationships between inaugurated and consummated eschatology. In order to point the way to the resolution of the Adventist problem on Heb. 8, I have distributed a summary statement by Ladd to ministerial classes ever since it first appeared about fifteen years ago.³⁶

What is the unifying principle of the diverse emphases in the theology of the New Testament? The diversity must be clearly recognized and not glossed over. According to the Synoptic Gospels, the central message of Jesus was the coming of the Kingdom of God. Sometimes He asserted that the Kingdom of God had come in the midst of history in His own person and mission (Matt. 12:28; Luke 17:20, 21), sometimes He looked forward to its coming at the end of the age and taught His disciples to pray for its coming (Matt. 6:10; 8:11; 13:43). When this eschatological Kingdom comes, the redeemed will enter into the eternal life of the Age to Come (Mark 10:23-30). In the Synoptic Gospels eternal life is never referred to as a present possession; it will be the inheritance of God's people in the eschatological Kingdom of God (Matt. 25:34, 46).

The Gospel of John has a very different emphasis. Jesus' references to the Kingdom occur infrequently there (John 3:3, 5, and 18:36). The central message of Jesus, according to John, is eternal life (3:15; 4:14; 6:40; see 20:31; and this gift of eternal life is a present possession (5:24; 6:47; 10:10) that men may now receive through faith in Jesus Christ.

The Book of Acts records a number of brief reports of the early apostolic preaching. These sermons say little about the Kingdom of God (Acts 1:3; 8:12; 19:8; 14:22; 20:25; 28:23); and eternal life is mentioned in only one place (Acts 13:46, 48); "life" is spoken of in 3:15; 5:20; 11:18). The apostolic message in Acts is the resurrection of Jesus from the dead. Because God has raised the crucified Jesus from the dead and exalted Him to His own right hand, men are called upon to repent, be saved, and receive the gift of the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:38). Luke, in telling the story of the expanding Church, is primarily interested in the working of the Holy Spirit who was given on the Day of Pentecost to unite believers into the fellowship that constituted the Church (Acts 1:5, 6; 2:1-39; 4:31; 8:15-17; 10:44; 19:2, 6), not in the indwelling of the Spirit in individual believers.

In the epistles of Paul we find a still different emphasis. Paul has little to say about the kingdom of God (Rom. 14:17; 1 Cor. 4:20; 6:9; Eph. 5:5); and although he mentions eternal life a few times (Rom. 2:7; 5:21; 6:22, 23; Gal. 6:8; 1 Tim. 1:16) and speaks frequently of life, this theme is not the central focus of his theology. Reformed theologians have made justification by faith the centre of Paul's thought, while the modern tendency has been to place the emphasis upon Christ's indwelling the believer through the Holy Spirit.

Yet there is no reason to view these two great Pauline doctrines as mutually exclusive; they are in fact complementary, expounding the objective and the subjective aspects of redemption. Justification has to do with the sinner's relation to God, who is the righteous Lawgiver and Judge. The obverse of justification is condemnation. The righteous man is justified — declared right — acquitted from all guilt by the righteous Judge; the sinner is pronounced guilty and justly condemned as a sinner (Rom. 8:33,

34). The unique element in Paul's doctrine of justification is that God acquits the sinner not by his good works nor by the law but by faith in Jesus Christ.

However, the man who is justified by faith is also indwelt by Christ through the Holy Spirit. This is the subjective side of salvation. God justifies the believer through faith on the ground of redemption wrought by Jesus Christ (2 Cor. 5:20, 21); and through the same faith, God imparts the Holy Spirit to indwell the believer (Gal. 3:2). The indwelling of the Spirit is also the indwelling of Christ (Rom. 8:9, 10), for the Spirit is the Spirit of the exalted Lord (Rom. 8:9).

This diversity of New Testament theology, though it cannot be here further illustrated, is unmistakable. The kingdom of God (the Synoptics), eternal life (John), the resurrection of Christ and the coming of the Holy Spirit to form the Church (Acts), justification by faith and the new life of the Holy Spirit (Paul) — what do these diverse theologies have in common?

This question was brought forcefully to my attention when a recent book of mine was understood to have the purpose of "unifying all theological thought in the New Testament around and in a single motif," namely, the kingdom of God. It is easy to understand how this impression was gained from the book, for its subtitle, "The Eschatology of Biblical Realism," may seem to suggest that the totality of biblical eschatology is to be subsumed under this single theme. But this conclusion is not necessary any more than it is necessary to conclude that the widely used terms "consistent eschatology" and "realized eschatology" apply to the eschatology of the entire New Testament. The "eschatology of biblical realism," like the two terms just mentioned, is meant primarily to designate the eschatological perspective of our Lord, not of the entire New Testament.

The paragraphs above indicate that I do not believe that the theology of John, Acts, and Paul can be accurately subsumed under the kingdom of God. In fact, such a harmonizing procedure would, in my judgment, do violence to the rich diversity of emphases of these other writings.

Where then is unity to be found? I believe that it appears in the common eschatological structure found in those several biblical writers: promise, fulfilment, and consummation. This was, in fact, my original choice for the title of the book.

The entire New Testament assumes the Old Testament's prophetic promises of an eschatological day of salvation and judgment. This promise appears in different forms in the several prophets; but common to all is the conviction that God, who had revealed Himself as the living God in delivering Israel from Egypt (Ex. 6:6, 7) in constituting Israel His people (Amos 3:1, 2), and in leading her both in grace and in judgment (Amos 6:6ff), would finally bring His redemptive purposes to a glorious consummation that would include the destiny not only of Israel but also of the Gentiles (Isa. 11:10; 66:18). This eschatological salvation would not only establish God's rule effectively among men but also accomplish the redemption of nature (Isa. 11:6-9; 55:12, 13). No single pattern of redemption can be found in the Old Testament. Sometimes God's reign will be accomplished through a Davidic messianic King (Isa. 9; 11); elsewhere by a supernatural heavenly figure (Dan. 7); elsewhere a servant of the Lord redeems his people through humiliation, suffering, and dying (Isa. 53). Frequently, the prophets speak of no messianic figure; God Himself will reign among His people (Isa. 40; Ps.

102; 138). The Old Testament does not explain how these several forms of the messianic hope are related to one another.

The entire New Testament reflects the conviction that these prophetic promises have been fulfilled in the person, mission, words, and deeds of Jesus of Nazareth within history; but the consummation of the promises awaits a further eschatological event that will establish the eschatological rule of God in all the world. **In other words, the New Testament writers see the fulfilment of the Old Testament promises in two great redemptive events: the earthly person and mission of Jesus, and His glorious appearing at the end of the age.** The New Testament explains how the several messianic personages of the Old Testament are related to one another in God's plan of redemption. The Messiah appears first as a man within history to fulfil the mission of the Servant of the Lord in suffering and death, but He will later appear at the end of the age as the glorious heavenly Son of Man in both judgment and salvation. In the biblical perspective, these are not two separate events but two acts of a single drama of redemption.

This tension between fulfilment and consummation is illustrated in each of the several theologies outlined above. In the Synoptic Gospels, the Kingdom of God is an eschatological event belonging to the Age to Come when the redeemed will enter into eternal life. However, this eschatological event has already invaded history in the person and mission of Jesus, offering to men advance of the eschatological consummation the redemptive blessings of forgiveness, righteousness, and fellowship with God. While the Kingdom is essentially eschatological, it has had a real fulfilment in history. The Old Testament hope has been fulfilled before the consummation; eschatology has become history.

The same tension is found in the Gospel of John, although the emphasis is different from that of the Synoptics. Eternal life in the Synoptics is the eschatological life of the Kingdom of God in the Age to Come; and in the Fourth Gospel, life is also an eschatological blessing (John 12:25; 4:14; 6:27). But even as the Kingdom of God has come to men in history, so has the life of the Kingdom come to them as a present experience. In a real sense, the concept of the kingdom of God and of eternal life are inseparable, for life is the life of the kingdom; and as the kingdom is present among men it has brought to them one of its most significant blessings — eternal life. **This tension of fulfilment within history and consummation at the end of the age enables us to preserve the evident diversity and yet find a basic unity.** The Old Testament hope (Dan. 12:2) has been fulfilled before the consummation; eschatology has become history.

The Book of Acts looks back upon the completed life and mission of Jesus and places its emphasis upon the significance of His resurrection and exaltation rather than upon His deeds and words. The reason for this is that the eschatological fulfilment present in the person, words, and deeds of Jesus finds an even deeper dimension in His resurrection and exaltation.

The early Christians proclaimed "in Jesus the resurrection from the dead" (Acts 4:2). It is strange that this message should have so grievously annoyed the Sadducees, for this doctrine was also held by the Pharisees. The point is that the early Christians were not teaching a doctrine of resurrection at the end of the age; they were proclaiming an eschatological deed that had occurred in history. They were not teaching a truth; they

were witnessing to an event. The same idea is expounded more clearly by Paul, who speaks of the resurrection of Christ as the “first fruits” of the eschatological resurrection at the end of the age (1 Cor. 15:23). First fruits in an agrarian economy were the beginning of the harvest itself. The resurrection of Jesus was not an isolated event; it was not merely promise of a future event; it was itself the beginning of the future event. The first act of resurrection had already occurred in the resurrection of Jesus, and this placed the Christian proclamation in a new and startling light.

The same eschatological dimension is found in the gift of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost. The prophecy of the outpouring of the Spirit in Joel belongs to the eschatological consummation of God’s redemptive purpose (Joel 2:28ff) at the Day of the Lord. When God finally redeems His people and makes Himself known as God in all the world (Joel 2:26, 27), one of the gifts of His eschatological salvation will be the outpouring of His Spirit. This event, Peter declared, has now occurred in history (Acts 2:16ff), because Jesus has been exalted to heaven and enthroned at the right hand of God as messianic king (Acts 2:30ff). The blessings of Messiah’s reign no longer belong exclusively to the Act to Come and the kingdom of God; they have come to men in history to bring into existence God’s new people — the Church. The Church is therefore an eschatological community, a people who not only are destined to inherit the consummated kingdom but also have already experienced the powers and blessings of that Kingdom through the coming of the Holy Spirit in history. The Old Testament hope has been fulfilled before the consummation; eschatology has become history.

Paul interprets the significance of the eschatological event of Jesus Christ primarily in terms of justification by faith and the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. Here again, although in yet different terms, Paul expounds the meaning for believers of the eschatological dimension of what had happened in history in Jesus Christ.

Justification focuses attention upon the meaning of Jesus’ death. His propitiatory sacrifice on the cross is the ground of justification by faith. Justification, as we have seen is the decree of the divine Lawgiver and Judge that a man is free from all guilt and condemnation. As such, it is an eschatological event that belongs to the day of judgment at the end of the world. This is clearly seen in a saying of Jesus: “On the day of judgment men will render account for every careless word they utter; for by your words you will be justified, and by your words you will be condemned” (Matt. 12:36, 37 RSV). Acquittal or condemnation in the eschatological day of judgment — this is the destiny of all men.

The death of Christ has provided the basis for the acquittal of men in history. Before the day of judgment, before the end of the age, the righteous Judge has rendered His decision. The man of faith is acquitted of all guilt; he is justified by His (God’s) grace as a gift, through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus” (Rom. 3:24). In effect, the eschatological event has already occurred in history; the Judge has rendered His final decision. The man of faith is freed from all condemnation.

Accompanying this eschatological event is another: the indwelling of the Holy Spirit to impart new life. That this gift of the Spirit indwelling every believer is also an eschatological event is shown by the words Paul uses to describe it: first-fruits and down payment. The Holy Spirit is the first fruits (Rom. 8:23) of the final redemption. Creation is in bondage to decay, and believers share the burden of pain, suffering, and death. Both await the eschatological glory of consummated redemption. But God has

given more than hope and promise; He has imparted the Spirit of life in the midst of corruption and decay, thus providing a beginning of the eschatological consummation.

The Holy Spirit is also called a down payment. The King James Version renders the word “earnest,” and the Revised Standard “guarantee.” The word “*arrabon*” in popular Greek meant a down payment that not only guaranteed the final full payment but also provided an actual but partial payment. Thus so the Holy Spirit is a partial experience of the believer’s eschatological inheritance until he will finally acquire full possession of it. (Eph. 1:14; see also 2 Cor. 1:22; 5:5). This means that everything that the Holy Spirit does, both in the fellowship of the Church (Acts) and in the lives of individual believers, is a real anticipation of the life of the Age to Come. The Old Testament hope has been fulfilled. Eschatology has become history.

All New Testament writers look forward to an eschatological consummation of all that was promised by the prophets. The Kingdom of God, eternal life, the resurrection of the dead, the vindication of the righteous in the day of judgment, and their transformation by the gift of the Holy Spirit (Ezek. 36:26, 27) all await the Age to Come. Yet because of the person, mission, death, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus Christ, all these eschatological events have witnessed a fulfilment in history. The Kingdom of God awaits the Age to Come; but it has invaded history in the person and mission of Jesus. Eternal life will follow the resurrection at the end of the age; but in the resurrection of Jesus, the eschatological event has begun and eternal life has come to mortal men in history. The day of judgment will introduce the Age to Come; but by virtue of the atoning death of Jesus, the judgment of acquittal has already been pronounced on men of faith. The eschatological redemption will mean “Spiritual” — that is, spirit-transformed — bodies for the redeemed (1 Cor. 15:44; Rom. 8:23); but the transforming gift of the Spirit has already been given to men in history.

Here is the striking unity in the rich diversity of the meaning of the total person and mission of Jesus: hope fulfilled in history without being emptied of its eschatological content at the future consummation. The several theologies of the New Testament are diverse ways of describing the redemptive significance of what God has already accomplished in Jesus Christ in its relation to the eschatological consummation. The totality of God’s redemptive working in salvation-history cannot be subsumed under any single doctrine; the rich diversity must be preserved within the basic unity of promise-fulfilment-consummation of God’s self-revelation and redemption.

Long before Ladd, G. Voss in his *Pauline Eschatology* pointed out that the heart of the New Testament, the writings of Paul, taught the nature of our present blessings in eschatological terms. The redemption, salvation, eternal life, destruction of sin and Satan, longed for through the ages, had actually come with Christ. The acquittal of the Last Judgment was now available for all who believe. Justification is the anticipation here and now of that ultimate verdict. Note the words of Voss:

The eschatological strand is the most systematic in the entire fabric of the Pauline thought-world. For it now appears that the closely interwoven soteric tissue derives its pattern from the eschatological scheme, which bears all the marks of having had precedence in his mind. ... It is safe to assume that far more than all this counted the eschatological mould into which the Apostle’s thought had been cast from the beginning. What gives dogmatic colouring to his teaching is largely derived from its antithetical structure, as exhibited in the comprehensive antithesis of the First Adam

and the Last Adam, sin and righteousness, the flesh and the Spirit, law and faith, and these are precisely the historical reflections of the one great transcendental antithesis between this world and the world-to-come. It is no wonder that such energetic eschatological thinking tended towards consolidation in an orb of compact theological structure. For in it the world-process is viewed as a unit. The end is placed in the light of the beginning, and all intermediate developments are construed with reference to the purpose *a quo* and the terminus *ad quem*.

A survey of the facts registered leaves little doubt but that between the two aspects of the matter, the priority belongs in the Apostle's mind to the eschatological aspect. If the starting-point had lain at the other end, we might surely expect some qualifying phrase to appear in the futurity-passages to intimate that not salvation as such, but only its perfection or consummation was associated with the end; the opposite is the case: salvation at the end is spoken of in an absolute way, as though it were the only conception customary; it is *ἡ σωτηρία*. In fact, the phenomenon furnishes a strict analogy to the manner after which in our Lord's teaching such things as "the kingdom of God" and "the Parousia of the Son-of-Man" are referred to as future things in an absolute way, as though no other kingdom, no other Parousia were reckoned with. There is a continuity in the writings of the New Testament of this way of speaking: the feeling expressed in the word of our Lord, "the hour comes and is now" re-echoes everywhere. The lower air was so surcharged with the sense of what great things had already come to pass and what greater things were on the wings in the upper air ready to come down, that the precision in speaking of the several parts and phases of the whole was for the moment in abeyance.³⁷

Kummel speaks similarly.

The often-held view, that Paul's doctrine of justification is a mere "polemical doctrine" and hence not a central expression of his message of salvation, cannot be maintained in view of the dominant position of this doctrine in the Pauline epistles. Quite to the contrary, we can easily see that the doctrine of justification represents the basic and most highly personal form of expression of the Pauline message of God's eschatological saving action.³⁸

That all such writers are essentially correct is made clear by Christ's own statements. He spoke of the kingdom as having come and yet to come, of judgment that "now is" and yet "cometh." At the beginning of His public work He applied the Jubilee type to His own gospel mission. See Luke 4:19. Yet the Jubilee will have its complete fulfilment at the end of the age as we have always taught.

Similarly, Christ linked the Passover both to the Cross and His second coming. See Matt. 26:26-29. Tabernacles also is applied to both advents. This feast of harvest had its first fulfilment in Christ's own day. Says Jeremias:

The harvest, like the wedding and the wine, is a well-established symbol of the New Age. Harvest is the great time of rejoicing:

„Thou has multiplied the exaltation,
Thou hast increased the joy.
They rejoice before thee
As men rejoice in harvest-time,
As they rejoice when they divide the spoil.“ (Isa. 9:2)

„Though a man may go forth in tears,
At the sowing of the seed,
Yet he shall come again rejoicing,
Bearing his sheaves with him.“ (Ps. 126:6)

Harvest and vintage symbolize in particular the Last Judgment with which the New Age begins. Joel (3:13) proclaims in view of the judgment over all people, „Thrust in the sickle for the harvest is ripe: come, tread ye; for the wine-press is full, the fats overflow; for their wickedness is great.“ The Baptist depicts the Coming One with the winnowing-fan in his hand, bringing in the harvest (Matt. 3:12; Luke 3:17). Paul compares the Last Judgment to the harvest (Gal. 6:7f). In the last book of the Bible (Apoc. 14:15), the angel cries from the Temple of God, „Send forth thy sickle, and reap: for the hour to reap is come; for the harvest of the earth is over-ripe.“ And the angel with the firebrand replies, „Send forth thy sharp sickle, and gather the clusters of the vine of the earth: for her grapes are fully ripe.“ The hour is come, says Jesus, as he sends out his disciples, not to sow, but to reap. The fields are white (John 4:35); sowing and reaping go on together (4:36).³⁹

But the Apocalypse applied the Feast of Harvest and the Old Testament sanctuary prophecies to the “last things” yet to come. Says McKelvey:

It is to the merit of Comblin that he has shown that the imagery of the concluding section of the Apocalypse (21:1-22:5) is based upon the Feast of Tabernacles, the Jewish feast *par excellence*. There is good reason for believing that Tabernacles also is the dominant image of the seven liturgical scenes. To start with, the faithful at 7:9ff are described as bearing palm branches; this is a feature of Tabernacles. Their rubric, “Salvation belongs to our God,” recalls the cry **Hosanna** of Ps. 118:25, which was used at the feast (M. Suk. 4:5). The description of the heavenly host in the posture of worship, the palms, the trumpets, and the Hallel is not in itself conclusive, but appearing together as these do and in conjunction with other details of the visions (see below) they make it reasonably certain that the reference is to Tabernacle. Quite explicit in fact is the allusion to the tabernacling presence: „Therefore are they before the throne of God, and serve him day and night within his temple; and he who sits on the throne will shelter them with his presence (σκηνοῦσι ἐπ’ αὐτοῦς)“ (7:15; cf. 21:3; John 1:14). This leads naturally to the thought of God’s care and provision for Israel in the wilderness. Finally, there is the promise of „springs of living water“ (7:17), alluding to the central rite of Tabernacles, the waterpouring, which from the time of Zechariah had an eschatological orientation (Zech. 14:8ff; cf. Rev. 22:1). Similarly in the sixth vision, Tabernacles once again appears to be the source of John’s inspiration. Thus the representation of the saints as victors standing beside the forbidding sea singing praises to God recalls the psalms sung at Tabernacles on the „steps of Tehom“. Again, the marked universal thrust of the liturgy accords well with Tabernacles (Zech. 14:16f). Many of these elements we shall find reappearing in the vision of the new Jerusalem, where Tabernacles is clearly in mind.

That John should have selected the Feast of Tabernacles for his imagery is not surprising. As the symbol, on the one hand, of the presence of God with His people, and, on the other hand, of the vindication of God’s people and their triumph over their enemies and the conversion of the nations to God (Zech. 14:16-19), the feast was peculiarly suited to His purpose.

Another way of saying the same thing is to interpret the vision to mean that the new Jerusalem is itself a temple. We recall that the city is cubiform, like the holy of holies in the temple of Jerusalem ... New Jerusalem and the new temple are one and the same thing.

Can we after all regard the church militant as the fulfilment of the long-cherished hope concerning the new temple? This question raises issues of New Testament eschatology which go far beyond the limits of this book, and all that one can hope to do in the present circumstances is to give an answer without supporting it. **One may say that the church on earth is and is not the fulfilment of the traditional hope. It is the fulfilment in so far as God dwells in it here and now; it is not in so far as His indwelling in this age is partial, incomplete, and hidden.** The findings of this chapter are thus a necessary qualification to the conclusion of the preceding chapters, reminding us that **the fullness of the divine presence and the unmediated vision of God, the perfection of communion, and the gathering together of the elect from the four corners of the earth still lie in the future.**

The new temple is the central idea of biblical eschatology from the earliest times and is found in the most diverse backgrounds. It explains the priestly legislation and the priestly interpretation of history (both of which developed around the desire for a sanctuary worthy of God); it explains the great prophecies of the exile and post-exilic periods and the disappointment and enervation which the program of Ezra and Nehemiah was designed to combat, just as it provides an important key to the meaning of apocalyptic.⁴⁰

Now we wish to emphasize that what is true on the apotelesmatic principle of the kingdom of God, the Jubilee, the Passover, the Feast of Tabernacles is also true of the Day of Atonement. Hebrews 9 applies that type especially to the cross, but the Apocalypse and Paul apply it to consummated eschatology — to the last Judgment. Adventists have been right in seeing the second, but have not been clear on the first. Most of the rest of the religious world was clear on the first, but did not see the second. Ellen White saw both. Thus her crystal-clear statements such as DA 751; AA 33; ST April 19, 1905.

Support for this double application of the Day of Atonement to both the cross and the judgment is found not only in the Apocalypse and Paul, but also in the New Testament eschatological application of the atonement prophecy of Dan. 9:24-27.

The resolution of our Adventist sanctuary problem is found in the apotelesmatic principle. The cleansing of the sanctuary, or its justification, is indeed eschatological, and applies to the consummated application of the Day of Atonement — the last Judgment. Our stumblings towards that truth were naturally marked with deficiencies, none of which need occasion us shame any more than the defective views of John the Baptist and the early disciples. No movement raised up by God has been infallible. Such a characteristic does not belong to anything human. But enfeebled and defective as was our pioneer conception of truth, it was in some remarkable ways miles ahead of the contemporaries for whom we had a special God-entrusted message.

PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

For three generations the denomination has been proclaiming to the living that a judgment is in process which only applied to the dead. According to our preaching, not one living person

has yet entered into that judgment. Such teaching, particularly when we include the concept that “the only cases considered are those of the professed people of God” is quite irrelevant for the great mass of unconverted souls. Indeed, if any of such listened to our preaching on the judgment they would be burdened by the thought that if they accepted Christ it would involve the necessity of facing the Investigative Judgment, a rigorous scrutiny involving a review of how they had hitherto used every moment of time, every cent of money, every jot of influence, every faculty and opportunity, etc. What a far cry from the gospel — the good news of the grace of God!

Furthermore, our usual presentation of the Investigative Judgment has strong legalistic overtones. It seems to make salvation dependent upon human achievement in character building, as though our works could ever match the requirements of God’s infinite law! Our critics have readily seen the tendency of such a doctrine to submerge the real heart of the New Testament. Here are the words of one such critic whose book shows an honest attempt to give us credit wherever possible:

Now it has been said at an earlier point in this study that Seventh-day Adventism is legalistic. The reason for which this is so, however, is not because it, together with the historic Protestant creeds, regards the Ten Commandments as God’s standard of righteousness in all ages. It is rather because Adventism, in spite of its protestations to the contrary, makes the believer’s character the ultimate ground of his acceptance or rejection by God.

There are, however, certain points which in the Adventist scheme of things are distinctive, and the most important of these is its understanding of the doctrine of justification, that is, of the sinner’s forgiveness and acceptance by a God who is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity. Evangelical theology rightly so-called grounds this in the perfect righteousness of Christ the Redeemer, which God graciously imputes to the believing sinner. No question of human effort or of human character comes under the purview of the doctrine of justification, strictly considered. (Footnote: These do appear, we hasten to add, in connection with the doctrine of sanctification, logically posterior to but inseparable from either justification or several other benefits of our redemption; without sanctification no man shall see the Lord. But justification is grounded in the righteousness of Christ and is received by faith alone; it is so that it might be by grace. See the chapters entitled “Justification” and “Sanctification” in John Murray, *Redemption Accomplished and Applied* [Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1955].) This, however, is not the view of Seventh-day Adventism. That is to say, when the question arises of what constitutes the sinner’s title to heaven, this movement gives us to understand that it is his keeping of the commandments: his keeping of them through faith in Jesus Christ, to be sure, but his keeping of them none the less. The following from Branson makes misunderstanding impossible:

“A Christian who through faith in Jesus Christ has faithfully kept the law’s requirements will be acquitted; there is no condemnation, for the law finds no fault in him.” (Branson, *Drama of the Ages*, 351.)

In some respects, this is reminiscent of other views which have in their own way compromised the gracious character of salvation by introducing, at one point or another, the notion of human merit. But it appears that Adventism surpasses them all. Indeed, it outdoes Rome itself, which it closely resembles in its grounding of justification in an “infused righteousness,” for the Roman Church, realising that, at least in most cases,

perfection will not be attained in this life, has thoughtfully provided a purgatory in which venial sins may be suffered for and the necessary rectitude attained after death. Adventism, of course, is not perfectionistic in the sense that it is unaware that the believer is likely to transgress divine law, the keeping of which, through faith in Jesus Christ, is his hope of salvation. It quite forthrightly informs its adherents that they are likely to commit sins, which are recorded in heaven and come to the attention of Christ as He ministers in the most holy place, and assures them that their confessions are also noted, and forgiveness granted through the blood of Christ. But even this can scarcely engender much peace of conscience when it is remembered that the Adventist teaching on this point is that the confession, specifically, of every sin that the believer has committed is required if he is not to be lost. We have cited Mrs. White's dictum: Branson similarly remarks:

"If it is found that one has broken even a single precept, and this transgression is unconfessed, he will be dealt with just as if he had broken all ten." (*Ibid.*)

What question could be more appropriate here than "Who then, can be saved?" For if this is the "gospel," the sinner saved by grace is at no point in his Christian experience any better off than was the Martin Luther of Augustinian cloister days, whose difficulty was "not whether his sins were big or little, but whether they had been confessed," and who discovered, to his dismay, that "some of man's misdemeanours are not even recognized, let alone remembered." (R. Bainton, *Here I Stand* [Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1950], p. 55.) The conclusion is inescapable, then, that the Adventist doctrine of salvation leads relentlessly to a kind of "justification by character." Indeed, the believer does not, in this system, keep the law in his own strength; the merit belongs to the indwelling Christ, by whose power the Christian keeps the commandments and thus, being acquitted in the "investigative judgment," is accounted worthy of eternal life. For this reason it is not accurate to say without qualification, as some have, that Seventh-day Adventism teaches that salvation is by keeping the law. **But it must be evident that there is little awareness in Adventism that the believer, as a matter of fact, offends in many ways, and neither does nor can perform all that is required of him; that he breaks God's law daily in thought, word and deed, and has, therefore, a need which surpasses that of the forgiveness of past sins and the power of the indwelling Christ for present victories. The note is not prominent in the teaching of this movement, if it is there at all, that what the sinner needs, and what Scripture offers him, is a Saviour who kept the law on his behalf, and whose perfect righteousness is imputed to him.** Because the Adventists seem not to grasp this foundational truth, it must be concluded that although the movement may be unaware of it, ("[We believe] that salvation through Christ is by grace alone, through faith in His blood." "[We believe] that man is justified by faith" [*Questions on Doctrine*, pp. 22f].) far from inculcating the glorious tidings that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law, the "sanctuary position" tends to a legalism as deadly, if not as explicit, as the Galatian Judaizers' own.⁴¹

It is not that the fact of judgment denies the grace of God in justification. We are justified by faith but judged by our works, for though saved by faith alone, the faith that saves is never alone. Though we are not accepted on the basis of faith plus works, we are accepted through a faith that does always work. Thus in the judgment our works testify to the reality of that faith in Christ through which salvation comes. But our usual mode of presenting the Investigative Judgment has made justification appear just an initial step in the Christian life leading on to the better thing, and the more necessary thing, of sanctification. Thus we have

blurred the New Testament distinction between the perfect and finished work of Christ **for** us, and the imperfect unfinished work of the Spirit **in** us.

Because the law demands 100% righteousness, and not even 99%, we can only be saved through imputed righteousness — the merits of Christ's perfect life and death. This truth is usually forgotten in our discussions on the Investigative Judgment, and therefore we leave our people fearful, without joy, and without power to witness to others of "so great salvation." Coming into an Investigative Judgment does not sound much to rejoice over.

On the other hand, if we emphasized that the believer does not even appear in physical person before the great Judge, but that Christ is Judge-Advocate, and is now and ever will be our Substitute before the judgment bar of God — that would make the hearer's heart to overflow with gladness.

Most Seventh-day Adventists never seem to have grasped the difference between law as a standard and law as a method. But this understanding is crucial. As a standard the law is irrevocable, eternal, always relevant and ever binding upon the conscience. But as a method it is illegal. The apparently conflicting passages of the New Testament find here their resolution. Those statements which seem anti-law are only anti-law as a method. See Gal. 2:16-19; 3:10-13; 5:4; 2 Cor. 3; Rom. 7:1-4.

How many Adventists really understand Rom. 6:14 — that sin ceases to have dominion over us only when we realize that as regards our acceptance "we are justified by faith regardless of our success in keeping the law" (Rom. 3:28 NEB)? Have we ever taken to heart the following:

Now do you see it? No one can ever be made right in God's sight by doing what the law commands. For the more we know of God's laws, the clearer it becomes that we aren't obeying them; his laws serve only to make us see that we are sinners. But now God has shown us a different way to heaven — not by "being good enough" and trying to keep his laws, but by a new way (though not new, really, for the Scriptures told about it long ago). Now God says he will accept and acquit us — declare us "not guilty" — if we trust Jesus Christ to take away our sins. And we all can be saved in this same way, by coming to Christ, no matter who we are or what we have been like. Yes, all have sinned; all fall short of God's glorious idea; yet now God declares us "not guilty" of offending him if we trust in Jesus Christ, who in his kindness freely takes away our sins. For God sent Christ Jesus to take the punishment for our sins and to end all God's anger against us. He used Christ's blood and our faith as the means of saving us from his wrath. In this way he was being entirely fair, even though he did not punish those who sinned in former times. For he was looking forward to the time when Christ would come and take away their sins. But isn't this unfair for God to let criminals go free, and say that they are innocent? No, for he does it on the basis of their trust in Jesus who took away their sins. (Rom. 3:20-26 Living Bible.)

The truth of the gospel is that he who has given himself to Christ, believing his debt was paid at Calvary, is ever accounted 100% righteous despite his failures and mistakes. God's attitude to the believer is unchanging, for it is dependent upon His attitude, not to our achievements, but to Christ and His achievements. Just so long as Christ remains as the second Adam — the second Head of the human race, perfect before God, so long does every believer in Him stand in His standing. This is why E.G. White says we are not to be anxious about what God thinks of us, but only what He thinks of Christ our Substitute and Surety.

What shall we say then as to our denominational duty in view of the fact that our traditional presentation of the Investigation Judgment is unsupportable from Scripture?

If we are honest with the evidence, and cast away our doctrinal swaddling clothes, or to use another figure, our scaffolding, truth will be revealed in its persuasive beauty. That truth is not complicated, being but John 3:16 in embryo. Let us tell our own people and the world that men are judged **now** — that they — the living — are judged by their present relationship to Christ who suffered divine judgment for sin on their behalf at the cross. See John 3:18, 36; 5:24. Let us tell them that judgment comes as they hear the invitation of the gospel, and that to accept means eternal life now, but, to reject means wrath and eternal loss. The close of probation is but Christ's pre-advent ratification of that decision.

Having been crippled for over one hundred years by certain non-Biblical eschatological teachings we can only benefit by surrendering such, and holding firmly on to "Thus saith the Lord." Instead of the embarrassment felt by many in evangelism and teaching, there will be joy and progress.

Acknowledgment of the meaning of Hebrews 9, coupled with the use made of the Day of Atonement in the Apocalypse, will preserve the essence of our eschatology truth, and indeed buttress it. We will give the Cross its right place thereby, and many will be drawn to Christ in result as He promised. John 12:31-32. The Biblical teaching on judgment can only bring great joy to the believer as he learns that not even Satan can accuse him successfully. Christ answers all accusations with arguments based on His own merits. Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ who justifies. There is therefore no condemnation to them in Christ Jesus. They have passed from death to life and have no fear in judgment.

To know that from the moment of faith and surrender we already have the verdict of the last judgment, and that we have that verdict for as long as we maintain that active trust (evidenced by obedience) — brings joy without bounds. The greatest issue of all is decided, and decided for the best. We are accepted in the beloved, and no longer need we be anxious trying to find some worthiness in ourselves. Being released from law as a method, we will receive, simultaneously, freedom from the dominion of sin. Rom. 6:14. Having died to the law as a method, we will bring forth fruit unto Christ. Rom. 7:4. No longer severed from Christ by dependence upon our own obedience rather than His, Christ's Spirit can have His full way with us, leading us in avenues of service, and victory, to God's glory and our joy.

Instead of the gospel being trammelled and cramped by legalistic fears about acceptance in the judgment, it will be given free course in such a way as to restore the apostolic spirit and power. (See our Appendix on the implications of the true gospel for all who receive it.) There is no other way to fulfil what our prophet has promised — the lighting of the earth with the glory of Christ — the sounding forth of the sweetest melody known to human lips — the victorious proclamation of that theme which swallows up every other — justification by faith, the third angel's message in verity, the message which has sponsored every great revival the world has ever known, and which alone can trigger the last great awakening.

ENDNOTES FOR CHAPTER FIVE

- ¹ E. S. Ballenger, *The Gathering Call*, May-June, 1941, inside front and back covers.
- ² Our own SDA Bible Commentary has laid foundations which effectually make it impossible to build the former doctrinal structure in this area. Frank denials that Hebrews teaches our sanctuary position, plain statements to the effect that Christ should have returned not in 1844 but in the first century, the teaching of the conditional element of prophecy, and the admonition that prophecy always had direct relevance for the people first addressed, admissions re the true meaning of key original terms such as *nitzdaq*, *hagia*, *esoteron tou katepetasmos*, and refusals to be dogmatic in areas where the facts will not permit — these have, for those who read, changed the complexion of our former apologetic in the area of the sanctuary. The details could be multiplied: Moses did not actually see the heavenly sanctuary; Christ entered not into a building made with hands but into heaven itself; *hagia* does apply to a single apartment and is used for the second specifically; the Day of Atonement is in focus in Hebrews 9 and 10; the little horn is the object of the judgment of Dan. 7; Antiochus Epiphanes is present in the prophecies of Daniel; the sharp edging of prophetic fulfilment is not possible in such prophecies as the 1260 years; difficulties in the original, in history, etc., make it impossible to affirm such conclusions as those of Litch such as regarding Aug. 11, 1840; Christ's use of "this generation" applied to those contemporary with Him; God's people of old could have prepared the world for the first advent as we are now preparing it for the second; prophecy can have more than one application; the nature of apocalyptic vision is such that the symbols should not be confused with the realities, for the prophet does not see the actual but a representation; all these, and many more, have a weakening effect on confidence in former positions.
- ³ E.H. Trenchard, "Acts," *A.N.T. Commentary*, ed. G. C. D. Howely; F. F. Bruce; H. L. Ellison (London, 1969), 299.
- ⁴ G.J. Pokinghorne, "*I Peter*," *Op. cit.*, 590.
- ⁵ *IT* 544. We use this reference not as proof, but as an example that this truth has long been recognized amongst us.
- ⁶ See our appendix, "The Biblical Doctrine of Judgment."
- ⁷ G.E. Ladd, *Reconciliation and Hope*, ed by Robert Banks, 285, 286-287, 289, 290.
- ⁸ *5T* 451.
- ⁹ Wordsworth, *Commentary on the Holy Bible*, 6, 62.
- ¹⁰ Lars Hartman, "Prophecy Interpreted," *Coniectanea Biblica*, New Testament Series 1, 152.
- ¹¹ Joseph Tanner, *Daniel and the Revelation* (London, 1898), 56.
- ¹² J. Jeremias, *New Testament Theology* (London, 1971), 1, 128, 129.
- ¹³ In Matt. 24:15 Christ quoted from Dan. 8:13 and its expansion in the later chapters of Daniel. In *Desire of Ages*, in chapter 69 we are told that Christ's words were not only fulfilled in AD 70, but also apply "for those who should live in the last scenes of this earth's history." Thus her application of Matt. 24:15 in *5T* 451 for the Rev. 13 Sabbath crisis.
- ¹⁴ Desmond Ford, *Daniel* (Nashville, 1978), Bacon cited on 49.
- ¹⁵ George McCready Price, *The Greatest of the Prophets* (Mountain View, 1955), 30, 331.
- ¹⁶ *SDABC*, 1:1017-1019, cited in *Daniel* 292, 293.
- ¹⁷ Ramm, *Berkhof and Beyerhaus* cited in *Daniel*, 49.
- ¹⁸ T.H. Home, *Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures* (Boston, 1868), 11, 641-643.
- ¹⁹ *DA*, 628, 631.
- ²⁰ *GC*, 611, 612, 389.
- ²¹ *4T*, 594.
- ²² Kenneth A. Strand, *The Open Gates of Heaven*. See appendix: "Dr. Strand's „Philosophy of History“ and the Apotelesmatic Principle," as to whether Dr. Strand can rightly be claimed in support of the apotelesmatic application of prophecy.
- ²³ Ellen G. White, Letter 103, 1904, 5, 6.
- ²⁴ Desmond Ford, *Daniel*, 294, 295.
- ²⁵ Desmond Ford, MA Thesis, "Dan. 8:14 and the Latter Days," 1959, Potomac University.
- ²⁶ H.C. Leupold, *Daniel* (Grand Rapids, 1969), 403, 411.
- ²⁷ *PP*, 358.
- ²⁸ Ellen G. White, *Review and Herald*, Oct. 21, 1890. (See also *Review and Herald*, May 30, 1974, p. 2).
- ²⁹ For example, F.C. Grant, *Gospel*; H.B. Sharman, *Son of Man and Kingdom of God* (London, 1943); A.T. Olmstead, *Jesus in the Light of History* (New York, 1942); and to a lesser extent, T.W. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus* (Cambridge, 1945), 260-263.
- ³⁰ Bultmann says: "We need only remember that eschatological expectation in itself is not necessarily associated with the call to repentance and with the preaching of the will of God. It can be combined just as well with wishful fantasies of future glory, with economic ideals and hopes, with thoughts of revenge and pictures of hell. Jewish apocalyptic as well as the history of eschatology elsewhere offers abundant proof of this. It still

needs to be explained why such ideas are not found with Jesus and why, on the contrary, with him the demand for obedience goes hand in hand with the proclaiming of the future age." *Jesus and the Word*, (E.T., London, 1958), pp. 93-94. But this comment is not to be understood as denying Bultmann's opinion that Jesus was an apocalyptic prophet. Elsewhere he acknowledges Christ's use of apocalyptic terminology, but insists that **for us** its meaning is existential. See his *Theology of the New Testament* (2 vols., E. T., London, 1951), 1, p. 23.

³¹ Yet, as Streeter reminds us, "Jewish Apocalyptic, albeit bizarre to modern eyes, was no ignoble thing," *Synoptic Problem*, 434.

³² See also C.S. Lewis, *Transposition and Other Addresses* (London, 1949), 51.

³³ J.A.T. Robinson, *In the End, God* (London, 1968), 19-21.

³⁴ Edward W.H. Vick, *Let Me Assure You* (Mountain View, 1968), 162-163.

³⁵ See appendix, "Quotations on Inaugurated Eschatology."

³⁶ *CT*, Nov. 19'65, "Unity and Variety in New Testament Faith" by G.E. Ladd.

³⁷ G. Vos, *The Pauline Eschatology* (Grand Rapids, 1953), 60-61, 53-54.

³⁸ W.G. Kümmel, *Theology of the New Testament* (London, 1974), 195.

³⁹ J. Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus* (New York, 1953), 118-119.

⁴⁰ McKelvey, *The New Temple* (London, 1969), 163, 175, 178, 179.

⁴¹ Herbert Bird, *Theology of Seventh-day Adventism* (Grand Rapids, 1964), 95, 90-92. Bird finds fault with our sanctuary exegesis as well as our seeming burying of justification by our sanctuary theology. He says:

"The sanctuary service was a „figure of the time then present, „transient and imperfect in that it anticipated Christ, a „high priest of good things to come," who „not by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood entered once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us."

"If it is objected that this „holy place" which Christ entered refers to the outer apartment of the heavenly sanctuary, the further explication of the high priestly ministry in 9:24ff. should be reflected upon. For here Christ is said to have entered heaven itself, „now to appear in the presence of God for us," or „now to appear openly before the face of God." Is it not then to do violence to the language to see delineated here anything other than the teaching that Christ, by virtue of the dignity of His person and His atoning sacrifice, is entitled to complete and continual access to God on behalf of His people, a right which was foreshadowed but faintly by God's sufferance of the high priest under the Old Testament to enter the holiest once annually, and not even then without the veiling of a cloud of incense?

"Before we take leave of the subject of the „sanctuary position," it is necessary to discuss briefly the import of Heb. 9:23, a verse which Adventism interprets as follows:

On that day [of Atonement] the „iniquities of the children of Israel" were removed. ... The antitype of that service, we believe, will be found in connection with Christ's ministry in the heavenly sanctuary, and this is apparent from Hebrew 9:23:

„It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified (*katharizo*) with these; but the heavenly things themselves (shall be purified) with better sacrifices than these (that of the Lamb of God.)" [*Questions on Doctrine*, 266].

"It is recognized, of course, that this verse contains mysterious elements; there are, however, interpretations of the words which are satisfactory as far as they go. B.G. Westcott, for example, gives an exposition of the passage which seems to meet the requirements of the case as he writes:

In what sense can it be said that the „heavenly things" need cleansing? ... Even „heavenly things," so far as they embody the conditions of man's future life, contracted by the fall something which required cleansing. Man is, according to the revelation in Scripture, so bound up with the whole finite order that the consequences of this action extend through creation in some way which we are unable to define. ... And conversely the effect of Christ's work extends throughout creation with reconciling, harmonizing power. (B.F. Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* [London: Macmillan and Co., 1920], 272f.)

"A glance at the Adventist exegesis of this verse is in order. It is evident that the movement regards the crucial point to be the temporal force of the verb to be supplied in the second clause. The writers of *Questions on Doctrine* felt justified in taking it as future — „shall be purified." The absence of reasons for arriving at such a construction is surprising in view of the fact that there is not the slightest indication in the clause itself, or in the context, that a change is to be made from the preterit, in which the whole argument has been cast up to this point, to the future. This can be accounted for only by the fact that no such evidence exists, other than the agreement of such a construction with the „sanctuary position" whose validity has been presupposed."

CHAPTER SIX

Ellen G. White, 1844, And The
Day Of Atonement

OUTLINE OF CHAPTER SIX

Ellen G. White, 1844, and the Day of Atonement	Page
Ellen G. White's Prophetic Interpretation In The Great Controversy	351
Summary Of Ellen White's Apotelesmatic Application Of Prophecy	355
The Marriage Of Matt. 25:10 And Great Controversy, 426-427	357
The Signs In The Sun, Moon, Stars, And Earth, According To Ellen G. White	360
Ellen G. White And The Day Of Atonement	363
Ellen G. White And The Shut Door	367
Ellen G. White And Matt. 25:1-13	377
Ellen G. White And Rev. 11	379
Ellen G. White's Larger View Of Dan. 8:14	381
Is The Third Angel's Message In Verity The Message Of Justification By Faith, Or The Sanctuary, Or Are These Two But One?	382
Rev. 14:6-12 And Romans	383
Ellen G. White's Use Of Erroneous Concepts	385
Early Views Of The Nature Of Ellen G. White's Inspiration	386
The Early Adventist Hermeneutic	388
Was The Investigative Judgment A Landmark? Should It Be Retained Because Of E.G. White's Use Of It?	391
The Limitations Of Prophepts - Especially Non-Canonical Prophets	394
The Authority Of Ellen G. White	396
Conclusions Regarding Pioneer (Including E.G. White) Views	407
The Bottom Line	410
Summary Of Conclusions Based On Chapters One To Six	417
Daniel 8:14	417
The Significance Of 1844	418
Ballenger And Fletcher	420
The Investigative Judgment	420
The Interpretation Of Apocalyptic Prophecy	422
The Recurring Fulfilment Of Prophecy And Prophetic Types	422
Ellen G. White	423
The Uniqueness Off Seventh-Day Adventism	426
Some Important Questions Answered By Later Appendices	431

ELLEN G. WHITE'S PROPHETIC INTERPRETATION IN THE GREAT CONTROVERSY

In her introduction to the last volume of the Conflict of the Ages series Ellen G. White wrote:

In immediate connection with the scenes of the great day of God, the Lord by the prophet Joel has promised a special manifestation of His Spirit. Joel 2:28. This prophecy received a partial fulfilment in the outpouring of the Spirit on the Day of Pentecost; but it will reach its full accomplishment in the manifestation of divine grace which will attend the closing work of the gospel.¹

This enunciates an important principle. Prophecies about ~~the~~ "the great day," i.e. the last moments of time before the Second Advent, often have a ~~partial fulfilment~~ "first, and then a ~~full accomplishment~~" at the close. See also pages 611-612, ~~The prophecies which were fulfilled in the outpouring of the former rain at the opening of the gospel are again to be fulfilled in the latter rain at its close.~~"²

From the very opening chapter of the book we find this principle exemplified. It is our Lord's discourse on the second coming which is used for chapter one of *Great Controversy* which is entitled ~~The Destruction of Jerusalem.~~ Repeatedly, it is pointed out by Ellen G. White in this chapter that Matt. 24, Mark 13, and Luke 21 had their first fulfilment in AD 70, but yet have to have their consummate application. For example, on page 36 we read:

The Saviour's prophecy concerning the visitation of judgments upon Jerusalem is to have another fulfilment, of which that terrible desolation was but a faint shadow. In the fate of the chosen city we may behold the doom of a world that has rejected God's mercy and trampled upon His law. Dark are the records of human misery that earth has witnessed during its long centuries of crime. The heart sickens, and the mind grows faint in contemplation. Terrible have been the results of rejecting the authority of Heaven. But a scene yet darker is presented in the revelations of the future. The records of the past — the long procession of tumults, conflicts, and revolutions, the ~~battle of the warrior ... with confused noise, and garments rolled in blood~~" (Isa. 9:5) — what are these, in contrast with the terrors of that day when the restraining Spirit of God shall be wholly withdrawn from the wicked, no longer to hold in check the outburst of human passion and satanic wrath! The world will then behold, as never before, the results of Satan's rule.³

In chapter two we find the same principle employed again.

When Jesus revealed to His disciples the fate of Jerusalem and the scenes of the second advent, He foretold also the experience of His people from the time when He should be taken from them, to His return in power and glory for their deliverance. From Olivet the Saviour beheld the storms about to fall upon the apostolic church; and penetrating deeper into the future, His eye discerned the fierce, wasting tempests that were to beat upon His followers in the coming ages of darkness and persecution. In a few brief utterances of awful significance He foretold the portion which the rulers of this world would mete out to the church of God. Matt. 24:9, 21, 22. The followers of Christ must tread the same path of humiliation, reproach, and suffering which their Master trod. The enmity that burst forth against the world's Redeemer would be manifested against all who should believe on His name.

The history of the early church testified to the fulfilment of the Saviour's words. The powers of earth and hell arrayed themselves against Christ in the person of His followers. Paganism foresaw that should the gospel triumph, her temples and altars would be swept away; therefore she summoned her forces to destroy Christianity. The fires of persecution were kindled.⁴

Let it be observed that the Scripture text itself has chiefly in view the great eschatological persecution, yet it is legitimate to apply it to all miniature preceding crises as does Ellen G. White.

Turning now to the chapter which follows, the same principle of apotelesmatic application of prophecy is again exemplified.

The apostle Paul, in his second letter to the Thessalonians, foretold the great apostasy which would result in the establishment of the papal power. He declared that the day of Christ should not come, —except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God.” And furthermore, the apostle warns his brethren that —the mystery of iniquity doth already work.” 2 Thess. 2:3, 4, 7. Even at that early date he saw, creeping into the church, errors that would prepare the way for the development of the papacy.

Little by little, at first in stealth and silence, and then more openly as it increased in strength and gained control of the minds of men, —the mystery of iniquity” carried forward its deceptive and blasphemous work. Almost imperceptibly the customs of heathenism found their way into the Christian church. The spirit of compromise and conformity was restrained for a time by the fierce persecutions which the church endured under paganism. But as persecution ceased, and Christianity entered the courts and palaces of kings, she laid aside the humble simplicity of Christ and His apostles for the pomp and pride of pagan priests and rulers; and in place of the requirements of God, she substituted human theories and traditions. The nominal conversion of Constantine, in the early part of the fourth century, caused great rejoicing; and the world, cloaked with a form of righteousness, walked into the church. Now the work of corruption rapidly progressed. Paganism, while appearing to be vanquished, became the conqueror. Her spirit controlled the church. Her doctrines, ceremonies, and superstitions were incorporated into the faith and worship of the professed followers of Christ.

This compromise between paganism and Christianity resulted in the development of —the man of sin” foretold in prophecy as opposing and exalting himself above God. That gigantic system of false religion is a masterpiece of Satan's power — a monument of his efforts to seat himself upon the throne to rule the earth according to his will.⁵

This entire chapter applies 2 Thess. 2 to the early apostasy of the first centuries of the Christian era and the resulting institution of the papacy. There is no hint in this chapter that the prophecy is yet to have another fulfilment of even greater extent and significance. But when we turn to the end of the book we do find just such teaching by the same author. Observe the following:

Fearful sights of a supernatural character will soon be revealed in the heavens, in token of the power of miracle-working demons. The spirits of devils will go forth to the kings

of the earth and to the whole world, to fasten them in deception, and urge them on to unite with Satan in his last struggle against the government of heaven. By these agencies, rulers and subjects will be alike deceived. Persons will arise pretending to be Christ Himself, and claiming the title and worship which belong to the world's Redeemer. They will perform wonderful miracles of healing and will profess to have revelations from Heaven contradicting the testimony of the Scriptures.

As the crowning act of the great drama of deception, Satan himself will personate Christ. The church has long professed to look to the Saviour's advent as the consummation of her hopes. Now the great deceiver will make it appear that Christ has come. In different parts of the earth, Satan will manifest himself among men as a majestic being of dazzling brightness, resembling the description of the Son of God given by John in the Revelation. Rev. 1:13-15. The glory that surrounds him is unsurpassed by anything that mortal eyes have yet beheld. The shout of triumph rings out upon the air: "Christ has come! Christ has come!" The people prostrate themselves in adoration before him, while he lifts up his hands and pronounces a blessing upon them, as Christ blessed His disciples when He was upon the earth. His voice is soft and subdued, yet full of melody. In gentle, compassionate tones he presents some of the same gracious, heavenly truths which the Saviour uttered; he heals the diseases of the people, and then, in his assumed character of Christ, he claims to have changed the Sabbath to Sunday, and commands all to hallow the day which he has blessed. He declares that those who persist in keeping holy the seventh day are blaspheming his name by refusing to listen to his angels sent to them with light and truth, this is the strong, almost overmastering delusion. Like the Samaritans who are deceived by Simon Magus, the multitudes, from the least to the greatest, give heed to these sorceries, saying: This is ~~the~~ great power of God." Acts 8:10.

But the people of God will not be misled. The teachings of this false Christ are not in accordance with the Scriptures. His blessing is pronounced upon the worshippers of the beast and his image, the very class upon whom the Bible declares that God's unmingled wrath shall be poured out.⁶

Note that Satan is now the "false Christ," not the papacy, and the apostasy here foretold is connected with the last test. It is ~~the~~ powerful delusion that takes the world captive."⁷ Elsewhere in the same book this second application of 2 Thess. 2 is also found. On page 553 we read:

Paul testifies that before the second advent of Christ there will be similar manifestations of satanic power. The coming of the Lord is to be preceded by ~~the~~ working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness." 2 Thess. 2:9, 10. And the apostle John, describing the miracle-working power that will be manifested in the last days, declares: ~~He~~ doeth great wonders, so that he maketh fire come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men, and deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by the means of those miracles which he had power to do." Rev. 13:13,14. No mere impostures are here foretold. Men are deceived by the miracles which Satan's agents have power to do, not which they pretend to do.⁸

And compare 593:

At every revival of God's work the prince of evil is aroused to more intense activity; he is now putting forth his utmost efforts for a final struggle against Christ and His

followers. The last great delusion is soon to open before us. Antichrist is to perform his marvellous works in our sight. So closely will the counterfeit resemble the true that it will be impossible to distinguish between them except by the Holy Scriptures.⁹

This double application of 2 Thess. has long been recognized by Adventist scholars and has been reflected through the pages of the Review repeatedly, and also in the SDA Bible Commentary..

It is in connection with the Second Advent movement that Ellen G. White's use of prophecy is most significant. She applies Rev. 11 to the French Revolution which coincided with the opening of the sealed book of Daniel; the predicted signs in the heavens are applied to the famous Dark Day of 1789, and the meteoric showers of 1833; the prophetic parable of Matt. 25:1-13 is used as foretelling the 1844 movement, and Dan. 8:14; 7:9-13; Mal. 3:1-4 are similarly applied.

Yet it is quite obvious that Ellen G. White did not regard any of these fulfilments as the ultimate accomplishment of the respective Scriptural prediction. The French Revolution is set forth as ~~a~~" (not *the*) ~~striking~~ fulfilment" of the prophecy of Rev. 11. But in *Testimonies* 4:594-595 we have a more significant application.

Until Christ shall appear in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory, men will become perverse in spirit and turn from the truth to fables. The church will yet see troublous times. She will prophesy in sackcloth. But although she must meet heresies and persecutions, although she must battle with the infidel and the apostate, yet by the help of God she is bruising the head of Satan. The Lord will have a people as true as steel, and with faith as firm as the granite rock. They are to be His witnesses in the world, His instrumentalities to do a special, a glorious work in the day of His preparation.¹⁰

Similarly, as pointed out in another place, Ellen G. White applied the signs in the heavens to *future* events that would be part of the complex of the Advent. Again, the parable of Matt. 25:1-13, when exegeted in *Christ's Object Lessons*, is applied eschatologically, and the Miller movement fulfilment is ignored. The ~~midnight~~ cry" of 1844 was the first fulfilment of the second angel's message. But ~~its~~ perfect fulfilment" is yet future. See *Great Controversy*, 389-390.

The second angel's message of Rev. 14 was first preached in the summer of 1844, and it then had a more direct application to the churches of the United States, where the warning of the judgment had been most widely proclaimed and most generally rejected, and where the declension in the churches had been most rapid. But the message of the second angel did not reach its complete fulfilment in 1844.

The Bible declares that before the conning of the Lord, Satan will work ~~with~~ all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness;" and they that ~~received~~ not the love of the truth, that they might be saved," will be left to receive ~~strong~~ delusion, that they should believe a lie." 2 Thess. 2:9-11. Not until this condition shall be reached, and the union of the church with the world shall be fully accomplished throughout Christendom, will the fall of Babylon be complete. The change is a progressive one, and the perfect fulfilment of Rev. 14:8 is yet future.¹¹

This being the case, it is not strange to find that Ellen G. White could also use Dan. 8:14 eschatologically as pointing not only to 1844, but also to "the final purification of the

universe from sin and sinners.”¹² This is in perfect harmony with her usage of prophecy in a twofold manner from the first chapter of *Great Controversy* to the last. We have lost much by not heeding the Saviour’s admonition about discovering the whole counsel of God: ~~It~~ is written *again ...*” (Matt. 4:7). With *Patriarchs and Prophets*, 358, should be compared the repeated references to the concepts of vindication, purification, and cleansing in the last thirteen pages of *Great Controversy*. They elaborate the ultimate fulfilment of Dan. 8:14 at the end of the world.

All these illustrations endorse our conclusions that *Great Controversy* in its prophetic exposition is chiefly a summary of the pioneer expositions of the 19th century, expositions which were appropriate for their own time, but by no means inspiration’s last word, and by no means complete. To ignore the hints in this same book about the more complete fulfilment of the eschatological prophecies in the last days is to miss much, and could spell shipwreck for many.

SUMMARY OF ELLEN WHITE’S APOTELESMATIC APPLICATION OF PROPHECY

Matt. 24: Applied to AD 70, the Middle Ages, and the Second Advent. *DA*, 628, 631.

2 Thess. 2: Applied to the papal Antichrist, and Satan’s final counterfeit.

Matt. 25:1-13:

The shut door:

First applied to close of probation in 1844. See *GC*, 429; Letter to Joseph Bates, July 13, 1847. The door was shut when Jesus rose from His mediatorial throne, and went into the holiest as Bridegroom to receive His kingdom.

Secondly, applied to close of first apartment ministry. See *GC*, 428, 429.

Thirdly, applied to close of probation at the end of the world. See *COL*, 412 and *GC*, 428.

The coming of the bridegroom:

First applied to an 1844 coming. See *GC*, 426.

Secondly, applied to coming at end of the world. See *COL*, 405-421.

The midnight cry:

First applied to message of 1844. See *GC*, 427.

Secondly, applied to loud cry at end of the world. See *COL*, 412, 414, 415, 147.

The bride:

First applied to the Holy City. *GC*, 427.

Secondly, to the church. *SDABC*, 7:985, 986; *COL*, 421.

Rev. 7:1-4:

The sealing:

First applied to the acceptance of the Sabbath from 1845 on. *EW*, 44.

Secondly, applied to an eschatological sealing just prior to probation’s close. *GC*, 613.

The shaking:

First applied to the years immediately following 1844. *EW*, 50.

Later applied to the future. *5T*, 80-82.

Rev. 14:6, 7:

The first angel's message.

First applied to Miller movement. *EW*, 232-237.

Later applied to SDA message till end of time. *GC*, 450, 453, 425.

Rev. 14:8:

The second angel's message.

First applied to midnight cry of 1844 and the Protestant churches fall.

Secondly, applied to loud cry, and the fall of all churches throughout the world. *GC*, 389-390.

Rev. 11:19:

The opening of the temple in heaven.

First applied to 1844. *GC*, 433.

Secondly, applied to end of world. (*R & H*, Nov. 23, 1905, 17; Week of prayer reading, Dec. 2, 1905; *EW*, 36.)

Rev. 11:7-11:

The persecution of the two witnesses:

First applied to the past, climaxing in 1793f. *GC*, 265ff.

Secondly, applied to the future. *4T*, 594; (cf *Ed*, 228).

Rev. 6:12, 13: Celestial signs applied to the past, but also to the Advent.

Joel 2:28: Applied first to Pentecost, and secondly to the latter rain. *GC*, 11.

Mal. 4:5, 6: Applied first to John the Baptist, and secondly to the Advent movement. See *DA*, 101.

Dan. 8:14:

The cleansing of the sanctuary.

Understood first as the cleansing of the earth by fire. This was Ellen Harmon's understanding during the Miller movement before receiving the gift of prophecy.

Secondly, understood as including the cleansing of records of sin. *GC*, 480.

Thirdly, as purification of universe from sin and sinners. *PP*, 358; *GC*, 666-678.

Lev. 16:

The Day of Atonement.

In years 1844-1857 understood as applying to "the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary."

From 1857 onwards applied particularly to the investigative judgment.

Later quotations from 1890 onwards applied to whole Christian era, climaxing in the judgment of the Second Advent, and at the end of the millennium. See the discussion in our next section.

NOTE: As we no longer preach the 1844 application of Matt. 25 and its shut door (as exegesis of that passage), so there is equally good reason for applying the other passages including Dan. 8:14 and Lev. 16 eschatologically. Indeed, only such application will meet the full demands of the Scriptural passages concerned.

Ellen G. White, as with other prophets, spoke ever in terms of the divine ideal for the people of God. Such a plan was conditional on the faithful response of the church. Israel could have entered the promised land in less than two weeks, but took over forty years to gain their inheritance. In the New Testament, we find repeatedly the promise of the Lord's soon return to that generation. Again, these promises were conditional. In 1844 and the years following, Ellen G. White applied Scripture in the same way, offering the imminent rest of glory, and the end of sin and sorrow. The last judgment had come, and the High Priest was about to cease His intercession. In the writings of Ellen G. White we find repeatedly the stress on conditionality. (See chapters 37 and 38 in Froom's *Movement of Destiny*.)

With the passing of the first generation of Adventists, Ellen G. White began to apply many of the same elements of Scriptural prophecy to the future. We were told that we might have to wander in the wilderness of this world many more years because of our insubordination. This new application of the sealing, the shaking, the future opening of the temple in heaven, the yet future cleansing of the sanctuary did not nullify the appropriateness of her earlier statements which on the basis of the apotelesmatic and conditional principles were adequate for those days. But we err now, if we wish to cling to applications no longer pertinent and neglect ~~present~~ truth." Her use of the two-apartment schema as a result of the emphasis of the visions on the Most Holy Place is also understandable at a time when our pioneers were struggling to find a meaning for the 1844 disappointment. It is no longer useful for a people who have had over a hundred years to learn from the New Testament the significance of the ark and mercy seat in the heavenly throne room. By now the full meaning of Israel's sanctuary, and its epitome service of Yom Kippur, should have dawned, irradiating with glory the ~~everlasting~~ gospel" of justification by faith — ~~the~~ third angel's message in verity" (1SM, 372). See also MS, 36, 1890.

THE MARRIAGE OF MATT. 25:10 AND GREAT CONTROVERSY, 426-427

In this and the following section (on the celestial signs) we propose to illustrate the apotelesmatic principle which as shown in the preceding pages was used by Ellen G. White in *Great Controversy* and elsewhere.

After the 1844 disappointment one little group of Adventists found comfort in the thought that Jesus had indeed done all that might have been expected of Him. He had entered, not earth, but the Most Holy Place to receive from the Father His kingdom. This was the marriage referred to in Luke 12:36 and Matt. 25:10. It was identical with Dan. 7:13, 14.

Joseph Turner, S.S. Snow, David Arnold, and the Whites, among others, wrote on this topic. Note, for example, *Great Controversy*, 426-427:

The coming of the bridegroom, here brought to view, takes place before the marriage. The marriage represents the reception by Christ of His kingdom. The Holy City, the New Jerusalem, which is the capital and representative of the kingdom, is called the ~~bride~~, the Lamb's wife." Said the angel to John: ~~Come~~ hither, I will show thee the bride, the Lamb's wife." ~~He~~ carried me away in the spirit," says the prophet, ~~and~~ showed me that great city, the holy Jerusalem, descending out of heaven from God." Rev. 21:9, 10. Clearly, then, the bride represents the Holy City, and the virgins that go out to meet the bridegroom are a symbol of the church. In the Revelation the people of God are said to be the guests at the marriage supper. Rev. 19:9. If **guests**, they cannot be represented also as the **bride**. Christ, as stated by the prophet Daniel, will receive from the Ancient of Days in heaven, ~~dominion~~, and glory, and a kingdom"; He will receive the New Jerusalem, the capital of His kingdom, ~~prepared~~ as a bride adorned for

her husband.” Dan. 7:14; Rev. 21:2. Having received the kingdom, He will come in His glory, as King of kings and Lord of lords, for the redemption of His people, who are to sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob,” at His table in His kingdom (Matt. 8:11; Luke 22:30), to partake of the marriage supper of the Lamb.

Compare the words of Snow:

But while they were slumbering on the subject of **time**, which was then so important and not realizing the nearness of the great event; in the summer of 1844, the midnight cry was sounded — “Behold, the bridegroom cometh, go ye out to meet him.” But who gave the cry? Not the virgins, wise and foolish, for they were slumbering. It could have been no other voice but that of Elias, the watchman, [Snow] who did not sleep upon his post. The time as proclaimed by that messenger, and proved by scripture and historical facts, was the tenth day of the Jewish month — the day of atonement and of the sounding of the trumpet of Jubilee in 1844. And true to **that appointed time**, the bridegroom came to the marriage. Our Lord and Saviour took the throne of His everlasting kingdom, and is now the King of kings and Lord of lords. By the power of that cry the virgins were roused from their slumber, and arose and trimmed their lamps. In other words, the Adventists, as they were called, began to prepare themselves, spiritually, for the Lord’s coming. While those elder brethren were going to get ready the Master of the house arose and closed the door of the gospel dispensation. The only saving grace that can be obtained by God, since the passing of that great crisis is through the dispensation of the fullness of times, or the restoration of all things, in the mission of Elias.¹³

This doctrine that the marriage of Christ is His invisible reception of His kingdom beginning in 1844 is worthy of our close attention. It is a pure innovation as regards Christian exposition of the passages in question. This, of course, does not disprove it.

It seems necessary to distinguish between Christ as King and Christ as the bridegroom. Christ assumed His kingship prior to His ministration in the heavenly sanctuary as a High Priest after the order of Melchizedec (who was both priest and king). This the book of Hebrews tells us repeatedly. See 2:9; 4:16; 7:1-3; 8:1.

Matt. 28:18 cites Dan. 7:14 as it sets forth Christ as One with all power given to Him by His Father. Rev. 3:21 assures us that He sits upon a throne since His victorious earthly ministry. All things have been put in subjection under Christ. 1 Cor. 15:27. Says Rev. 12:10 concerning the time when Satan was overcome by the cross:

And I heard a loud voice in heaven, saying, “Now the salvation and the power and the kingdom of our God and the authority of his Christ have come, for the accuser of our brethren has been thrown down, who accuses them day and night before our God.” (Rev. 12:10 RSV)

But there is to come a time when Christ’s authority will be visibly manifested on earth. His reign will be made visible, and His right which has been challenged will be vindicated. Rev. 11:15 points to this time. Part of the rejoicing of that event is Christ’s taking possession of His bride, the church. Both the Church and the New Jerusalem are called the bride, the second only in the sense that it is to be the home of the former. See Rev. 19:7, 8, which assures us that the Bride is composed of those who have made themselves ready by receiving the fine linen which is righteousness bestowed upon the believers. **This passage is also emphatic that the marriage follows the Armageddon of the Second Advent, not 1844.**

Now Matt. 25 begins with “Then,” and we need to observe the climax of the preceding chapter which concerns the Advent of Christ. There can be no avoiding the point that Matt. 25:1-13 concerns the very moments concerned with the visible appearing of Christ. In a Jewish wedding, the bridegroom with his friends went after sunset to the home of the bride to fetch her. The bride accompanied by her friends proceeded to the bridegroom’s house for the wedding supper.

To argue that in the book of Revelation the saints are said to be the guests, and therefore cannot be represented also as the bride, is to forget the nature of Biblical imagery. This situation is no more incongruous than that of the Lamb who is said to “take” a book from the Father’s hand, and who is also represented in the same book as a Priest-King (chapter 1), and a mighty warrior (chapter 19). Parables are not allegories, and there is no endeavour in a parable, any more than in a type, to make everything walk on four legs.

The writer of *Christ’s Object Lessons* interprets the story as follows:

As Christ sat looking upon the party that waited for the bridegroom He told His disciples the story of the ten virgins, by their experience illustrating the experience of **the church that shall live just before His second coming**, (p. 406)

So with **the church that lives just before Christ’s second coming**, (p. 408)

The great final test comes **at the close of human probation**, when it will be too late for the soul’s need to be supplied, (p. 412)

The coming of the bridegroom was at midnight — the darkest hour. So the coming of Christ will take place in the darkest period of this earth’s history, (p. 414)

... **they go forth to meet the bridegroom** ... The marriage of the Lamb is come, and **His wife hath made herself ready** ... And he saith unto me, Write, Blessed are they which are called unto the marriage supper of the Lamb. (p. 421)

The *SDA Bible Commentary* gives the following comment on Rev. 19:7, 8, from Ellen G. White:

“The church is the bride, the Lamb’s wife.” Letter 29, 1902.

“The church is the bride, the Lamb’s wife ... She is the bride of a King.” Letter 177, 1901.

“The church is the bride of Christ ...” Letter 123 1/2 1898.

This application of the parable of the virgins and the marriage of Christ in connection with the Second Advent, and not 1844, is certainly Scriptural. The 1844 application is one of principle rather than one of exegesis. **In view of Great Controversy 428, which equates the cleansing of the sanctuary with this coming of the bridegroom, we must see in both events future rather than past realities.**

Thus both the Adventist interpretation of Matt. 25:1-13 and its equation with Dan. 8:14 (the investigative judgment) were coined to meet the disappointment, and are not Scriptural.

THE SIGNS IN THE SUN, MOON, STARS, AND EARTH, ACCORDING TO ELLEN G. WHITE

The purpose of this small study, like others in this chapter, is to show that our consideration of the investigative judgment teaching in the *Great Controversy* should not be divorced from a parallel study of other interpretations of the same book, such as Matt. 25:1-13, the sixth trumpet, the French Revolution, and the signs of upheaval in heaven and earth.

We wish to examine the pioneer view of the last mentioned prediction — the signs in the sun, moon, stars, and earth, as having been all fulfilled by the close of 1833.

The following are the chief Scripture passages:

Therefore I will make the heavens tremble,
and the earth will be shaken out of its place,
at the wrath of the Lord of hosts
in the day of his fierce anger. (Isa. 13:13 RSV)

All the host of heaven shall rot away,
and the skies roll up like a scroll.

All their host shall fall,
as leaves fall from the vine,
like leaves falling from the fig tree. (Isa. 34:4 RSV)

And the Lord roars from Zion,
and utters his voice from Jerusalem,
And the heavens and the earth shake.
But the Lord is a refuge to his people,
a stronghold to the people of Israel. (Joel 3:16 RSV)

—Immediately after the tribulation of those days the sun will be darkened, and the moon will not give its light, and the stars will fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens will be shaken.” (Matt. 24:29 RSV)

—But in those days, after that tribulation, the sun will be darkened, and the moon will not give its light, and the stars will be falling from heaven, and the powers in the heavens will be shaken.” (Mark 13:24-25 RSV)

—And there will be signs in sun and moon and stars, and upon the earth distress of nations in perplexity at the roaring of the sea and the waves, men fainting with fear and with foreboding of what is coming on the world; for the powers of the heavens will be shaken.” (Luke 21:25-26 RSV)

His voice then shook the earth; but now he has promised, —Yet once more I will shake not only the earth but also the heaven.” (Heb. 12:26 RSV)

When he opened the sixth seal, I looked, and behold, there was a great earthquake; and the sun become black as sackcloth, the full moon became like blood, and the stars of the sky fell to the earth as the fig tree sheds its winter fruit when shaken by a gale; the sky vanished like a scroll that is rolled up, and every mountain and island was removed from its place. (Rev. 6:12-14 RSV)

Then God's temple in heaven was opened, and the ark of his covenant was seen within his temple; and there were flashes of lightning, loud noises, peals of thunder, an earthquake, and heavy hail. (Rev. 11:19 RSV)

We should observe several features of these texts:

1. They are all in the setting of the Day of the Lord.
2. The signs are not always in the same order. In Isa. 13 the stars are first mentioned, and then the sign in the sun, while Joel puts the earthquake first, then the shaking of the heavens, then signs in the sun, moon, and stars — in that order. See Joel 2:10. Thus it is implied that the signs transpire contemporaneously, not separated by decades or centuries.
3. When Christ rehearsed the signs in His Olivet discourse, He was quoting from the Old Testament references in Joel and Isaiah.

He declared that ~~in~~ those days, after that tribulation, the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars of heaven shall fall, and the powers that are in heaven shall be shaken. And then shall they see the Son of man coming. ..." Mark 13:24, 25.

Observe that "in those days" comprehends all the signs and the Advent itself. Too often we have argued that the dark day came after the tribulation of the Middle Ages, but before the end of the 1260 years. The fact is that the falling of the stars also is said to take place ~~in~~ those days" — and the second coming as well. Our argument placing the signs as necessarily commencing before 1798 is quite unsound.

These signs reappear in the Bible's closing book. There the last great earthquake is said to be one that shakes every mountain and island — and one greater than any previous earthquake. See Rev. 16:18ff. This certainly could not fit the Lisbon tragedy. The earthquake which climaxes earth's history is linked with the seventh plague — the ~~great~~ hail" — referred to not only Rev. 16, but also in other passages including Rev. 11:19. To give Rev. 6:12-14 a different application to Rev. 11:19 and 16:17-21 is not legitimate exegesis.

It is clear from Rev. 16:17-21; Isa. 34:1-10 and Joel, chapters two and three, that the signs belong to the Day of the Lord, the days of the seven last plagues, God's final indignation upon the wicked. Any placing of them prior to that time is only an apotelesmatic fulfilment rather than the absolute accomplishment which will be part of the last great Day. Ellen G. White recognized this also. See *GC*, 640-642 and *EW*, 41.

What we have, therefore, in the *Great Controversy* allusions to the Lisbon earthquake, the Dark Day, and the falling of the stars, is an application suitable for the people first addressed — Adventists of the nineteenth century. That application is passé in the twentieth century, except for our recognition in it of evidence of the mercy and wisdom of God in giving anticipatory signs of the end to the generation which took hold of the Second Advent truth in its revived form. Similarly, Ellen G. White's *Great Controversy* explanations of other passages from Scripture such as Matt. 25:1-13 and Dan. 8:14, were appropriate for her original readers, but certainly do not constitute God's final word for us today.

Let us now observe one of Ellen White's earliest comments on this subject:

Shaking of the Powers of Heaven

December 15, 1848, the Lord gave me a view of the shaking of the powers of the heavens. I saw that when the Lord said ~~heaven~~, "in giving the signs recorded by

Matthew, Mark, and Luke, He meant heaven, and when He said ~~earth~~” He meant earth. The powers of heaven are the sun, moon, and stars. They rule in the heavens. The powers of earth are those that rule on the earth. The powers of heaven will be shaken at the voice of God. Then the sun, moon, and stars will be moved out of their places. They will not pass away, but be shaken by the voice of God.

Dark, heavy clouds came up and clashed against each other. The atmosphere parted and rolled back; then we could look up through the open space in Orion, whence came the voice of God. The Holy City will come down through that open space. I saw that the powers of earth are now being shaken and that events come in order. War, and rumours of war, sword, famine, and pestilence are first to shake the powers of earth, then the voice of God will shake the sun, moon, and stars, and this earth also. I saw that the shaking of the powers in Europe is not, as some teach, the shaking of the powers of heaven, but it is the shaking of the angry nations.¹⁴

The heading “Shaking of the Powers of Heaven” is a quotation from, or at least a definite allusion to, Luke 21:26 (and Matt. 24:29; and Mark 13:24, 25) where we read after our Lord’s prediction of “signs in sun and moon and stars” that “the powers of the heavens will be shaken.” The second statement is epexegetical of the first — for the powers of the heavens are (as this same *Early Writings* statement tells us) the sun, moon, and stars.

Thus *Early Writings*, in commenting upon these passages, gives quite a different application than does *Great Controversy*, 306, 307, 308, 332-334. While the *Great Controversy* comments apply the signs to events in the eighteenth and nineteenth century — events already in the past for Ellen G. White and her readers — *Early Writings* applies the prophecy to the future. Not only does *Early Writings* apply the prophecy to the future, but it locates the fulfilment in the Day of the Lord when according to Joel 2:1, 10, 11, 30-32; 3:14-16, these signs will occur as “the Lord roars from Zion, and utters his voice from Jerusalem.” Rev. 16:17-20 covers the same ground, foretelling the heavenly voice saying “it is done,” with a resulting earthquake. Rev. 6:12-17 also mentioned this earthquake, and links it with the other signs in the sun, moon, and stars. In this last reference, we find associated with the heavenly signs scenes of terror on earth as men flee from the eschatological wrath of God. We are expressly told that this time is “the great day of their wrath,” i.e. the wrath of God and the Lamb at the end of the world.

The last paragraph of *Early Writings*, 41, assures us that prior to the early shaking of the powers of heaven there is a shaking on earth as the nations grow angry. This places the fulfilment in connection with the seventh trumpet when the kingdom of this world becomes the kingdom of our Lord. Verse 18 of Rev. 11 speaks of the nations being angry, and then adds “but thy wrath came.” The next verse speaks of “lightning, voices, peals of thunder, an earthquake, and heavy hail” — a parallel of Rev. 16:17-21.

Thus there is no escaping the truth that in *Early Writings*, 41, Ellen G. White specifically says that in vision she was shown that the signs in the sun, moon, and stars, were yet future, would be part of the last great day, consequent on the voice of God, heaven’s reply to the angry nations.

But there is another feature yet to be noticed. In this *Early Writings* statement we also see how the prophet of God has foreshortened the import of her vision. To her it seemed that the existing wars in Europe (1848) were the beginning of the fulfilment of the last things. This fact helps us to understand how the same writer in *Great Controversy* could apply other Scriptures (such as Matt. 25:1-13 and Dan. 8:14 which have their consummation

at the end) to her own day, even 1844 and immediately after. The implications are several and significant, and readers can work out the rest for themselves.

But not the least of these implications is that the reference to Aug. 11, 1840, on the last page of the discussion about the falling of the stars belongs to the same bracket as the Millerite application of the heavenly signs — quite illegitimate for our day as the fulfilment of the Scriptures in question — but perfectly understandable in the nineteenth century when believers thought themselves on the fringe of the Second Advent. The pioneer view of the investigative judgment must be seen in this same historical context and understood in the same way.

ELLEN G. WHITE AND THE DAY OF ATONEMENT

Most Adventists are familiar with Ellen G. White's use of the Day of Atonement in *Great Controversy*, where 1844 and the investigative judgment are in focus. But it is rare to find someone conversant with a later and different application of that same Old Testament symbolism by the Spirit of Prophecy. We wish to look at a set of statements reflecting this later application.

First, two provisos. By ~~later~~" we mean in general, for the seed of these quotations written after Ellen G. White had entered her sixties is found in her earliest book. Secondly, by ~~different~~" we do not mean ~~contrary~~." We believe the second set of statements, the later ones, are more comprehensive, and complementary to the earlier ones, **even if in some details apparently „contrary."** It should be kept in mind that it was Ellen G. White herself who affirmed that: "... the God of Heaven sometimes commissions men to teach that which is regarded as contrary to the established doctrines."¹⁵ And:

Some things must be torn down. Some things must be built up. The old treasures must be reset in the framework of truth. They (Adventist preachers) are to preach God's word; their testimony must not be moulded by the opinions and ideas that have been regarded as sound, but by the word of God which liveth and abideth for ever.

I have been shown that Jesus will reveal to us precious old truths in a new light, if we are ready to receive them.¹⁶

Here, then, is the second group of statements, applying the Day of Atonement type more comprehensively than the *Great Controversy* presentation. These quotations refer Israel's day of expiation to the atonement made on the cross (and thus are in harmony with *Early Writings*, 251, 253, which declare that the atonement from 1844 onwards was ~~special~~" and ~~final~~" rather than **the** atonement). Some of them go further, and set forth the Day of Atonement as pointing to **both** advents.

In stooping to take upon Himself humanity, Christ revealed a character the opposite of the character of Satan. But He stepped still lower in the path of humiliation. ... As the high priest laid aside his gorgeous, pontifical robes, and officiated in the white linen dress of the common priest, so Christ took the form of a servant, and offered sacrifice, Himself the priest, Himself the victim.¹⁷

As in the typical service, the high priest laid aside his pontifical robes, and officiated in the white linen dress of an ordinary priest, so Christ laid aside His royal robes, and garbed Himself with humanity, and offered sacrifice, Himself the priest, Himself the victim. As the high priest, after performing his service in the Holy of holies, came forth to the waiting congregation in his pontifical robes, so Christ will come the second time,

clothed in garments of whitest white, —so as no fuller on earth can white them.” He will come in His own glory and in the glory of His Father and of all the angelic host who will escort Him on His way.¹⁸

Still bearing humanity, He ascended to heaven triumphant and victorious. He has taken the blood of the atonement into the Holiest of all, sprinkled it upon the mercy seat in His own garments, and blessed the people. Soon He will appear the second time to declare that there is no more sacrifice for sin.¹⁹

With a rending noise the inner veil of the temple is torn from top to bottom by an unseen hand, throwing open to the gaze of the multitude a place once filled with the presence of God. In this place the Shekinah had dwelt. Here God had manifested His glory above the mercy seat. No one but the high priest ever lifted the veil separating this apartment from the rest of the temple. He entered in once a year to make an atonement for the sins of the people. But lo, this veil is rent in twain. The most holy place of the earthly sanctuary is no longer sacred.

All is terror and confusion. The priest is about to slay the victim; but the knife drops from his nerveless hand, and the lamb escapes. Type has met antitype in the death of God’s Son. The great sacrifice has been made. The way into the holiest is laid open. A new and living way is prepared for all. No longer need sinful, sorrowing humanity await the coming of the high priest. Henceforth the Saviour was to officiate as priest and advocate in the heaven of heavens. It was as if a living voice had spoken to the worshipers: There is now an end to all sacrifices and offerings for sin. The Son of God is come according to His word, —“Lo, I come (in the volume of the Book it is written of Me), to do Thy will, O God.” —“By His own blood” He entereth —in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.” Heb. 10:7; 9:12.²⁰

The mercy seat, upon which the glory of God rested in the holiest of all, is opened to all who accept Christ as the propitiation for sin, and through its medium they are brought into fellowship with God. The veil is rent, the partition walls broken down, the handwriting of ordinances cancelled. By virtue of His blood the enmity is abolished. Through faith in Christ Jew and Gentile may partake of the living bread.²¹

Christ came to demolish every wall of partition, to throw open every compartment of the temple, that every soul may have free access to God.²²

A new and living way, before which there hangs no veil, is offered to all. No longer need sinful, sorrowing humanity await the coming of the high priest.²³

Let us consider these. **All of them employ Day of Atonement allusions, but none of them mentions 1844 or the investigative judgment. All apply the Day of Atonement to the cross of Christ and that atonement.** In other words, they harmonize perfectly with Heb. 9, as on the other hand, *Great Controversy* is closer in meaning to the use of the Day of Atonement in the Apocalypse.

The first quotation from *Desire of Ages*, 24, refers to Yom Kippur when the high priest divested himself of his glorious robes. Ellen G. White applies that act as a type of the incarnation whereby Christ became priest. The officiating of the high priest on the Day of Atonement she applies to Christ’s offering Himself on Calvary. In this quotation, the Day of Atonement is certainly in focus, but 1844 and the investigative judgment as certainly are not.

The second quotation, this time from *Acts of the Apostles*, 33, is similar. But it moves from the offering of the sacrifice on Calvary, straight to the ministry of the Most Holy Place, and then the Second Advent. Note that again there is no reference to 1844, no reference to any ministry in the first apartment occupying most of the Christian era, and no reference to the investigative judgment. Instead, the Day of Atonement here is made to span the whole Christian era, and Ellen G. White specifically mentions the incarnation, Calvary, the ministry in the Most Holy, and the return of Christ.

The third reference, that of the *Signs of the Times*, April 19, 1905, (the approximate time of Ballenger's expulsion) again draws from the Day of Atonement type. The blood of the atonement, its being sprinkled by the high priest upon the mercy seat, and the emergence from the Most Holy to the waiting congregation in the courtyard are not stressed. Again there is nothing about 1844, nothing about the investigative judgment, nothing about a first apartment ministry. The sacrificial act is immediately linked with the sprinkling in the second apartment (sprinkling could only take place while the blood was still warm — before coagulation). The reference to the blessing of the people between the account of sprinkling of the blood on the mercy seat (which happened at the dedication of the priesthood) seems to point to the same as Acts 2:33. It was through the Spirit at Pentecost that Christ blessed the people, after His atonement had been accepted in heaven, and He sat down on His Father's throne as the true Melchizedec — Priest and King. As for the phrase ~~the~~ "the Holiest of all," this is taken from the KJV of Heb. 9:8, and applies to the Most Holy Place as is made clear by Heb. 10:19, 20. This is also evident from the Ellen G. White quotation itself, for the Holiest of all is there linked with ~~the~~ "the mercy seat."

Thus this quotation from the *Signs* of 1905, pictures our High Priest entering immediately within the second apartment where the mercy seat (after His ascension) was located.

Letter 230, 1907, also sets forth the Holiest of all as the place where the mercy seat and the Shekinah rested. And the rending of the veil at Christ's death is applied as in Heb. 10:19 — the dissolution of every barrier to the immediate presence of God. Note that not only ~~the~~ "the holiest of all," but the expression ~~opened~~, "has been taken from Heb. 10:19, 20. And the context of the letter of 1907 equates the making open of the Holiest apartment with the dissolution of the barriers spoken of in Eph. 2:15 and Col. 2:14, which all admit took place at the death of Christ. **Thus Ellen G. White is saying that ever since the death of Christ, the way to the mercy seat of the Most Holy has been opened to all, and no veil exists any longer.** See Heb. 4:16.

Christ's Object Lessons, 386, has the same setting as Letter 230. Both speak of the dissolving of the barriers between Jews and Gentiles. But we have this addition, that the rending of the veil is now clearly spelled out as throwing open ~~every~~ "every compartment of the temple." **There are no longer two apartments in the heavenly temple with a dividing veil between.**

But the *Desire of Ages* commentary is the clearest of all, as we might expect it to be, for it explains the significance of the simultaneous rending of life from Christ and the rending of the inner veil. And this statement also speaks of the second apartment, ~~the~~ "the holiest of all," and the ~~new~~ "new and living way" of Heb. 10:19, 20. Note that in *Desire of Ages*, 757, it is the ministry of the high priest on the Day of Atonement that is used to explain the rent veil. Specifically is that day referred to by the words ~~He~~ "He entered in once a year to make an atonement for the sins of the people. But lo, this veil is rent in twain."

On this page we are further told that now ~~type~~ "type has met antitype" in the making of the great sacrifice, and that that event laid open the way into the second apartment — the Holiest. This,

Desire of Ages says, showed that the High Priest had indeed come, and henceforth would not officiate within two apartments one after another, but ~~in~~ the heaven of heavens.” Then in summation, Ellen G. White quotes Heb. 10:7 and 9:12, saying that Christ’s death was the obtaining of eternal redemption, and on the basis of His own blood, having done God’s will perfectly, He entered where the high priest entered — the ~~holy~~ place” of Lev. 16:2, 17, 20, 23, elsewhere known as the Most Holy Place. In this quotation also, Ellen G. White makes Christ pass from Calvary and the tomb to the Most Holy, without any intervening ministry in a first apartment. Not 1844, but the cross is the heart of the Yom Kippur, according to this clear commentary.²⁴

In *Testimonies*, 4:122, where Ellen G. White’s theme is ~~purification~~ from sin” (see line four of the page) as illustrated by the red heifer ceremonial, the Day of Atonement type is invoked as having to do with cleansing. Thus she does exactly as the writer of Hebrews where chapter nine also linked these two types. Says Ellen White at this place:

Thus Christ, in His own spotless righteousness, after shedding His precious blood, enters into the holy place **to cleanse the sanctuary**. And there the crimson current is brought into the service of reconciling God to man.²⁵

In the red heifer ceremony a prior sacrificial death provided that which was continually available for cleansing purposes. So, says Ellen White, the death of Christ, though it cleansed the sanctuary after His death, was ever available meritoriously for sinners. Thus Ellen G. White, as with Hebrews, makes Christ’s atoning death for the purification of sin ~~the~~ cleansing of the sanctuary.” See Heb. 1:3; 9:23-25. By ~~holy~~ place” here she means the second apartment which in Lev. 16 is repeatedly called ~~the~~ holy place.” In the *Review* of February 25, 1890, she also spoke of ~~the~~ holy place, where Jesus has gone to make an atonement for His children.” Her husband similarly used ~~holy~~ place” for the sanctuary behind the second veil. In May, 1850, *The Present Truth* carried his article on ~~The~~ Sanctuary, 2300 Days, and the Shut Door,” which affirmed that:

... the sinner, to whom Jesus stretched out His arms all the day long, and who had rejected the offers of salvation, was left without an advocate, when Jesus passed into the Holy Place, and shut that door in 1844.

On page 124 of the same volume 4, Ellen G. White comments regarding:

~~How~~ full the atonement of the Saviour for our guilt . . . Neither times nor events can lessen the efficacy of the atoning sacrifice. As the fragrant cloud of incense rose acceptably to Heaven, and Aaron sprinkled the blood upon the mercy seat of ancient Israel, and cleansed the people from guilt, so the merits of the slain Lamb are accepted by God today as a purifier from the defilement of sin.

This is exactly the meaning given to Christ’s death by Heb. 9 when it mingles the atonement with the red heifer sprinkling. On page 123, midway between our first quotation from this testimony and the one just given Ellen G. White, the atonement took place at the cross, cleansing the sanctuary then (*4T*, 122), but its benefits are still being ministered and will be until all sin is purged from the universe. Observe closely that while *Great Controversy* can apply the cleansing of the sanctuary eschatologically, here she uses the term soteriologically for what took place at the death of Christ. To her, as to the apostle, the cleansing of the sanctuary is the forensic cleansing of the guilty world by the cross.

While *Early Writings*, 251, 253; *Great Controversy*, 417-432; and *Patriarchs and Prophets*, 358, give the Day of Atonement a special eschatological application, these other quotations are primarily soteriological. While the former parallel the use made of Israel's day of expiation in the Apocalypse, the second set parallel Hebrews. Two statements at least of this second set link the Day of Atonement to **both** the judgment of the cross and the judgment of the Second Advent. One statement of the prior set of quotations tells us that the essence of the teaching of Israel's typical day of purification of the sanctuary was that one day the universe itself would be purified from sin and sinners. See *Patriarchs and Prophets*, 358.

Thus Ellen White is in harmony with the apotelesmatic principle, and the way in which the New Testament applies the truths of eschatology to both the inaugurated phase at the first advent, and the consummated phase at the second. See our preceding chapter.

Nor is Ellen White's use of the Day of Atonement in two different ways at all peculiar in her application of Scripture. There are many other motifs besides the Day of Atonement which Ellen G. White applied first to one time, and then to another later time. For example, just after 1844 she could apply the shaking, the anger of the nations, the sealing, and the signs in the heavens, and specially Matt. 25:1-13 to events around 1844. But in later years, these same motifs were applied to events yet future, clustering around the Second Advent itself. This is a strong parallel to her use of the Day of Atonement symbolism. (See appendix, 'An Analysis of 'Prophetic Tension' in the Eschatology of E.G. White.'")

ELLEN G. WHITE AND THE SHUT DOOR

We now come to a vital key to our problem. Very few of us are intimately acquainted with our own Adventist early history and the problems associated with the "shut door" controversy. Neither are many familiar with our earliest literature. We would venture to affirm that nobody can speak with authority on Ellen G. White's use of Dan. 8:14 who has not done their homework in these areas. And even those who have done their homework will only speak accurately if the evidence is viewed impartially. As one reviews the history of our successive apologetics on the "shut door," one finds tremendous disparity and disagreement, even confusion. Daniells contradicts his predecessors, and Spicer contradicts Daniells, and Spalding contradicts Spicer, while the most recent and exhaustive of all studies on the topic is not in agreement fully with any of the preceding attempts. Obviously, prejudice has vitiated the investigations and conclusions of most.

To read the eleven numbers of *The Present Truth*, the five of the *Advent Review*, the *Advent Review Extra* of September, 1850, and the *Advent Review* (48-page special of September, 1850) shows that two topics in particular dominated the writing and argumentation of our early pioneers — the Sabbath and the shut door of Matt. 25:10. **The great majority of the articles revolve around these two topics.** As Arthur White has written concerning these publications: "One expression appears often which serves as a key to these frequently misunderstood years — the shut door."²⁶

It is abundantly clear as one reads the literature that Matt. 25:1-13 is applied specifically as a prophetic parable of the 1844 experience. Our pioneers rejected the interpretation of others that the parable applied to the Second Advent future. To them it was past. We offer examples. Particularly observe James White's discussion on the shut door published in *The Present Truth*, May, 1850.

III. The Shut Door

That there is to be a shut door prior to the second advent, many will admit; yet but few seem willing to have it where it actually took place. Let us take a brief view of our past history, as marked out by the parable of the ten virgins [Matt. 25:1-11] and I think we shall clearly see that there can be no other place for the shut door but at the Autumn of 1844.

Here Jesus gives us the history of an eastern marriage, and declares that the kingdom of heaven [the history of the living subjects of the looked for kingdom, for nothing else could go forth to meet the bridegroom, &c., &c.] should be likened [compared] unto it. Now in order to compare second advent history with that of an eastern marriage given by Jesus, every event in our history, corresponding with each point in the history of an eastern marriage, must be complete, and we must stand down this side of the shut door, then we can look back and compare both histories. This we will now do.

Advent History

The doctrine of the second advent of Christ called out a devoted people who took their Bibles [lamps] for their light, and who confidently expected to meet Christ [the Bridegroom] in 1843.

We were disappointed, and the best light we could see, for a few months after that disappointment, was that we were in the *tarrying* time. In that tarrying time we ~~all~~ slumbered and slept" on time.

But soon we saw that the 2300 days extended to 1844. We saw that it would take all of 457, and all of 1843, to make 2300; therefore it would take as much of 1844, to complete 2300 full years, as had passed from the 457, when the decree went forth. From the best light we could then obtain from the autumnal types we were very confident that the days would end at the seventh month, and the cry — "Behold the Bridegroom cometh" was actually raised, swelled louder and louder throughout the land, until the advent people were fully awake, anxiously expecting to see Jesus on the tenth day of the seventh month.

When we came up to that point of time, all our sympathy, burden and prayers for sinners ceased, and the unanimous feeling and testimony was, that our work for the world was finished for ever. —As he [Christ] is, so are we in this world" 1 John 2:17. The living branches

Marriage

—Then shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins, who took their lamps, and went forth to meet the bridegroom." &c.

—While the bridegroom tarried they all slumbered and slept."

—And at midnight there was a cry made, Behold the bridegroom cometh; go ye out to meet him"

—Then all those virgins arose and trimmed their lamps."

—And the foolish said unto the wise, Give us of your oil for our lamps are gone out."

—But the wise answered, Not so: lest there be not enough for us and you: but rather go to them that sell and buy for yourselves."

on earth, will sympathize with, and move in concert with the ~~the~~ "true vine" in heaven.

The reason why the living branches felt that their work was done for the world, was, because the 2300 days were ended, and the time had come for Jesus to shut the door of the Holy, to receive the Kingdom, and cleanse the Sanctuary. This change, so wonderfully described in Dan. 7:13, 14, answers to the coming of the bridegroom and shut door, in the parable.

—And while they went to buy, the bridegroom came; and they that were ready, went in with him to the marriage and the door was shut."

—Then shall the kingdom of heaven be likened [compared] unto ten virgins," &c. When? At this very time, when the faithful servant is giving meat to the ~~HOUSEHOLD~~," (not to the unbelieving world,) and is opposed by the evil servant, and when the advent history, marked out by the parable, is fulfilled, and the shut door in the past. Now we may see that the only place for the shut door was in 1844. Amen.

But says the objector — ~~The door of mercy will not be closed until Jesus comes.~~" We do not read of such a door as ~~the door of mercy~~" in the Bible; neither do we teach that such a door was shut in 1844. God's ~~mercy~~ endureth for ever." See Ps. 136; 106:1; 118:1. He is still merciful to his saints, and ever will be; and Jesus is still their advocate and priest. **But the sinner, to whom Jesus had stretched out His arms all the day long, and who had rejected the offers of salvation, was left without an advocate, when Jesus passed from the Holy Place, and shut that door in 1844.** The professed church, who rejected the truth, was also rejected, and smitten with blindness, and now, ~~with their flocks and with their herds~~" they go ~~to~~ seek the Lord" as still an advocate for sinners; but, says the prophet, [Hosea 5:6, 7] ~~they shall not find him; he hath WITHDRAWN HIMSELF from them.~~ They have dealt treacherously against the Lord; for they have begotten strange children."

The reason why they do not find the Lord is simply this, they seek Him where He is not; ~~he hath withdrawn himself:~~ to the Most Holy Place." The prophet of God calls their man-made converts, ~~STRANGE CHILDREN~~;" ~~now~~ shall a mouth devour them, and their portions."

Says the objector — ~~I believe that Jesus is still on the mercy-seat.~~" In answer to this oft-repeated assertion, let me say; Jesus never was on the mercy seat, and never will be. The mercy seat is in the Most Holy Place, where Jesus entered at the end of the 2300 days. Its position is upon the ark of the ten commandments; and over it are the cherubims of glory. Before the mercy seat stands our Great High Priest pleading His blood for Israel.

If the door (represented by the door in the parable) is not to be shut until Jesus descends from heaven in flames of fire, then where will be the knocking, and saying, ~~Lord, Lord, open unto us~~"? It is evident that the door is shut prior to the second advent, and that unbelievers are ignorant of the fact of its being shut; therefore they knock at the shut door, and say, ~~Lord, Lord, open unto us.~~" When the great day of God's wrath is come, and unbelievers are apprised of their lost situation, they will not knock, with a hope of being admitted, no, no; but they will flee to rocks and mountains for shelter.

See Isa. 2:19-21; Rev. 6:15-17. Now their prayer is, ~~—~~Lord, Lord, OPEN UNTO US;” but then their prayer will be to ~~—~~flocks and mountains,” ~~—~~FALL ON US, and HIDE us FROM the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb.”

It is impossible to harmonize such portions of the Word as Isa. 2:19-21; Rev. 6:15-17, with the idea of the shut door, and knocking being at, and after the advent. The 2300 days and cleansing of the Sanctuary of Dan. 8:13, 14, the parable of the ten virgins, and other parallel portions of Scripture clearly fix the shut door in 1844. This view establishes our holy advent experience in the past, gives certainty to the ~~—~~blessed hope” of very soon seeing Jesus, and causes our path to shine ~~—~~more and more unto the perfect day.” Amen.²⁷

Observe that James White says, ~~—~~think we shall clearly see that there can be no other place for the shut door but at the Autumn of 1844.” He repeats the essence of this introductory comment by a later one: ~~—~~Now we may see that the only place for the shut door was in 1844.” He further affirms in more than one place that it is not possible to believe that the shut door applies in connection with the Second Advent. David Arnold’s comments on the same paper (December, 1849) are similar:

Thus we had in our experience, previous to the tenth day of the seventh month, 1844, a perfect fulfilment of all the events in the parable, as stepping stones to the SHUT DOOR; and since that time, the event, (knocking at the shut door,) that was to take place after the shutting of the door, has not failed to fill up the concluding scene in the drama. We are thus brought to a clear and perfect fulfilment of every feature of this important parable, and also to a clear fulfilment of those Scriptures connected with, and relating to the shut door; such as the parable of the great supper, Luke 14:16-24; the proclamation of the ~~—~~mighty angel,” ~~—~~that there should be TIME NO LONGER,” Rev. 10:1-8; the flying angel, proclaiming the hour of judgment come, Rev. 14:6, 7; and the cleansing of the sanctuary, &c. Therefore, we are brought by the force of circumstances, and the fulfilment of events, to the irresistible conclusion that, on the tenth day of the seventh month, (Jewish time,) in the autumn of 1844, Christ did close His daily, or continual ministration or mediation in the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary, and SHUT THE DOOR, which no man can open; and opened a door, in the second apartment, or Holiest of all, which no man can shut, (see Rev. 3:7, 8,) and passed within the second veil, bearing before the Father, on the breastplate of judgment, all for whom He is now acting as intercessor. If this is the position that Christ now occupies, then there is no intercessor in the first apartment: and in vain do misguided souls knock at that door, saying ~~—~~Lord, Lord, open unto us.” The words of the prophet apply to the fulfilment of this point in the parable.

~~—~~They shall go with their flocks and with their herds to seek the Lord; but THEY SHALL NOT FIND HIM — HE HATH *WITHDRAWN* HIMSELF FROM THEM.

~~—~~They have dealt treacherously against the Lord, for they have begotten STRANGE CHILDREN; now shall a month devour them with their portion.” — Hosea 5:6, 7.

But, says the objector, does not this leave the present generation, who have passed the line of accountability, since that time without an intercessor or mediator, and leave them destitute of the means of salvation? In reply to this objection, I would remark, that as they were then in a state of INNOCENCY, they were entitled to a record upon the breastplate of judgment as much as those who had sinned and received pardon; and are therefore subjects of the present intercession of our great high priest.

The professed conversions, through the instrumentality of the different sects, are also urged as positive proof that the door is not shut. I cannot give up the clear fulfilment of prophecy, in our experience, which shows the shut door in the past, for the opinions, fancies and feelings of men, based upon human sympathy and a superstitious reverence for early imbibed views. God's word is true, though it prove all men liars. As a stream is of the same character as the fountain that sends it forth, (see James 3:11), and does not rise higher than the fountain, so these professed converts will not rise to a better state than the low standard of the fallen sects; therefore, they are converted to the religion of the various sects, but not to God, and the high and holy standard of the Bible. The Prophet Hosea saw this time; and for ~~our~~ learning" and guide has written — ~~They~~ have dealt treacherously against the Lord; for they have begotten strange children."²⁸

Arnold, as later White, is saying that probation had closed for all who heard the Miller message, and only children lately come to the age of accountability had a possibility of salvation. Professed conversions among all other religious groups were deceptive. The door had been shut, and it was too late for genuine conversion after 1844 from the ranks of those of accountable age during the Miller revivals. In the same issue White wrote as follows:

Once, the whole advent host believed that the parable of the ten virgins applied exclusively to the advent movement; and that the first going forth, in the parable, was fulfilled in us, as we came up to the first specified time; and that the cry in the parable, ~~Behold the bridegroom cometh, go ye out to meet him,~~" and the trimming of lamps, &c. were also fulfilled by us, as we gave the seventh month cry. We still believe what the whole host once believed; and with holy confidence and energy published and preached to the world. And strange to tell, many of those who have abandoned the fulfilment of prophecy in our past experience, are ready to brand us with fanaticism, and rank us with Shakers, &c. for believing what they once believed, and for carrying out and showing a consistent fulfilment of the parable, in all its parts, which shows that the door is shut.

Many will point us to one who is said to be converted, for positive proof that the door is not shut, thus yielding the word of God for the feelings of an individual.²⁹

Let it be observed that Adventists were not saying that probation had closed for the Sabbath keepers as well. This they denied, and opposed certain perfectionists among their contemporaries who believed they were already sealed for eternity. It was the wicked world and the fallen church which had rejected the Miller message whose probation had ended when the door shut. The faithful ones needed to hold on still and persevere to the end soon to come. Until 1851-1852 this was the consistent stance of Sabbathkeeping Adventists, as they repeatedly denied the possibility of conversion for the rejected sinners of earth. **Until the summer of 1851 our pioneers considered their task as confined to "the little flock" while unbelievers were considered as left in outer darkness since the closing of the 1844 door.** When in 1851 and 1852 James White reprinted some of his earlier articles, he omitted or changed a number of his former statements about the shut door.

What about Ellen G. White's views on the shut door? The evidence is overwhelming that while Ellen White's insights transcended that of her brethren in some important particulars, as regards the shut door she too for years believed that the door of Matt. 25:10 was shut in 1844, and that ~~sinners~~" henceforth were excluded from hope of eternal life. By ~~sinners~~," she meant all who had rejected the Advent message of 1844, or the gospel itself.

The main purpose of Ellen White's first vision was to confirm the confidence of her fellow Adventists in the past midnight cry message, and in the fact that a door had indeed been shut on October 22. A few weeks after this vision, she received another which confirmed Turner's Bridegroom theory that Christ had come to the Father on October 22 for the wedding of the reception of the kingdom. Furthermore, this vision appeared to confirm the conviction that the popular churches and the world were now outside the door of mercy because of their rejection of the Advent message. But in 1847 we find Ellen G. White affirming that God still had children among both the first-day Adventists and the churches of Babylon — these children being ones who had not been guilty of rejecting light.

Even the stress on an open door which first came in 1849 did not deny the existing shut door theory.³⁰ Her account of the vision of November, 1848 assures us that ~~the~~ "the midnight cry is behind us, the door was shut in 1844." Not only so, but she asserts that there is no more ~~travail~~ "travail of soul for sinners as used to be" since ~~the~~ "the time for their salvation is past." The word ~~their~~ "their" in this comment includes ministers and their professed converts who had rejected present truth. **Only from 1852 onwards do we find Ellen White urging the preaching of truth to all, rather than to the little flock alone.**

In *The Present Truth* for August, 1849, Ellen G. White had written as follows:

The reformations that were shown me, were not reformations from error to truth; but from bad to worse; for those who professed a change of heart, had only wrapt about them a religious garb, which covered up the iniquity of a wicked heart. Some appeared to have been really converted, so as to deceive God's people; but if their hearts could be seen, they would appear as black as ever. (p. 22)

A month later when there was a local short-lived pestilence the message came:

I heard an Angel say, ~~speed~~ "speed the swift messengers, speed the swift messengers; for the case of every soul will soon be decided, either for Life, or for Death."

I saw that those who had the means, were required to help speed those messengers, that God had called to labour in His cause, and as they went from place to place, they would be safe from the prevailing pestilence. But if any went that were not sent of God, they would be in danger of being cut down by the pestilence; therefore all should earnestly seek for duty, and be sure and move by the direction of the Holy Spirit.

What we have seen and heard of the pestilence, is but the beginning of what we shall see and hear. Soon the dead and dying will be all around us. I saw that some will be so hardened, as to even make sport of the judgments of God. Then the slain of the Lord will be from one end of the earth to the other; they will not be lamented, gathered, nor buried; but their ill savour will come up from the face of the whole earth. Those only who have the seal of the living God, will be sheltered from the storm of wrath, that will soon fall on the heads of those who have rejected the truth. In Hope, E.G. White.

And on page 64 of the same publication we find the following:

The excitements and false reformations of this day do not move us, for we know that the Master of the house rose up in 1844, and shut the door of the first apartment of the heavenly tabernacle; and now we certainly expect that they will ~~go~~ "go with their flocks," ~~to~~ "seek the Lord; but they shall not find him; he hath withdrawn himself (within the second veil) from them." The Lord has shown me that the power which is with them is a mere human influence, and not the power of God.

It should be observed that the sentiments expressed by Ellen G. White, her husband and other pioneers seem identical, even many of the same texts, phrases and conclusions being used by all.

The Camden vision should also be considered. Once thought of as spurious, Uriah Smith's allusions to it in his *Visions of Mrs. E. G. White* indicate its authenticity, although we believe the date is not correct. (This has been found with some other early Ellen G. White documents.) Here it is, and the sentiments fit exactly the years immediately following 1844.

The Camden Vision

Camden, N.Y.

June 29, 1851

The Lord shewed that he had, in answer to prayer, removed his frown from this band, and that they could have the smiles of Jesus, if they would live very humble, and walk carefully before the Lord, and know that in every step that they took that God was guiding them, and the band would be strong and would be a terror to their enemies; and the band must press together. Then I saw Bro. Wing and Bro. Hyatt — that the enemy had been trying to destroy them — that they were praying for light upon a few texts of Scripture, and the more they prayed the darker they grew, and the enemy was shutting down a network of darkness over them; and just about as they were getting entirely shut in, they were delivered — the net was broken, and they escaped. I saw the true light on these texts, &c. I saw that this rebuke was given by Jesus to the Pharisees and Jews, who were filled with self-righteousness, and would only speak to or greet those who were just as full of self-righteousness and hypocrisy as they themselves were; and they entirely neglect and pass by those who did not make quite as much, and who did not receive greeting in the market as they did. I saw that it did not in any way apply to this time — that we are now living in. **Then I saw that Jesus prayed for his enemies, but that should not cause US to pray for the wicked world, whom God had rejected — when he prayed for his enemies, there was hope for them, and they could be benefited and saved by his prayers, and also after he was a mediator in the outer apartment for the whole world; but now his spirit and sympathy were withdrawn from the world: and our sympathy must be with Jesus, and must be withdrawn from the ungodly.** I saw that God loved his people — and, in answer to prayers, would send rain upon the just and the unjust — I saw that now, in this time, that he watered the earth and caused the sun to shine for the saints and the wicked by our prayers, by our Father sending rain upon the unjust, while he sent it upon the just. **I saw that the wicked could not be benefited by our prayers now** — and although he sent it upon the unjust, yet their day was coming. Then I saw concerning loving our neighbours. I saw that scripture did not mean the wicked whom God had rejected that we must love, but he meant our neighbours in the household, and did not extend beyond the household: yet I saw that we should not do the wicked around us any injustice: — But, our neighbours whom we were to love, were those who loved God and were serving him.

(Signed) E.G. White

Copied by R.R. Chapin.³¹

In 1882, *Early Writings* was published with a preface affirming that ~~no~~ portion of the work has been omitted. No shadow or change has been made in any idea or sentiment of the original work; and the verbal changes have been made under the author's own eye and with her full approval." The *Advent Review* of Dec. 25, 1882, contained an article by G.I. Butler

pointing out that the recently issued *Early Writings* contained all of Ellen G. White's original manuscripts without omission or suppression. But Butler was wrong. Omitted from the original *A Word to the Little Flock* were the following lines: ~~It~~ "was just as impossible for them to get on the path again and go to the city, as all the wicked world which God had rejected. They fell all along the path, one after another."³² Similarly the quotations above, including the Camden vision, were omitted from the *Early Writings* of 1882. We do not agree with D.M. Canright that the brethren were guilty of deception. Nor was Ellen G. White. But they obviously felt it wiser not to confuse the reading public, now that the shut door error had been repudiated. Our main concern in quoting these materials is to show that **the original application by Seventh-day Adventists of Matt. 25:1-13 was not correct exegesis. But Ellen G. White, like her brethren, equated this passage with Dan. 8:14; Dan. 7:13, 14; Mai. 3:1.**

Another factor must be kept in mind. Ellen G. White certainly believed Christ was coming very soon after 1844. In *Early Writings* we find her words: ~~I~~ "saw that the time for Jesus to be in the most holy place was nearly finished and that time can last but a very little longer," and ~~what~~ "what we have been years learning, they will have to learn in a few months" (58, 67). The statement given above from pages 31-32 of *Present Truth* indicate that she considered the local temporary plague of 1849 the beginning of the end. ~~What~~ "What we have seen and heard of the pestilence is but the beginning of what we shall see and hear. Soon the dead and dying will be all around us." Her use of Rev. 11:18, part of the seventh trumpet, parallels her use of Matt. 25 in these early years. See *Early Writings*, 36, and also 42. If God's people had speedily taken hold of the gospel and dedicated their all to Christ the end would not have been so long postponed. See the appendix on this tension in Ellen G. White's prophetic interpretations.

Rolf J. Poehler, in his exhaustive study of the shut door controversy, comments on Ellen G. White's involvement as follows:

The history of the shut-door debate has clearly shown that one of the greatest hindrances to a correct interpretation of EGW's utterances during those early years has been the failure to understand her from the perspective and within the framework of her time. This is not to say that EGW was a prisoner of the limited insights and erroneous conceptions of the people around her; in fact, EGW presented views which were far ahead of her age. Nonetheless, she always spoke not only to, but also from within her epoch, and remained, therefore, in a sense, a child of her time.

There seems to be a fine, but important, distinction between regarding EGW as being ~~time-conditioned~~ "time-conditioned" and ~~time-related~~ "time-related." While the critics of SDA have attempted to prove her complete dependence on her fellow-believers and their limited (and erroneous) ideas, SDA apologists have consistently failed to fully recognize that even a prophet remains truly a human being and, therefore, indissolubly tied to (though not necessarily tied down to) the language, thinking, ideas, and habits of his age. Thus, while the previous chapters of this paper served their own interests, they constitute, in another sense, only an extensive but necessary introduction to our discussion of the shut-door problem as related to the SDA prophetic.

Any division of the first decade of EGW's prophetic ministry in terms of the shut-door issue is, to some degree, artificial and arbitrary. For, right from the beginning, her statements contained elements of surprising far-sightedness which repeatedly caught her fellow believers by surprise and decisively contributed to and hastened the development

of the open-door theology among Sabbatarian Adventists. On the other hand, even after she had been setting forth some clear soteriological and missiological open-door notions, EGW continued to defend ideas which apparently reflect a mercy-limiting conception of the shut-door. This overlapping of open-door and shut-door notions makes any clear-cut division extremely difficult.³³

It was necessary for James White to delete a number of passages from his wife's early writings as well as his own in 1851 when republishing. On this Poehler says:

There must be, then, another explanation given to account for the fact that EGW's early writings seem to reflect the erroneous shut-door doctrine held by the SDA pioneers as a whole — and that she revised her visions at the time when they began to realize the inadequacy of some of their ideas. To explain the changes (made by Ellen and James White) in the text of her early visions as an attempt to clarify their true intent, raises the question as to **whether EGW herself had, from the beginning, realized the full import of her revelations.** At least, the close connection between language and thought suggests that, if EGW never claimed “infallibility in the use of language” (Daniells), **she may also have been subject to certain limitations in her understanding of truth. In other words, we must seriously reckon with the possibility that there occurred a process of progressive understanding of revealed truth not only with regard to the SDA pioneers as a whole, but also on the part of EGW herself.**

To take such an approach allows us to admit the undeniable, viz., that various of the deleted passages were not reprinted because they no longer adequately expressed the views of EGW in the summer of 1851. At the same time, it also prevents us from maintaining the unbelievable, namely, that EGW believed and taught the opposite from what her writings clearly indicate her as saying. But, on the other hand, it also enables us to present a viable alternative to the charges of the critics who — for understandable reason — have rejected the unconvincing explanations of the SDA apologists regarding the omission in *CEV*. In other words, instead of denying the reality and seriousness of the problem or jumping to premature conclusions which barely conceal their polemical bias, **we suggest that the recognition of a theological development taking place in the thinking and writing of EGW adequately accounts for the revisions which were carried out on the visions in 1851.**

In this way, we will also be able to avoid the simplistic “all-or-nothing” attitude which has characterized the history of the shut-door debate. We no longer have to assert that there are “no difficulties in the visions” and that the deleted passages “contain nothing but what we still fully endorse” (Smith, later he considerably changed his view on this point). But neither will we have to conclude that the omissions prove EGW a false prophet and her vision “a glaring falsehood” and “delusion.” Instead, **the recognition of the inevitable human element in the thinking and writing of EGW should help us to arrive at a more accurate conception of the inspiration process** as well as a more adequate appreciation of her role and function as SDA prophet.³⁴

Poehler's conclusions are worthy of our close attention:

Our survey of the EGW writings during the shut-door period has shown that, when these documents are subjected to a careful historical and literary analysis, they present a picture of EGW which combines her exceptional insights (which she said to have

gained through her frequent ~~v~~isions”) with the human limitations that are an intrinsic element of every person’s life — prophet or not.

On the other hand, we have seen how from the very beginning of her prophetic ministry, EGW was presenting ideas which not only challenged some of the mistaken notions of her fellow believers, but also opened new vistas of understanding which decisively contributed to the development of SDA theology. (1) The continuation of the atoning ministry of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary; (2) the emphasis placed on the principle of rejection; (3) the development of the Sabbath theology which gradually replaced the emphasis on the past and directed it to the present and the future; (4) the call to missionary work among non-Millerites; (5) the challenge to plan for evangelistic efforts in worldwide dimensions; (6) the emphasis on the open door aspect of the sanctuary theology, the fruitful tension between the *Naherwartung* and the overwhelming missionary task for honest souls; (7) her opposition to various time-setting attempts — these are some of the most impressive examples of the influential role which EGW played in the formative period of the SDA church, decisively contributing both to the prevention of excesses in theology and practice among Sabbatarian Adventists, and to the formation of theological positions which enabled the SDA pioneers to gradually free themselves from their erroneous shut-door notions without having to abandon their Millerite heritage.

On the other hand, it is undeniable that EGW was not detached from the time and place in which she lived. Performing her ministry predominantly among those Millerites who had come to accept Turner’s mercy-limiting shut-door doctrine, she apparently shared many of their ideas, though she seems to have been very sensitive to the excesses that occurred among them. **It is an incontrovertible fact that for years EGW firmly believed that the parable of Matt. 25 had been fulfilled — including the shutting of the door.** And while it is true that this view was essentially an expression of faith in the Seventh Month movement and the salvation-historical significance of the October date, it is also true that this position had some rather inevitable soteriological implications. (This is confirmed by the fact that not long after the SDA pioneers abandoned their erroneous shut-door notions they also revised their interpretation of Matt. 25 by declaring the ~~d~~oor” to be yet wide open.) The way in which EGW expressed herself during those early years closely shows that, in her view, the world and the churches were irrevocably excluded from divine mercy; and, though she never taught that only Millerites could be saved, she did not call for efforts on behalf of ~~s~~inners” but only for ~~h~~onest souls.” The close relationship between language and thought does not allow us to ignore the terminological changes that occurred in the writings of EGW after the crucial year 1851. And only if we recognize the changing meaning of various terms during the years — which reflects an accompanying development of thought — can we relate EGW’s later comments on the shut-door problem in a satisfactory manner to the obvious meaning of the contemporary documents.

Our study also reveals that EGW’s strong expectation of an imminent parousia was a crucial factor in her shut-door view — as it was also for her fellow believers. More than anything else it was this *Naherwartung* which confirmed their mistaken idea that there was nothing more to do for the sinful world and fallen church as a whole. And only the passage of time could bring them to the realization that they had again to proclaim another message, not merely to ~~h~~onest souls,” but to everyone who would listen — including ~~s~~inners.” To ignore this fact in one’s evaluation of the views of SDA and EGW is to misunderstand their situation and its intricacies.

That the realization of the inaccuracies in the shut-door view of the SDA pioneers did also involve EGW herself seems clear from a careful investigation of the passages that were deleted in her first book in 1851. Since some of her previous statements no longer accurately expressed the mind of EGW, it was thought best to simply omit them. Whether or not this decision was the best possible one to take, it is clearly an unfair exaggeration to speak of a dishonest cover-up and of suppression, for this ignores the missiological situation of the group which apparently provided the main rationale for the deletions.

Thus, EGW emerges as a truly remarkable woman whose ministry gives indeed credence to her claim of divine inspiration — at least as long as one does not require a prophet to be impeccable in every respect. Unfortunately, the shut-door debate has been marked by an inappropriate narrow-mindedness in this respect. Writers on both sides have reflected a one-sided all-or-nothing attitude which has led them either to deny any evidence of EGW's human fallibility or to entirely reject her as a false prophet. But to approach this subject with fixed, preconceived notions as to what a prophet may or may not say or do, does little to contribute to either an accurate historical investigation or the development of an adequate doctrine of inspiration. Besides, to require a prophet to be inerrant in his views, is to tell God how he must act and under what conditions we are willing to listen to him.³⁵

ELLEN G. WHITE AND MATT. 25:1-13

Now we are prepared to face that which may first appear a problem but which is actually a solution. **The important fact in this whole thing is that Ellen G. White set forth three different interpretations of Matt. 25:1-13.** Her early visions endorse the general pioneer view of the parable fitting exactly the 1844 experience, culminating in the shut door which excluded from mercy the wicked world. The second interpretation is found in *4 SP* and in *Great Controversy*, where Matt. 25:1-13 is still applied to the 1844 experience but the shut door now becomes an open door, and her earlier stress on an 1844 close of probation for “sinners” is not found. But in *Christ's Object Lessons* we find her third and most mature application of Matt. 25:1-13 — and it says nothing about the 1844 experience. Instead it interprets the parable in the way opposed by James White and David Arnold and others during the early years of the movement — that is, she applies it as the open-door Adventists' did — to the Second Coming of Christ! The door shut is not now the door of the first apartment ministry, but the door of human probation, (analogous to the prophetic misinterpretation of 1846-1851) but now rightly applied to immediately before the Second Advent rather than approximately a century and a half before.

The following paragraph from *Great Controversy*, 426, is very significant:

The coming of Christ as our high priest to the most holy place, for the cleansing of the sanctuary, brought to view in Dan. 8:14; the coming of the Son of man to the Ancient of Days, as presented in Dan. 7:13; and the coming of the Lord to His temple, foretold by Malachi, are descriptions of the same event; and this is also represented by the coming of the bridegroom to the marriage, described by Christ in the parable of the ten virgins, of Matt. 25.

The succeeding paragraphs interpret the significance of these Scriptures, applying them to the 1844 movement. For example, we read:

The proclamation, ~~Behold~~, the Bridegroom cometh,” in the summer of 1844, led thousands to expect the immediate advent of the Lord. At the appointed time the Bridegroom came, not to the earth, as the people expected, but to the Ancient of Days in heaven, to the marriage, the reception of His kingdom. ~~They~~ that were ready went in with Him to the marriage: and the door was shut.” They were not to be present in person at the marriage; for it takes place in heaven, while they are upon the earth.³⁶

On page 398 we have a similar application in a chapter significantly entitled, ~~Prophecies Fulfilled~~.”

~~While~~ the bridegroom tarried, they all slumbered and slept. And at midnight there was a cry made, Behold, the bridegroom cometh; go ye out to meet him. Then all those virgins arose, and trimmed their lamps.” Matt. 25:5-7. In the summer of 1844, midway between the time when it had been first thought that the 2300 days would end, and the autumn of the same year, to which it was afterward found that they extended, the message was proclaimed in the very words of Scripture: ~~Behold~~, the Bridegroom cometh!”³⁷

Ellen White applies the door of the parable of Matt. 25 to the door of the first apartment ministry. See *Great Controversy*, 429-430. But in *Christ's Object Lessons*, 405ff, we find an interpretation on a larger scale, applying the coming of the bridegroom, not to a coming to the Most Holy Place in heaven, but a coming to earth at the end of time; the midnight cry to the loud cry — the last warning in the very last days — and the shut door now becomes the door of human probation just before the outpouring of the seven last plagues.

What shall we do with these contrasting interpretations? Observe the differing applications:

The Coming			
The Marriage	of the Bridegroom	The Midnight Cry	Shut Door
<u>GC, 426, 427</u>			
Receiving his kingdom in the investigative judgment.	Beginning of 1844 ministry.	1844 Midnight Cry	Close of first Apartment ministry in 1844. ³⁸
<u>COL, 405-421</u>			
Receiving his bride, the church, at the Second Advent.	The Second Advent	The Loud Cry of Rev. 18:1-4	Close of human probation at end of time.

Which is correct? Or are both correct? And if the latter, in what sense can both be correct? Is one more correct than the other? Could one be a pastoral application for the emergency of the great disappointment? Or, at its best, an apotelesmatic application?

Let us ask this question of Scripture: When does the shut door of the parable of Matt. 25:1-13 apply? To 1844, or the end of probation for the human race? We turn to the context.

The verses immediately before the parable, and indeed all the verses of the preceding chapter deal with the Second Advent. For example, verse 37 speaks of the coming of the Son of man, verse 39 uses the same words, verse 42 speaks of ~~what~~ day your Lord is coming,” in verse 43 that coming is likened to the suddenness and unexpectedness of a thief's coming, verse 44 says ~~the~~ Son of man is coming at an hour you do not expect,” verse 46 refers to the ~~master~~

when he comes,” and verse 50 similarly. Then follows the parable in question which pictures that sudden unexpected coming of the preceding verses. At midnight, when all are sleeping, the bridegroom (the master) comes, and it is too late then to make preparation. The door is shut not long after the echoes of the midnight proclamation, —Behold, the bridegroom cometh.” The last words of Christ in this immediate section of the parable are —Watch therefore, for you know neither the day nor the hour.” This admonition parallels the same in 24:42, 43 which certainly applies to the Advent itself.

The following verses, Matt. 25:14-30, tell us that the next parable parallels that of the bridegroom. —For it will be as when a man going on a journey called his servants and entrusted to them his property. ... Now after a long time the master of those servants came and settled accounts with them.” To what time does this **settling** (not reckoning) of accounts belong? To 1844 or the Second Advent?

Then a third parable is given, and again the time is unmistakably that of the Second Advent. —And he will send out his angels with a loud trumpet call, and they will gather his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other” (Matt. 24:31).

It is obvious from the context that Matt. 25:1-12 applies particularly to the Second Advent of Christ, and not to 1844. Such an application as the latter becomes pastoral, whereby a Scripture principle is applied to a local situation in time and place. But if Matt. 25:1-12 is the same as Dan. 8:14 and 7:13, and Mal. 3:1 ff, then these latter passages also must apply not to 1844 primarily, but to the end of time — which fits perfectly with a correct exegesis of Dan. 8:14; 7:13; and Mal. 3:1 ff. (Just as Dan. 7:9-13, 26, is applied to the first advent of Christ and the deliverance of all dominion to Him after the cross. The kingdom of heaven came with Bethlehem and Calvary but is yet to be consummated. From age to age its power has invaded earth with the fresh vigour of new revival. As with Dan. 7:26, so with 8:14.)

Thus it is evident that the Adventist application of Dan. 8:14 to 1844 was an application in principle, an apotelesmatic fulfilment — a legitimate but not exhaustive application, particularly in view of the fact that if all in the Second Advent movement had been faithful, the consummation of the age would have speedily dawned. Just as the failure of Israel and that of the early Christian church caused a great hiatus between the first and Second Advent, so the continuing failure of the nineteenth century delayed the consummated fulfilment of Dan. 8:14.

ELLEN G. WHITE AND REV. 11

In an earlier chapter of *Great Controversy*, we have another apocalyptic prophecy applied historically to the time just prior to the great Second Advent movement. The two witnesses are said to be the Old and New Testament despised and banned for three and a half years during the French Revolution. But when we turn to *Testimonies*, 4:594, as already noticed, we find another application, this time worldwide, and for the very last days. We are glad for this, inasmuch as it is not possible to support the *Great Controversy* exposition of Rev. 11 either exegetically or historically, as all who have studied it are aware.³⁹

Let us consider two more examples of this principle of apotelesmatic fulfilments as set forth in *Great Controversy*. Rev. 11:19 is applied also to the 1844 movement:

—The temple of God was opened in heaven, and there was seen in His temple the ark of His testament.” Rev. 11:19. The ark of God’s testament is in the holy of holies, the

second apartment of the sanctuary. In the ministration of the earthly tabernacle, which served ~~unto~~ the example and shadow of heavenly things,” this apartment was opened only upon the great Day of Atonement for the cleansing of the sanctuary. Therefore the announcement that the temple of God was opened in heaven and the ark of His testament was seen points to the opening of the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary in 1844 as Christ entered there to perform the closing work of the atonement. Those who by faith followed their great High Priest as He entered upon His ministry in the most holy place, beheld the ark of His testament.⁴⁰

Clearly and definitely, Ellen G. White here says that Rev. 11:19 was fulfilled in 1844. Then was seen the ark of His covenant. In a later place in *Great Controversy* the law of that ark is again opened to view:

... there appears against the sky a hand holding two tables of stone folded together... That holy law, ... is now revealed to men as the rule of judgment ... there are seen the precepts of the Decalogue.⁴¹

Compare also *Review & Herald*, Nov. 23, 1950, p. 17, and Week of Prayer reading, Dec. 22, 1905: —The kingdoms of this world **are soon to become** the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ.”

Let us now turn to Scripture itself, and view 11:19 in its context.

Then the seventh angel blew his trumpet, and there were loud voices in heaven, saying, —The kingdom of the world has become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever.” And the twenty-four elders who sit on their thrones before God fell on their faces and worshiped God, saying,

~~We~~ We give thanks to thee, Lord God almighty,
 who art and who wast,
 that thou hast taken thy great power and
 begun to reign.
 The nations raged, but thy wrath came,
 and the time for the dead to be judged,
 for rewarding thy servants, the prophets and saints,
 and those who fear thy name, both small and great,
 and for destroying the destroyers of the earth.”

Then God’s temple in heaven was opened, and the ark of his covenant was seen within his temple; and there were flashes of lightning, loud noises, peals of thunder, an earthquake, and heavy hail. (Rev. 11:15-19 RSV)

The passage is not describing 1844, but the end of time when the kingdoms of the world become the kingdom of our Lord. It is the time of His wrath according to verse 18, that wrath described in later chapters as without mixture of mercy. It is the time for rewards for the saints and destruction for the wicked. At that time the ark of the law is seen amid the flashes of lightning, voices, peals of thunder, earthquake, and great hail — all of which belong, not to 1844, but to the last great day. Compare 6:12-17 and 16:17-21, which point to the same climactic events. There is no possible way of making Rev. 11:19 fit 1844, except by way of the apotelesmatic principle, in the limited sense that the law of that Most Holy Place was at that time brought to the attention of God’s Advent people. But here again Ellen G. White has

seen also the true consummated fulfilment when she pictures the law as being displayed amid the terrors of the last great day.

ELLEN G. WHITE'S LARGER VIEW OF DAN. 8:14

On pages 666 to 678 of *Great Controversy* we have Ellen G. White's final picture of the last fulfilment of Dan. 8:14 and Dan. 7:9-13. She pictures the last judgment at the end of the millennium, the books of record, the destruction of the wicked, the vindication of God and the purification of the universe. Notice some paragraphs from these graphic pages:

But the time has now come when the rebellion is to be finally defeated and the history and character of Satan disclosed. In his last great effort to dethrone Christ, destroy His people, and take possession of the city of God, the archdeceiver has been fully unmasked. Those who have united with him see the total failure of his cause. Christ's followers and the loyal angels behold the full extent of his machinations against the government of God. He is the object of universal abhorrence.

Every question of truth and error in the long-standing controversy has now been made plain. The results of rebellion, the fruits of setting aside the divine statutes, have been laid open to the view of all created intelligences. The working out of Satan's rule in contrast with the government of God has been presented to the whole universe. Satan's own works have condemned him. God's wisdom, His justice, and His goodness stand fully vindicated.⁴²

In the cleansing flames the wicked are at last destroyed, root and branch — Satan the root, his followers the branches. The full penalty of the law has been visited; the demands of justice have been met; and heaven and earth, beholding, declare the righteousness of Jehovah.⁴³

“I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away.” Rev. 21:1. The fire that consumes the wicked purifies the earth. Every trace of the curse is swept away. No eternally burning hell will keep before the ransomed the fearful consequences of sin.⁴⁴

There is the New Jerusalem, the metropolis of the glorified new earth, “a crown of glory in the hand of the Lord, and a royal diadem in the hand of thy God.” “Her light was like unto a stone most precious, even like a jasper stone, clear as crystal.” “The nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it: and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honour into it.” Saith the Lord: “I will rejoice in Jerusalem, and joy in My people.” “The tabernacle of God is with men, and He will dwell with them, and they shall be His people, and God Himself shall be with them, and be their God.” Isa. 62:3; Rev. 21:11, 24; Isa. 65:19; Rev. 21:3.⁴⁵

The great controversy is ended. Sin and sinners are no more. The entire universe is clean. One pulse of harmony and gladness beats through the vast creation. From Him who created all flow life and light and gladness throughout the realms of illimitable space. From the minutest atom to the greatest world, all things, animate and inanimate, in their unshadowed beauty and perfect joy, declare that God is love.⁴⁶

Observe the stress on “vindication” and “purification,” as well as on the destruction of the wicked and the final tabernacling of God with men. Compare *Patriarchs and Prophets*, 681, 79, 348; *Christ's Object Lessons*, 178-180; *Desire of Ages*, 26, 58, 761-764; *Great Controversy*, 504; *SDA Bible Commentary*, 7:986.

Thus when Ellen G. White's interpretation of Dan. 8:14 in *Great Controversy* is compared with her interpretations of Matt. 25:1-13; Dan. 7:9-13; Mal. 3:1 ff; Rev. 11:4-9; 11:19; 6:12, 13 in the same book — and when then these interpretations are compared with other interpretations, either later in the same book or in other volumes, it becomes obvious that the Scripture passages are applied in *Great Controversy* chiefly in the apotelesmatic sense, finding a fulfilment appropriate for the Second Advent people of the 19th century, but destined to reach their consummation and truest application, as Ellen White herself realized full well, in the very last things.



To return to Ellen G. White's double use of the Day of Atonement — both to the judgment of the cross and the judgment of the Second Coming — this usage parallels Dan. 9:24 where the Yom Kippur terminology is also applied to both advents. Calvary made an end of sin, finished the transgression, made atonement for iniquity, brought in everlasting righteousness, fulfilled prophetic vision, and anointed the Most Holy — all this happened forensically at the cross. But it all happens empirically in a consummative sense at the Second Advent. Thus Ellen G. White can urge us to cooperate with heaven in order to —bring in everlasting righteousness."⁴⁷ This twofold use of the Day of Atonement accords perfectly with what we have just noticed in *Great Controversy*.

IS THE THIRD ANGEL'S MESSAGE IN VERITY THE MESSAGE OF JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH, OR THE SANCTUARY, OR ARE THESE TWO BUT ONE?

Yet another line of thought prominent in Ellen G. White can help us here. She has told us that —justification by faith is the third angel's message in verity." In *Testimonies*, 6:19 we are admonished that righteousness by faith must be more fully proclaimed before the end can come — and that that proclamation is our special task. This justification message is said to be the sweetest melody that can issue from human lips, and the one topic which will swallow up every other, being indeed the light that is to lighten the whole earth with its glory.

But the same writer assures us that the light regarding the antitypical day of atonement, the cleansing of the sanctuary, is the very basis of our faith. **If both sets of statements are true and we believe they are — there must be a connection, an intimate connection between justification by faith and the sanctuary truth. What is this connection?**

A daily and yearly typical atonement is no longer to be made but the atoning sacrifice through a mediator is essential because of the constant commission of sin. Jesus is officiating in the presence of God, offering up His shed blood, as it had been a lamb slain. Jesus presents the oblation offered for every offense and every shortcoming of the sinner.

Christ, our Mediator, and the Holy Spirit are constantly interceding in man's behalf, but the Spirit pleads not for us as does Christ, who presents His blood, shed from the foundation of the world; the Spirit works upon our hearts, drawing out prayers and penitence, praise and thanksgiving. The gratitude which glows from our lips is the result of the Spirit's striking the cords of the soul in holy memories, awakening the music of the heart.

The religious service, the prayers, the praise, the penitent confession of sin ascend from true believers as incense to the heavenly sanctuary, but passing through the corrupt

channels of humanity, they are so defiled that unless purified by blood, they can never be of value with God. They ascend not in spotless purity, and unless the Intercessor, who is at God's right hand, presents and purifies all by His righteousness, it is not acceptable to God. All incense from earthly tabernacles must be moist with the cleansing drops of the blood of Christ. He holds before the Father the censer of His own merits, in which there is no taint of earthly corruption. He gathers into this censer the prayers, the praise, and the confessions of His people, and with these He puts His own spotless righteousness. Then, perfumed with the merits of Christ's propitiation, the incense comes up before God wholly and entirely acceptable. Then gracious answers are returned.

Oh, that all may see that everything in obedience, in penitence, in praise and thanksgiving, must be placed upon the glowing fire of the righteousness of Christ. The fragrance of this righteousness ascends like a cloud around the mercy seat.⁴⁸

The incense, ascending with the prayers of Israel, represents the merits and intercession of Christ, His perfect righteousness, which through faith is imputed to His people, and which can alone make the worship of sinful beings acceptable to God.⁴⁹

The precious emblems of the Most Holy Place on the Day of Atonement, the bloodstained mercy seat and the ascending incense from the hand of our great High Priest symbolize the heart of the gospel — the imputed justifying merits of Christ which enable God to look at that infinite, sacred, perpetual — but broken law through the blood drops on the covering seat — and count us innocent for Christ's sake. (Thus Paul invokes the Day of Atonement symbolism of the mercy seat as he reaches the heart of his exposition of justification. See Rom. 3:25 original.) There in the Most Holy, to which divinely granted visions in 1844 and onwards have referred us — there are the signs of the great truth which brings all the world to judgment, and judgment to all the world. Christ has borne our guilt, died our death, taken our judgment and condemnation — but those who refuse such grace must make their own atonement, and endure their own judgment and condemnation. As Leon Morris has written: —. the full weight of God's judgment and wrath has fallen on Christ. ... It is precisely in the context of judgment that the atonement is to be understood.”⁵⁰

To the pioneers of this message in 1844 were entrusted the basic truths of the apostolic gospel — truths in danger of being lost and forgotten — some of them in fact had already been lost, including the integrity of the law of God and the certainty of the return of Christ. As the apostles had their attention drawn to the Most Holy Place and Christ's ministry there (Matt. 27:51; Heb. 9 and 10 particularly, but also chapters 4, 6, 7, 8, 13) so now our pioneers were directed to the same place. As the atonement was central to the apostles, so now the atonement is meant to absorb the remnant church. As the verdict of judgment — justification — was the essence of the apostolic message, so it is meant to be the third angel's message in verity. Thus Daniells could say: —believe that this truth regarding the ministry of Christ should have gone right along with the message of righteous (*sic*) by faith that was given to us in 1888.”⁵¹

REV. 14:6-12 AND ROMANS

If it is profitable to compare Rev. 14:6-12 with the epistle of —justification by faith in verity” — Romans. Rev. 14:6 speaks of —the everlasting gospel.” The same is the heart of Romans. See 1:16, 17. Rev. 14:7 warns of the judgment for which only the gospel can prepare men. The same theme of judgment is dominant in Romans. See 1:18; 2:1.

The similarities between the apocalyptic and Pauline concept of wrath are striking. In both wrath is a function of God's righteousness (Jub. 36:10; Rom. 1:17f). In both the wrathful judgment is corporate (1 Enoch 5:6f; 84:4; 93:9; 103:7ff, etc.; Rom. 1:18-3:20). In both an outpouring of wrath comes on the Last Day (1 Enoch 91:7; Rom. 2:5f). In both God shows His forbearance by holding back His wrath (II Baruch 59:6; 48:14, 17; Rom. 2:3-5). In both God's wrath falls on men who act as if they are Lord (Jub. 5:6; Rom. 1:18-32).⁵²

The third angel's message warns against the worship of the beast and his image. So likewise Romans warns against the idolatry of false worship. See 1:20-25.

As the third angel's message has the sanctuary for its basis and is justification by faith in verity, so with Paul's message in Romans. In 3:25 he sets forth Christ as the mercy seat, and declares that it was by the blood of that mercy seat that justification by faith was made available for sinners. The blood continues to be prominent in the later chapters, and judgment as well. We who ~~are~~ now justified by His blood," ~~much~~ more shall we be saved by Him from the wrath of God" because through Him we have now received the reconciliation, i.e. atonement. Rom. 5:9-11.

Does the third angel's message end with emphasis on the commandments of God as well as the faith (the gospel) of Jesus? So does Romans. From chapter 12 onwards (as well as in previous chapters such as six and eight) obedience to the law is stressed as the fruit of having received the gospel. The book of Romans begins and ends with ~~the~~ obedience of faith" — that is, the obedience that springs from faith. See 1:5; 16:26; and compare Rev. 14:12.

It is not strange that Romans should be so parallel to the three angels' messages. It has long been understood by exegetes that Paul's language regarding justification and other matters is a form of realized eschatology. Indeed, it is when we see the connection between justification and the last judgment that we can never accuse Paul of cheap grace or antinomianism. It is because Paul sees the depths of the law (even a momentary incipient wrong desire violates that law and merits death — see Rom. 7:7-12), and knows that only one hundred percent fulfilment of it can meet its demands and yield righteousness — it is because of these convictions that he recognizes that we are thrown upon Christ, and upon dependence on His merits which alone meet the infinite requirements of that sacred and eternal law. It is because Paul knows that we must all stand before the judgment seat (Rom. 14:10) that he insists on our securing now that perfect righteousness by imputation, which alone can enable us to stand in that day when every motive, thought, word and deed are scrutinized. (The Reformers did not have the full light on justification. It has been left for our day to recover the eschatological nature of justification. Romans, chapters 1-3, sets forth justification in a judgment setting as 1:17,18; 2:1, 2, 5-12, 16; 3:19. Justification is God's ultimate verdict for all who abide in Christ. It ever brings with it sanctification and glorification. Rom. 8:29-30; 6:1-14. We have often erred by reducing justification to merely an initial blessing of forgiveness of past sins instead of a continued status up to and through judgment day.) Thus Paul can emphasize not only law but grace, not only obedience but faith, not only justification but sanctification. And the third angel's message likewise calls for these twin emphases.

What better way could God have brought to our pioneers the last-day message than by directing them to eschatological prophecy which spoke of the sanctuary, that house of the gospel emblems, the protecting cover for the tables of the law, a golden mercy seat. No wonder we read in *Early Writings*, 254, that the third angel points to the heavenly sanctuary. There the infinite law and infinite mercy were symbolized, pointing to the curses that must

fall on those who reject the covenant of grace, but the blessings for those who trust in Christ's own substitutionary obedience and penalty bearing.

ELLEN G. WHITE'S USE OF ERRONEOUS CONCEPTS

What shall we say then regarding Ellen G. White's use of the first apartment as a symbol of a first apartment ministry in heaven, and also what shall we say of her teaching of the investigative judgment? Some may say that these are creative re-interpretations of the Scripture, but it seems to us that *Testimonies*, 5:605 precludes that.

It seems that the elements of the pioneer two-apartment heavenly ministry represent swaddling clothes around the baby of truth, swaddling clothes now to be discarded, for truth need no longer be presented in infantile form. It was not given to prophets to have a thorough understanding of their visions. Ellen G. White misunderstood some aspects of her earlier visions on ~~the~~ "the shut door," applying those elements to the close of probation for ~~the~~ "the wicked world" in 1844, and only years after realizing her error. See 1 Peter 1:10, 11 and Dan. 8:15, 27; 12:8. Prophets did not have a precise understanding even of the central motifs of their own message. John the Baptist expected the end of the world in his day and believed the last judgment was about to commence. See Matt. 3:7-12.

It should be emphasized that the ~~swaddling clothes~~" referred to were absolutely essential in the nineteenth century for the survival of the disappointed and bewildered remnant who remained faithful to the Miller emphasis. It provided a needed rationale for their position.

Ellen G. White, of necessity, leaned to some extent upon contemporaries whom she trusted. God never does supernaturally what can be done naturally, and this principle leads to dangers as well as blessings. **Thus Ellen White accepted the prophetic conclusions of Josiah Litch regarding Aug. 11, 1840**, though he was entirely wrong and himself later repudiated his interpretation. The 1888 edition of *Great Controversy* speaks of the prophecy of Rev. 9:15 being fulfilled on the very day Litch had foretold. Later this reference was changed, as can be seen in the 1911 edition.

Similarly, in *Great Controversy* Rev. 11:9 is applied to events in France in the 1790's. Here Ellen G. White copied from Uriah Smith⁵³ (even using his same sources at times, in the same order with the same ellipses) who had copied from Storrs who had copied from Croly, who was quite unreliable in his historical allusions.

Ellen G. White drew from Uriah Smith and J.N. Andrews for her setting forth of the investigative judgment. (See appendix, ~~Pioneer Sources of Ellen G. White Sanctuary Chapters.~~) And she incorporated not only underlying doctrinal deviations, but Scriptural and historical errors. The idea of blood going in daily into the first apartment is not correct — the priestly ministry of the first apartment only very rarely included blood. Blood from the offerings of the daily sacrifices by the people was administered in the courtyard, not the first apartment. The dogmatism of Smith and Andrews on prophetic dates associated with Dan. 7, 8, 9, was not accepted by W.W. Prescott, and is not today by a number of our scholars. Yet Ellen G. White did accept the assertions of Smith and Andrews probably on the basis (in God's understanding, not hers) that such understandings of prophecy were appropriate for that time.

But this error in the sanctuary minutiae is no more significant than her error regarding the prophecies of Rev. 9 and 11. The essential heart of her message that Dan. 8:14 pointed to the final cleansing of the universe by eradication of sin and sinners in the last

judgment as the antitype of Yom Kippur was correct and well in advance of contemporary non-Adventist religious thought.

The errancy here brought to view should not trouble us excessively. We have never taught that inspiration is mechanical or inerrant. Such is not even the case with Scripture. Paul could use faulty arguments to arrive at right conclusions (see 1 Cor. 9:6-10; Gal. 3:16), and it does not concern us for we understand that God is not on trial in ~~logic~~.⁵⁴

Only when we see the writings of Ellen G. White as given ~~for~~ practical purposes⁵⁵ will we be delivered from the Maginot line mentality whereby we think we must defend every syllable she wrote as one handed down miraculously from heaven. In an age where research has no end and no limits, where scholars are discovering historical errors in chapter after chapter of *Great Controversy*, we had better quickly reconcile ourselves to a tenable theory of inspiration rather than a cultic and superstitious one which is quite indefensible. There is no way of turning back the clock of time. Ours is a new era where error of every type is gladly exposed by researchers. In a time of speedy communication and rapid publishing, a single significant discovery can reach at least half the church in a matter of days. Any administrative body that attempts to behave as though now is the nineteenth century or the Middle Ages cannot hope to retain the confidence of an educated laity. On the other hand, an open and honest spirit will earn and claim that confidence.

EARLY VIEWS OF THE NATURE OF ELLEN G. WHITE'S INSPIRATION

Repeatedly, W.C. White in his letters deplors those who wish to make his mother's writings a basis for doctrine. He insists that they are not canonical, nor verbally inspired. He tells us that his mother refused to make doctrinal pronouncements as a rule, and wished people to go to the Bible for light. This was specially demonstrated over the years of controversy on the ~~daily~~.

Not only W.C. White, but W.W. Prescott, A.G. Daniells, W.A. Spicer, and many other leaders saw the danger of wrong views of inspiration. (See appendix on this topic.) Several predicted that a crisis for the church would arise because the laity had not been rightly informed on the matter. We find, for example, W.W. Prescott writing in 1915 to W.C. White as follows:

Takoma Park, April 6, 1915

Dear Brother White:

I appreciate your letter of March 12, and I thank you for your message of sympathy concerning my father's death.

I have noted what you have said about your mother's condition, although you neglected to inclose [*sic*] the statement which you mentioned. When I see these early believers like your mother, my father, and Eld. Olsen passing away so rapidly, and then think of how little has really been accomplished in seriously warning the whole world of the impending second advent, I am led to wonder whether any of us now connected with this movement will after all live to see the consummation. It is a serious question.

It seems to me that **a large responsibility rests upon those of us who know that there are serious errors in our authorized books and yet make no special effort to correct them.** The people and our average ministers trust us to furnish them with reliable statements, and they use our books as sufficient authority in their sermons, but

we let them go on year after year asserting things which we know to be untrue. I cannot feel that this is right. It seems to me that **we are betraying our trust and deceiving the ministers and people.** It appears to me that **there is much more anxiety to prevent a possible shock to some trustful people than to correct error.**

Your letter indicates a desire on your part to help me but I fear that it is a little late. The experience of the last six or eight years and especially the things concerning which I talked with you have had their effect on me in several ways. I have had some hard shocks to get over, and after giving the best of my life to this movement I have little peace and satisfaction in connection with it, and I am driven to the conclusion that the only thing for me to do is to do quietly what I can do conscientiously, and leave the others to go on without me. Of course this is far from a happy ending to my life-work, but this seems to be the best adjustment that I am able to make. **The way your mother's writings have been handled and the false impression concerning them which is still fostered among the people have brought great perplexity and trial to me. It seems to me that what amounts to deception, though probably not intentional, has been practiced in making some of her books, and that no serious effort has been made to disabuse the minds of the people of what was known to be their wrong view concerning her writings.** But it is no use to go into these matters. **I have talked with you for years about them, but it brings no change. I think however that we are drifting toward a crisis which will come sooner or later and perhaps sooner.** A very strong feeling of reaction has already set in.

It has been very quiet here for a few weeks, as many of the brethren are in the field. The weather has been quite cold, and we had about five inches of snow last Sabbath, but it is more like Spring today. My mother is quite feeble, although she bears up full better than I really expected. She misses father very much. They lived together more than sixty-seven years.

The work of the office seems to be prospering and we are all very busy trying to meet the demands upon us. I should be glad to hear from you at any time. If you can properly do so, I would be glad to have you express to your mother my sympathy for her affliction.

Yours faithfully,
(Signed) W.W. Prescott

Handwritten: ~~Have~~ written this myself as I did not wish to dictate it to anyone."⁵⁶

Only in very recent years have our contemporary leaders and ministers begun to understand this matter of inspiration as it actually functioned for Ellen G. White. We now know that Ellen G. White was in the habit of submitting some of her writings to others for criticism and correction lest she fail to rightly express certain doctrinal truths. When J.H. Waggoner failed to submit some corrections, she expressed her displeasure.

When one comes to the records of the revision of *Great Controversy* in 1911, one finds that at least half of the account of that revision has to do with the fruitless search for evidence in support of the chapter on the French Revolution explaining Rev. 11. The brethren would have done better to have gone first to Uriah Smith from whom Ellen White copied profusely, and then to Storrs from whom Smith copied, and then to Croly, the original writer of these materials — but an unreliable writer historically.

Other chapters in *Great Controversy* also cannot be substantiated in detail historically. The chapter on Huss errs at several points, and so does the chapter on the Waldenses. Prescott listed some of his criticisms of the 1888 *Great Controversy* as recorded in our appendix. (See appendix on authority and inspiration, etc.)

The evidence points to a busy prophet of God, pursuing a strenuous course with many diverse duties, and doing them well, but of necessity securing all the human aid she could. She winnowed a mass of literature and distilled the best of it for a people who read little of outside works. We should be tremendously grateful. (See appendix, “Ellen G. White and the Charge of Plagiarism.”) But when we make her books additions to Scripture or turn them into infallible commentaries, we err theologically, historically and pastorally. The one who told us that the Bible was yet but dimly understood did not consider her writings to be the great microscope. She who told us we had but the first gleamings of the light, certainly did not consider her writings an addition to Scripture or their infallible commentator. Her words at Battle Creek are still appropriate now — more appropriate than when first given to our leaders:

But I do not ask you to take my words. Lay Sister White to one side. Do not quote my words again as long as you live until you can obey the Bible. When you make the Bible your food, your meat and your drink, when you make its principles the elements of your character, you will know better how to receive counsel from God. I exalt the precious word before you today. Do not repeat what I have said, saying “Sister White said this,” and “Sister White said that.” Find out what the Lord God of Israel says, and then do what He commands.⁵⁷

THE EARLY ADVENTIST HERMENEUTIC

Our Adventist pioneers, including Ellen G. White, based their distinctive positions on the sanctuary on the principle of analogy. The Old Testament sanctuary parable, the New Testament parable of the Ten Virgins, was constantly in their thinking, preaching and writing. Our first publications give overwhelming evidence for this. **This approach, linked to the proof-text method, had built-in inadequacies.**

From Hebrews they drew the words about the earthly sanctuary being “a copy and shadow of the heavenly ...” 8:5; 9:23, and from the parable of Matt. 25:1-13 they deduced a prophecy of the 1844 experience, with the shut door of verse 10 made particularly prominent.

Our pioneers applied the details of the sanctuary type and the details of the parable in a way their spiritual descendants could never do. It was assumed that both the type and the parable had a one-to-one relationship with the ultimate fulfilment. Thus because the sanctuary had two apartments on earth, so it must be in the heavenly. As there was a ministry for most of the year in the first apartment before the second, so there must be in heaven a corresponding ministry for most of the Christian age in heaven’s first apartment. In the parable of Matt. 25:1-13 such details as the midnight cry, and the shut door were applied to events in the year 1844. It was reasoned, for example, that the virgins did not represent the bride of Christ. Instead, the New Jerusalem was the bride. Similarly, the coming of the bridegroom is not the Advent but takes place beforehand, and that marriage is the reception by Christ of His kingdom rather than of His people. After the marriage will be the second coming, which is not to be confused with the coming of the bridegroom in the parable. The going in of the virgins to the marriage is not their literal joining Christ at the Advent, but a prior spiritual entrance by faith to His marriage in the invisible heavens. The closing of the door is the close of probation for “sinners” in 1844. Such were the pioneer positions, and exegetically all of

them were wrong. It is vital that we remember that the pioneers equated the invisible coming of Christ in Matt. 25 with His entrance into the second apartment above. See *Great Controversy*, 426. This also is exegetically indefensible.

Today, as our commentary points out, we do not fall into the error of interpreting types and parables in this manner. Types are never the basis for doctrine, and differ considerably from their antitypes, often teaching by way of contrast rather than comparison. Similarly, parables cannot be used as a basis for doctrine. Their purpose is usually to teach one main lesson, and therefore parables should not be interpreted allegorically.

As regards the sanctuary, our pioneers overlooked many things when they applied Heb. 8:5 and 9:23 as they did. Consider the following texts from the same book:

For since the law has but a shadow of the good things to come instead of the true form of these realities. (Heb. 10:1f RSV)

For when there is a change in the priesthood, there is necessarily a change in the law as well. For the one of whom these things are spoken belonged to another tribe, from which no one has ever served at the altar. For it is evident that our Lord was descended from Judah, and in connection with that tribe Moses said nothing about priests ... a former commandment is set aside because of its weakness and uselessness (for the law made nothing perfect); ... He has no need, like those high priests, to offer sacrifices daily, first for his own sins and then for those of the people; he did this once for all when he offered up himself. Indeed, the law appoints men in their weakness as high priests, but the word of the oath, which came later than the law, appoints a Son who has been made perfect for ever. (Heb. 7:12ff RSV)

... the priests go continually into the outer tent, ... but into the second only the high priest goes, and he but once a year, ... By this the Holy Spirit indicates that the way into the sanctuary (Most Holy place - NIV) is not yet opened as long as the outer tent is still standing (which is symbolic for the present age) ... he (Christ) entered once for all into the Holy Place (Most Holy - NIV), taking not the blood of goats and calves but his own blood, ... For Christ has entered, not into a sanctuary made with hands, a copy of the true one, but into heaven itself, ... Nor was it to offer himself repeatedly, as the high priest enters the Holy Place (Most Holy - NIV) yearly with blood not his own; ... As it is, he has appeared once for all at the end of the age to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. (Heb. 9:8ff RSV)

Thus according to Hebrews the type was not the very image of the heavenly reality, and fell very far short of it. As Christ is not like the earthly priest (He was not of the tribe of Levi, He was not a sinner, His ministry was not cut short by death, He had no need to make an offering for Himself, His sacrifice was not to be continually repeated) so the heavenly sanctuary is also different from the earthly. The first apartment of the earthly typified the Levitical era with its temporary and ineffectual rituals, while the second apartment symbolized heaven itself into which Christ entered —“within the veil” at His ascension. Hebrews says nothing about a heavenly presentation effecting our redemption, but says sin was put away by Christ’s sacrifice. Hebrews never applies the first apartment to anything in heaven above, but forgets it after alluding to its earthly position. Christ does not offer daily sacrifices and then an ultimate yearly one — His own sacrifice comprehends all — similarly the ministries of the earthly priest are all fulfilled by His death and ascension into the immediate presence of God. He is not like them, ever busy, ever standing, but His work is complete and He has sat down on the throne — for, unlike them, He is a King. As to the parable of Matt. 25, it should be

obvious that it was not given to predict events during the year 1844, but to point to Christ's actual Second Advent. The virgins represent the church whom Christ is united to at His coming. The eastern bridegroom came for his bride, and took her to his father's house for the wedding and the feast. The coming, the marriage, the feast, all belong to the one complex and do not symbolize events separated by over 135 years. **It is perfectly clear from Rev. 19:7-9 and the following verses that the marriage is not something before the Advent. It is at Christ's coming that His people are gathered to the marriage.** Then it is that ~~the~~ marriage of the Lamb has come, and his Bride has made herself ready." Only because the New Jerusalem is both the emblem and the home of the church is it called the Bride. To apply Luke 12:36 as our pioneers did, making the servants of the parable distinct from the bride is to make havoc of exegesis by allegorizing beyond permissible limits.

Neither does the shut door of Matt. 25:10 point to a close of probation for the wicked world in 1844. It images the separation at the end of time. And the midnight cry of the parable points not to a message of over a century ago, but a message yet future. *Christ's Object Lessons* is very clear on these matters. On the same basis as the pioneers worked, we conclude that half of professed Christians would have gone in with Christ by faith in 1844, but the fact is that only a tiny handful are claimed to have done that. We can put no stress whatever on the detail of ~~five~~ were wise, and five were foolish."

Note again Ellen G. White's summary of the position of the pioneers (except she does not here give their teaching on the shut door):

The coming of Christ as our high priest to the most holy place, for the cleansing of the sanctuary, brought to view in Dan. 8:14; the coming of the Son of man to the Ancient of Days, as presented in Dan. 7:13; and the coming of the Lord to His temple, foretold by Malachi, are descriptions of the same event; and this is also represented by the coming of the bridegroom to the marriage, described by Christ in the parable of the ten virgins, of Matt. 25.⁵⁸

Now it must be emphasized that Ellen G. White agreed with her brethren on these applications. They were hers also. She, like them, believed the parable applied to 1844 prophetically, and that the cry was the midnight cry, and the marriage not the Second advent at all. She believed the door of probation for "sinners" closed in 1844, and limited her ministry to "the little flock" of Advent believers. It took seven years for Ellen G. White, her husband, and the tiny group of Sabbathkeepers to change their minds on the shut door. Ellen G. White had, like prophets before her, not rightly understood the visions granted her. To her in the 1840's, those visions confirmed "the shut door" position of Sabbathkeeping Adventists.

The very fact that her early statements on probation's close (for those who had rejected the message, meaning the apostate church and the wicked world) were removed in the 1851 reprints and later is the best evidence of the change of interpretation. While Ellen G. White never held to an extreme shut door position as though all but Sabbathkeepers were lost, and as though even Sabbathkeepers also had had their probation closed — she certainly first understood the shut door in a very different way to her understanding from 1851 onwards. And this being the case, it is not at all difficult to see that likewise her understanding of ~~the~~ cleansing of the sanctuary" could also have been imperfect. The new emphases in her later uses of the Day of Atonement indicate this. The entirely different presentation in *Christ's Object Lessons* to *Great Controversy* on Matt. 25:1-13 is extremely significant.

Ellen G. White over the years held three different understandings of Matt. 25:1-13. This change matches her change on such matters as the law in Galatians and the covenants. (See appendix quotation from Tim Crosby.) We do her wrong, therefore, to make her writings the sovereign interpreter of Holy Scripture. She never made **that** error, but continually revised even her written statements on the basis of continuing light from the Word. The church, if it is to prosper, must follow that example.

WAS THE INVESTIGATIVE JUDGMENT A LANDMARK? SHOULD IT BE RETAINED BECAUSE OF E.G. WHITE'S USE OF IT?

Few Adventists are aware that the investigative judgment was a "late-comer" amongst us. It was not taught by our pioneers of 1845. It was not held by Edson, Crosier, or the Whites during the 1840's at any time. When Ellen G. White refers to the experience of searching out the landmarks in the forties, it is a plain fact of history that the investigative judgment teaching was not among these. Neither do we find in the original visions any reference to an investigative judgment.

The cleansing of the sanctuary was certainly a landmark. By this term was meant the eschatological antitype of the Day of Atonement. But as Don Neufeld has written recently, we should not equate the cleansing of the sanctuary with the investigative judgment.⁵⁹

This writer does not question the eschatological cleansing of the sanctuary, and the fact that the Day of Atonement and Dan. 8:14 point to that. Such positions were landmarks of our pioneers and I accept them heartily. But the close of the 1848 Sabbath conferences found a group believing all that, but not believing in the investigative judgment. This position is sound. A pre-Advent judgment decision as Christ is about to close His intercession is Biblical, but not an attenuated investigative process.

The investigative judgment was part of a complex of prophetic interpretation during the 1850's and later decades which began to be revised around the turn of the century. The interpretation of the "daily" of Dan. 8:13 was first revised, and thus a new view given to 8:14 as well. We find these new positions in the *Bible Readings* of 1915, Spicer's *Certainties of the Second Advent Movement*, and the writings of W.W. Prescott, and L.E. Froom. Similarly, by the early years of the twentieth century the opposition to the seeing of Antiochus Epiphanes in Daniel was crumbling, and key scholars amongst us asserted his presence there. Again, the interpretation of the trumpets was looked at afresh, and Litch's position on Aug. 11, 1840, was rejected as false, and the exegetical application of Rev. 11:19 to 1844 also came under questioning. Besides these, the application of the eleventh chapter of Revelation to the French Revolution became a problem to us, until finally it was admitted that there was no way of sustaining the *Great Controversy* position.

As the years have passed, a new approach to Bible study has brought many other changes in interpretation. We no longer teach an East-West Armageddon, or Turkey coming to its end, or that "many shall run to and fro" has to do with increase of knowledge in science, communication, and transport. No longer do our New Testament exegetes feel that Matt. 25:1-13 can be rightly interpreted as in the 1840's. Problems found in Dan. 8 and Heb. 6-10 have now been investigated with different conclusions to those of our pioneers. Dr. Cottrell's rehearsal of the history of the Daniel committee demonstrates this. **It is time we recognize that the investigative judgment is not now, and never was, a landmark of this church. Ellen G. White's use of it is no more proof for it than her application of Matt. 25:1-12 and Rev. 9:15 and Rev. 11:9, 19 are proof for those admittedly erroneous positions.** If the prophet of God could grow in her understanding, and courageously change some of her

positions (as illustrated in *Christ's Object Lessons* on Matt. 25 compared with *Great Controversy*) why should the modern church hesitate to do so?

Over the years we have changed our doctrinal positions regarding: the Trinity, the deity of Christ, the "sinful nature" of Christ, the atonement, the daily, Joel 3, Dan. 11, Rev. 16, Dan. 12:4, Isa. 2, Isa. 7:14, "this generation" of Matt. 24:34, the trumpets, the seals, 2 Thess. 2, "within the veil," Heb. 8 and 9 as the basis for our sanctuary teachings, the literality of apartments in heaven, and other matters. (By "change" we refer to a new position taken by many in administrative, or academic leadership. We do not mean unanimity in all cases. We still have some Arians amongst us.)

Not the least of the changes has to do with our understanding of the nature of Ellen G. White's inspiration. Until comparatively recently most of our people believed that the vast bulk of Ellen G. White's writings were original with her. Today we know that hundreds of pages (speaking very conservatively) of her books incorporate un-credited references from other nineteenth century writers. This phenomenon confronts us in the Conflict of the Ages series, the *Testimonies*, *Ministry of Healing*, *Education*, etc. *Great Controversy* uses approximately one hundred sources and certain of them prolifically. When we compare, for example, Ellen G. White's story of Luther with that of Adam's abridgement of D'Aubigné, the original contribution of Ellen G. White is slight. Conclusions reached in the White Estate assert that "the immediate and in some cases the exclusive source of the objective and mundane historical narrative in *Great Controversy* was the work of historians not visions."⁶⁰ Furthermore, these borrowed materials include errors of fact.

In doctrinal statements also, Ellen G. White borrowed from others. For example, the sanctuary doctrine is set forth in *Spirit of Prophecy* and in *Great Controversy* in terms borrowed from Uriah Smith or J.N. Andrews. Let us see, therefore, the relevance of the following admonitions:

It is a fact that we have the truth, and we must hold with tenacity to the positions that cannot be shaken; but we must not look with suspicion upon any new light which God may send, and say, Really, we cannot see that we need any more light than the old truth which we have hitherto received, and in which we are settled. While we hold to this position, the testimony of the True Witness applies to our cases its rebuke, "And knowest not that thou art wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked." Those who feel rich and increased with goods and in need of nothing, are in a condition of blindness as to their true condition before God, and they know it not.

We must not think, "Well, we have all the truth, we understand the main pillars of our faith, and we may rest on this knowledge." The truth is an advancing truth, and we must walk in the increasing light.

A brother asked, "Sister White, do you think we must understand the truth for ourselves? Why can we not take the truths that others have gathered together, and believe them because they have investigated the subjects, and then we shall be free to go on without the taxing of the powers of the mind in the investigation of all these subjects? Do you not think that these men who have brought out the truth in the past were inspired of God?"

I dare not say they were not led of God, for Christ leads into all truth; but when it comes to inspiration in the fullest sense of the word, I answer, No. I believe that God has given them a work to do, but if they are not fully consecrated to God at all times, they

will weave self and their peculiar traits of character into what they are doing, and will put their mould upon the work, and fashion men in religious experience after their own pattern. It is dangerous for us to make flesh our arm. We should lean upon the arm of Infinite Power. God has been revealing this to us for years. We have living faith in our hearts and reach out for larger knowledge and more advanced light.

A spirit of Pharisaism has been coming in upon the people who claim to believe the truth for these last days. They are self-satisfied. They have said, ~~—~~“We have the truth. There is no more light for the people of God.” But we are not safe when we take a position that we will not accept anything else than that upon which we have settled as truth. We should take the Bible, and investigate it closely for ourselves. We should dig in the mine of God’s word for truth. ~~—~~“Light is sown for the righteous, and gladness for the upright in heart.” Some have asked me if I thought there was any more light for the people of God. Our minds have become so narrow that we do not seem to understand that the Lord has a mighty work for us. Increasing light is to shine upon us; for ~~—~~the path of the just is as the shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day.”

There is no excuse for anyone in taking the position that there is no more truth to be revealed, and that all our expositions of Scripture are without an error. The fact that certain doctrines have been held as truth for many years by our people, is not a proof that our ideas are infallible. Age will not make error into truth, and truth can afford to be fair.

We have many lessons to learn, and many, many to unlearn. God and heaven alone are infallible. Those who think that they will never have to give up a cherished view, never have occasion to change an opinion, will be disappointed. As long as we hold to our own ideas and opinions with determined persistency we cannot have the unity for which Christ prayed.

God sees that our leading men have need of greater light.

Whenever the people of God are growing in grace, they will be constantly obtaining a clearer understanding of His word. They will discern new light and beauty in its sacred truths. This has been true in the history of the church in all ages, and thus it will continue to the end. But as real spiritual life declines, it has even been the tendency to cease to advance in the knowledge of the truth. Men rest satisfied with the light already received from God’s word, and discourage any further investigation of the Scriptures. They become conservative, and seek to avoid discussion.

The fact that there is no controversy or agitation among God’s people should not be regarded as conclusive evidence that they are holding fast to sound doctrine. There is reason to fear that they may not be clearly discriminating between truth and error. When no new questions are started by investigation of the Scriptures, when no difference of opinion arises which will set men to searching the Bible for themselves, to make sure that they have the truth, there will be many now, as in ancient times, who will hold to tradition, and worship they know not what.

I have been shown that many who profess to have a knowledge of present truth, know not what they believe. They do not understand the evidences of their faith. They have no just appreciation of the work for the present time. When the time of trial shall come, there are men now preaching to others, who will find, upon examining the positions

they hold, that there are many things for which they can give no satisfactory reason. Until thus tested, they knew not their great ignorance.

As a people, we are called individually to be students of prophecy. We must watch with earnestness that we may discern any ray of light which God shall present to us. We are to catch the first gleamings of truth; and through prayerful study, clearer light may be obtained, which can be brought before others.⁶¹

THE LIMITATIONS OF PROPHETS - ESPECIALLY NON-CANONICAL PROPHETS

M.L. Andreasen is supposed to have commented in class that if the day ever came that the writings of Ellen G. White should be considered for inclusion in Scripture then probably one percent of them would finally be admitted to the canon.⁶² Undoubtedly he was referring to the fact that the words of non-canonical writers are particularly conditioned by local circumstances, and are not therefore in detail or as rules applicable always to later situations. Because God's attention to matters is proportionate to their importance, He has exercised more miraculous superintendence over Scripture than over the writings of Ellen G. White. This is not to speak of degrees of inspiration, but rather degrees of revelation. God's work is ever perfect for its purpose — but that purpose is His not ours. Only when we remember that inspired writings operate as a moral test, ever leaving room for doubt by the ungodly — only then will we cease to be disturbed by that which does not match our concept of perfection in those writings. We gladly walk under the guiding light of the sun although it has spots on it, and we are grateful for our eyes though some optometrists assert they are most deficient optical instruments. Who would reject a wheaten loaf because of a tiny amount of chaff within it? Constantly before us is the phenomenon of a church composed of defective and deficient sinners yet precious in the sight of God and all heaven. With such a church He proposes to bring salvation to millions. God apparently chooses to be less fussy than we proud mortals. We should remember the words of Elton Trueblood:

It is as much an evil to say that we know the truth perfectly as it is to say that there is no truth to know.

The doctrine of necessary fallibility is the philosophical equivalent of the religious doctrine of original sin. This latter doctrine asserts, with much factual evidence to support it, that a chronic sinfulness dogs our steps at every point, especially in our claims to virtue, which are tainted with the sin of pride. Every human institution, no matter how noble its aims, is inevitably involved in the struggle for power and prestige, and this, so far as we can see, is not likely to be lessened with the passage of centuries. In short, sin is not a matter of cultural lag but is intrinsic to the situation, part of the price which man pays for his self-consciousness and relative freedom from external constraint. Just as all our efforts to be virtuous are tainted with sin, so all our efforts to achieve the truth are liable to error. We correct some errors only to make others, frequently making one in the very act of correcting another. We are very small; our grasp of reality is very slight; to claim anything else is to be arrogant and presumptuous.

Any religious doctrine which claims infallibility, whether it be that of Biblical inerrancy or papal claims or any other, is bound in the end to fail to sustain itself intellectually because it runs head on into the fact of human failure. We are always in the finite predicament, even when we are most religious, and often **especially** when we are most religious. If our human capacity to err needs any demonstration, it is given to us constantly by the fact that we have to reconstruct our theories and reassess our facts.

The changes that are necessary, as a result of further insight, include not only the physical world but the spiritual world also.

It is conceivable that, by some miracle, God could make an exception to liability to error by creating an infallible Bible or an infallible papacy, but how could we ever know that this is the case? Infallibility necessarily includes not only an infallible revelation but the infallibility of the human mind to **judge** that revelation. It is helpful to realize that the Bible never asserts its own infallibility. Even if there were some institutions which had never made any mistakes, in precisely defined areas of inerrancy, how could we know that must always be the case or is intrinsically the case? In the nature of things the future is not yet, and the evidence is never all in.

It is chiefly by a more realistic appraisal of human nature that we see the error of inerrancy. Man has made great strides in many areas of experience, including the spiritual, the artistic and the scientific, but he always carries his own limitations with him. He is hindered, not only by his own ignorance but even by his own greed and pride. Any group which claims at any point to be free from these limitations is guilty of idolatry, confusing the position of the human with that of the divine.

All honest doubt has a quasi-religious or at least a moral character about it, because it shows an overriding concern for the truth. Those who do not care tremendously about the truth do not bother to doubt, for doubt entails work. The dangerous man is not the man who doubts, but the man who does not care.

The truth *is*, even though it may be beyond us. This is an immense practical help in that, while we are saved from the delusion of supposing that we are more than we are, it is nevertheless worth while to use all the means at our disposal to help one another to get closer and closer to the truth which is. If we hold a philosophy which denies the existence of objective truth we necessarily cut the nerve of moral effort, since there is no use in disciplining our minds for participation in a meaningless endeavour. But the endeavour is neither meaningless nor profitless. Though the truth is something which we cannot grasp with perfection, much of our glory lies in the fact that we can make approximations to it. To see through a glass darkly is better than not to see at all.⁶³

Many reading the writings of Paul have wondered at his anacolutha, his digressions, his logical complexities and inadequacies — yet these writings have been the source of every religious revival since Pentecost. Similarly, those studying the Synoptic problem find apparent contradictions at every turn, but if wise, give thanks to God for His holy Word therein. Even when we turn to the fourth Gospel and find it impossible to draw the line between the words of John and those of Jesus as in chapter 3, we do not thrust that holy book from us but fold it to our hearts. It is not becoming for weak, ignorant, animated dust to demand of God more than their actual needs require. Let us take Scripture just as it reads, and none of us will be lost. And let us take the writings of Ellen G. White, confident that God has spoken through her in a way He has not spoken through us, and acknowledge them as light, though a lesser light when compared with Holy Writ. Let us read them for pastoral admonition, for spiritual insight, but not as an Enquire Within upon everything, or as a ready means of avoiding the rigorous task of Biblical exegesis. Then with our eyes on Jesus and His cross, knowing the necessity of His imputed righteousness in order to survive the judgment, we shall turn from trivia to our holy task of giving the saving gospel to a lost world.

Some things must be torn down, some things must be built up. The old treasures must be reset in the framework of truth. They (Adventist preachers) are to preach God's word; their testimony must not be moulded by the opinions and ideas that have been regarded as sound, but by the word of God which liveth and abideth for ever.

I have been shown that Jesus will reveal to us precious old truths in a new light, if we are ready to receive them.⁶⁴

THE AUTHORITY OF ELLEN G. WHITE

Seventh-day Adventism and the writings of Ellen G. White have been inseparably linked for well over a century. The conjunction began with our birth as a people and continues to the present. The union is reflected by every phase of our work — evangelistic, educational, medical, publishing, etc.

Some in the church wish now to establish a cleavage, and to relegate Ellen G. White to obscurity as an embarrassing phenomenon. They see her either as a false prophet, or a good woman misled by physiological and/or psychological maladies. Others insist that the Bible should only be understood through her eyes, and that she is the final arbiter of all claims to truth. M.L. Andreasen was correct when he wrote that “The ever-present question of the position which Sister White should hold among us is a prolific cause of difficulty.”⁶⁵ We would suggest that until that question is settled the denomination is bound to limp, rather than go forth “conquering and to conquer.”

In this connection, certain facts stand out. Protestants have been agreed through their history on *Sola Scriptura*, and the phenomenon of “the Bible plus some Johnny-come-lately” is the well-known characteristic of a cult. The sure evidence for the latter is when the Bible is made to take a subordinate position. We have seen this in Swedenborgianism, Christian Israelites, Christian Science, Mormonism, Jehovah's Witnesses, etc.

Scripture is emphatic that “the faith” was “once for all delivered to the saints” in the first century. Jude 3. The revelation through Christ attested by the apostles was the greatest revelation ever made to men and the climactic one. Heb. 1:1. Any subsequent revelation claiming the right to judge Christ's words, rather than to submit to being judged by them thereby indicates its falsity. I Kings 13 is a solemn warning against superseding the Word of the Lord by the words of one claiming to be a prophet.

Now there dwelt an old prophet in Bethel. And his sons came and told him all that the man of God had done that day in Bethel; the words also which he had spoken to the king, they told to their father. And their father said to them, “Which way did he go?” And his sons showed him the way which the man of God who came from Judah had gone. And he said to his sons, “Saddle the ass for me.” So they saddled the ass for him and he mounted it. And he went after the man of God, and found him sitting under an oak; and he said to him, “Are you the man of God who came from Judah?” And he said, “I am.” Then he said to him, “Come home with me and eat bread.” And he said, “I may not return with you, or go in with you neither will I eat bread nor drink water with you in this place; for it was said to me by the word of the Lord, ‘You shall neither eat bread nor drink water there, nor return by the way that you came.’” —And he said to him, “I also am a prophet as you are, and an angel spoke to me by the word of the Lord, saying, ‘Bring him back with you into your house that he may eat bread and drink water.’” —But he lied to him. So he went back with him, and ate bread in his house, and drank water.

And as they sat at the table the word of the Lord came to the prophet who had brought him back; and he cried to the man of God who came from Judah, —Thus says, the Lord, Because you have disobeyed the word of the Lord, and have not kept the commandment which the Lord your God commanded you, but have come back, and have eaten bread and drunk water in the place of which he said to you, —Eat no bread, and drink no water;” your body shall not come to the tomb of your fathers.’ —And after he had eaten bread and drunk, he saddled the ass for the prophet whom he had brought back. And as he went away a lion met him on the road and killed him. And his body was thrown in the road, and the ass stood beside it; the lion also stood beside the body. (1 Kings 13:11-24 RSV)

It is true that Scripture contains the doctrine of spiritual gifts, and it is also true that manifestations of the gift of prophecy are promised for the last days. Joel 2:28. But:

The Spirit was not given — nor can it ever be bestowed — to supersede the Bible; for the Scriptures explicitly state that the word of God is the standard by which all teaching and experience must be tested. Says the apostle John, —Believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world.” 1 John 4:1. And Isaiah declares, —To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.” Isa. 8:20.⁶⁶

The writer of those words suggested that her readers apply that test to her own work.⁶⁷ Never did Ellen G. White claim to be a medium of truth that superseded Scripture. Instead, she affirmed that did we but understand the Word, her writings would be unnecessary. Ellen G. White clearly believed in the primacy of Scripture and opposed those who wished to place her writings on a level with the Word, or pragmatically above it. Thus she wrote:

If you are in doubt upon any subject you must first consult the Scriptures.⁶⁸

The testimonies of Sister White should not be carried to the front. God’s Word is the unerring standard. The Testimonies are not to take the place of the Word. ... Let all prove their position from the Scriptures and substantiate every point they claim as truth from the revealed Word of God. ... And never do we want any soul to bring in the Testimonies ahead of the Bible.⁶⁹

From Ellen G. White’s own pen came counsel that belief in her specific role was not to be made a test of church membership or fellowship.

In the last vision given at Battle Creek I was shown that an unwise course was taken at ... in regard to the visions at the time of the organization of the church there. There were some in ... who were God’s children, and yet doubted the visions. Others had no opposition, yet dared not take a decided stand in regard to them. Some were sceptical, and they had sufficient cause to make them so. The false visions and fanatical exercises, and the wretched fruits following, had an influence upon the cause in Wisconsin to make minds jealous of everything bearing the name of visions. All these things should have been taken into consideration, and wisdom exercised. There should be no trial or labour with those who have never seen the individual having visions, and who have had no personal knowledge of the influence of the visions. Such should not be deprived of the benefits and privileges of the church, if their Christian course is otherwise correct, and they have formed a good Christian character.

Brother G. sought to move with great caution. He knew that the class who opposed the visions were wrong, that they were not genuine believers in the truth; and therefore, to shake off these clogs, he proposed to receive none into the church who did not believe the third angel's message and the visions. This kept out some few precious souls who had not fought against the visions. They dared not unite with the church, fearing that they should commit themselves upon that which they did not understand and fully believe. And there were those at hand ready to prejudice these conscientious ones, and to place matters before them in the worst possible light. Some have felt grieved and offended because of the conditions of membership, and since the organization their feelings of dissatisfaction have greatly increased. Strong prejudice has governed them.⁷⁰

It has long been our claim that our doctrines are based on Scripture alone, and came solely through the study of the Word. See Froom's *Movement of Destiny*, 91-112.

It is true that in the early days of the movement, when our brethren were yet dependent upon the proof-text method, and when every man had a different interpretation, at such a time God through Ellen G. White indicated some evidence from Scripture which decided the point at issue. For example, the early believers were not united on the matter of when to begin the Sabbath. But J.N. Andrews had suggested that Scripture taught sundown as the dawning of the holy day, and Ellen G. White's revelation confirmed that Scriptural truth. She did not originate a new position on the basis of vision. A study of the chronology of her visions indicates that they followed, as a rule, rather than preceded, Bible study on a specific doctrine. The second coming of Christ, the seventh-day Sabbath, the cleansing of the sanctuary, health reform, etc., were all taught amongst us before Ellen G. White claimed visions upon such subjects. Ellen G. White was not an innovator.

Ellen G. White refused to be the arbiter in matters of doctrinal controversy. Time after time she was solicited to end the ~~daily~~ controversy by some authoritative word from the Lord, but this she refused to do. Instead she wrote:

I have words to speak to my brethren east and west, north and south. I request that my writings shall not be used as the leading argument to settle questions over which there is now so much controversy. I entreat of Elders H, I, J, and others of our leading brethren, that they make no reference to my writings to sustain their view of ~~the daily~~.

It has been presented to me that this is not a subject of vital importance. I am instructed that our brethren are making a mistake in magnifying the importance of the difference in the views that are held. I cannot consent that any of my writings shall be taken as settling this matter. The true meaning of ~~the daily~~ is not to be made a test question.

I now ask that my ministering brethren shall not make use of my writings in their arguments regarding this question [~~the daily~~]; for I have had no instruction on the point under discussion.⁷¹

It is true that at times Ellen G. White rebuked specific people teaching heresy, but this was always on the basis of Scriptural truth earlier made clear. Never in a dispute that was novel, and unrelated to previous positions, did she attempt to legislate as to what was truth and what was error. She opposed the early extreme perfectionists in our ranks on the basis that their theories of holiness were contrary to the truths of Scripture as understood by previous movements of God such as the Reformation and the Miller revival. She affirmed Ballenger was rejecting ~~mighty~~ truths held for ages" and saw him as challenging the validity of the

Advent movement already confirmed through Bible study and the witness of the Spirit. Kellogg's pantheism was a hoary error seeming to challenge the personality of God and the reality of His dwelling-place. The holy flesh fanatics of Indiana were but duplicating the type of extremism rejected by Luther and other approved servants of God.

With Adventism many heresies have circulated, including anti-trinitarianism, Arianism, the non-personality of the Holy Spirit, false views on prophecy such as Turkey as the King of the north, and an east-west Armageddon. But Ellen G. White never made these the object of direct attack. While refusing to promulgate such teachings herself, she never drew the attention of the church members to her gift as the final arbiter of truth. In times of crisis when flagrant error threatened the church, as with prophets before her, she invoked the words of prior messengers (Scripture). This is one of the marks of an authentic message of God — endorsement rather than innovation.

We believe that Ellen G. White's own perception of her role has not yet been understood by the body of believers. Consider the following plain statements.

Little heed is given to the Bible, and the Lord has given a lesser light to lead men and women to the greater light.⁷²

But notwithstanding all this [the sufficiency of the Word of God to enlighten the most beclouded mind and the fact that it may be understood by those who have any desire to understand it], some who profess to make the Word of God their study, are found living in direct opposition to its plainest teachings. Then, to leave men and women without excuse, God gives plain and pointed testimonies, bringing them back to the word that they have neglected to follow. The Word of God abounds in general principles for the formation of correct habits of living, and the testimonies, general and personal, have been calculated to call their attention more especially to these principles.⁷³

If you had made God's word your study, with a desire to reach the Bible standard and attain to Christian perfection, you would not have needed the *Testimonies*. It is because you have neglected to acquaint yourselves with God's inspired Book that He has sought to reach you by simple, direct testimonies, calling your attention to the words of inspiration which you had neglected to obey, and urging you to fashion your lives in accordance with its pure and elevated teachings.

The written testimonies are not to give new light, but to impress vividly upon the heart the truths of inspiration already revealed ... Additional truth is not brought out; but God has through the *Testimonies* simplified the great truths already given, and in His own chosen way brought them before the people, to awaken and impress the mind with them, that all may be left without excuse.

The very essential principles of godliness are not understood, because there is not a hungering and thirsting for Bible knowledge, purity of heart, and holiness of life. The *Testimonies* are not to belittle the Word of God, but to exalt it, and attract minds to it, that the beautiful simplicity of truth may impress all.⁷⁴

The attitude of many to the prophetic gift has been superstitious and cultic rather than Scriptural. The gift of prophecy does not make its possessor more than human. It does not confer omniscience and guarantee against fallibility. This church has never officially held to the view of inspiration called "inerrancy." (See appendix on "Authority, Inspiration and

Inerrancy.”) But in practical situations, time and again we have as individuals acted contrary to our official stand.

John the Baptist was the greatest among the prophets according to Jesus. But his view of truth was exceedingly limited. He expected a different type of Messiah from Jesus, and his view of the divine kingdom was erroneous. To John the Messiah would be one immediately ushering in the kingdom of glory. We should observe also that not only was John’s understanding of truth imperfect, but that his main role was to rebuke sin and to point to Christ, rather than to coin doctrine, or predict the future in great detail.

Nor is the case otherwise with some other mighty men of God. The apostles after Christ’s resurrection still clung to errors regarding the plan of heaven. They thought the kingdom was to be restored to the Jews. In other words, they clung to a shut door heresy, believing the Gentiles were still excluded. It took a miracle — the vision to Peter — and other manifestations such as the gift of tongues to Gentiles — to convince the brethren otherwise. Inerrancy does not belong to the servants of God, even His most privileged servants. Neither does immaculate behaviour. Paul and Barnabas quarrelled, and the former may have been too hard on John Mark. Peter backslid after Pentecost. See Gal. 2:11-15.

Too many want better bread than can be made from grain. But God, who has given us light to walk by, from a sun with spots, does not consent to work according to human expectations. Even the Bible is a shock to our prejudices, as was Christ the Living Word. Does not every one of us think he could have improved on Scripture? Would we not have chosen a Book that listed the infallible doctrines in its first chapter, and provided such overwhelming evidence of its divine authorship in the second that every atheist would be humbled and convinced? Would we not have made sure that somewhere in the New Testament there would be repeated the command to hallow the seventh day?

The Jews rejected Christ because **He was not such a revelation of God as they expected.** The Jews rejected Christ since **He was not such a revelation of God as they “deserved.”** They had woven a doctrinal fabric which fit into their ideas of how God should act. When the reality did not fit **their** expectations, they reacted violently. **The same dangers remain with us today.** It is a truth which needs to be constantly kept in mind that at every religious crisis, God acts in unanticipated ways which are usually contrary to most believer’s expectations **and** desires. The plain truth is that we expect a great deal from God and others, but very little from ourselves. This arrogance is rarely recognized for what it is. God is not primarily concerned with making us prophets, or theologians, or infallible. The real difficulties of Scripture do not concern what we don’t understand, but what we do — such as the two great commandments. Scripture is essentially moral, for two-thirds of life is conduct, and the work of Scriptural prophets was usually to apply the law and offer the gospel, rather than to set forth esoteric truths with technical precision.

Because of our own weakness, we long for some oracle that will enable us to stand without perpetual bewilderment. Not even Scripture is that oracle. God’s revelatory agencies are in the business of building holy characters, not geniuses. Heaven is concerned with our practice of truth, not just knowledge of it, and therefore it concentrates on practical matters. In Scripture, truth is revealed in such a fashion as compels us to constantly admit our dependence upon God, and our residual ignorance and fallibility. Thus the New Testament has very few rules, but great principles. As a result, the believer is thrown upon God in continual humble dependence for moment by moment guidance. This develops character, particularly faith and humility.

All this is most relevant as we consider what sort of instrument God would choose to help this special movement of the latter days. He would not act contrary to His way in previous times. Any special messenger from Him would be one who gave priority to earlier attested words of God, and whose chief task was to speak to the saints ~~for~~ their upbuilding and encouragement and consolation.” Such a messenger would not be inerrant, immaculate, nor omni-gifted.

It is vital we recognize what theologians call the divine economy of miracle. God never does miraculously what can be done naturally. He sends the sunshine and the rain, but He does not harvest the crop, or prepare it for eating. The Christ who was prepared to raise Lazarus was not prepared to roll away the stone. He who turned water into wine did not fill the pots with water. Similarly, when Scripture was written, God did not dictate word after word. For the writing of the Gospels, He chose men who had been with Christ, or were close friends of those who had had that privilege. Matthew and Luke drew much of their narratives from the previous one by Mark. Only one percent of Mark is not found in the other two synoptic Gospels. Again, for setting forth the theology of the church, God could have chosen any humble believer, and dictated truth to him for the saints. Instead, He chose one learned in all the theological lore of the times, and gifted with theological genius — Paul. When working through Paul, God pursued His customary economy of miracle. The epistles were not as a rule the result of visions. From Chloe, Paul heard of the situation at Corinth, not from a dream of the night.

It is ignorance of the true nature of inspiration that has caused many problems for Seventh-day Adventists. Our leaders at the 1919 Bible conference recognized this fact. (See appendix on ~~—~~Authority, Inspiration and Inerrancy.”) Most of us have pagan views of revelation akin to the devotees of the Delphic oracle. Did the wise man learn by prophetic vision that ~~—~~a wise son makes a glad father, but a foolish son is a sorrow to his mother,” that ~~—~~hatred stirs up strife,” that ~~—~~anxiety in a man’s heart weighs him down, but a good word makes him glad,” that ~~—~~a slothful man will not catch his prey,” and that ~~—~~it is better to live in a corner of the housetop than in a house shared with a contentious woman”? Did the Psalmist need a vision before he could urge us to ~~—~~worship and bow down”?

God does not even give prophets more than they need, and every work of God, in this sin-cursed world, is marked with the cross of humiliation, imperfection, and surprise.

Ellen G. White not only refused to claim infallibility, but gave tangible evidence that such a claim would have been erroneous. In *Early Writings*, 173, 185, 186, she presents the Herod who had slain John the Baptist as the Herod who also took James the brother of Peter. This is erroneous, and so is the explanatory footnote. Ellen G. White sometimes named the wrong author of a Bible verse, gave wrong geographical or chronological locations, and confused disparate items. It was possible for her to misread Scripture as when she numbered wrongly the allies of Abraham and the number of generations that were contemporary with Adam.⁷⁵ Some non-biblical traditions were accepted by her, such as the myths about Simon Magus. See *Sketches from the Life of Paul*, 328 and consult articles on Simon in comprehensive Bible dictionaries or encyclopaedias such as *HERE*, 11:515, 523. The remarkable thing is that most of these errors are so minor and are not a hundred times more numerous.

The traditional Adventist concept that Ellen G. White received all her materials for her books direct from heaven just does not match the facts. She was a wide reader, and selected first-class materials from the literature of her day to feed the church of God. One should compare the first chapter of *Patriarchs and Prophets* with Milton’s *Paradise Lost*; *Sketches from the Life of Paul* with Conybeare and Howson’s account; the chapter titles and their succession in

Desire of Ages with Edersheim's work on Christ; her encomiums on the book of Revelation with the commentary by A.R. Fausset; the *Acts of the Apostles* description of Peter and John with the writings of J.R. McDuff, and other gospel commentary with the words of Fleetwood, Hanna, Marsh, Farrar, Geikie, Harris, etc. *Ministry of Healing* should be compared with the writings of L.B. Coles, and *Education* with the products of nineteenth century European educators, such as Pestalozzi, Herbart, and Froebel.⁷⁶

There was no measure of deceit in this usage of materials by Ellen G. White. She recommended to the church through the pages of the church papers, books she herself was using such as D'Aubigne's *History of the Reformation*, and Conybeare and Howson's *St. Paul*. While academic works of her day gave credit, sometimes that credit was rather sparing, and popular works usually did not bother at all. Even Howson failed to credit at least one writer he quoted at length. Some of the Ellen G. White manuscripts contained quotation marks, according to her son.

Ellen G. White submitted her manuscripts to others for criticism. Waggoner, Jones and others did this work for her. She changed a number of pages in *Great Controversy* as a result of W.W. Prescott's insistent admonitions. All this is far removed from the work of a Delphic oracle.

When one considers Ellen G. White's emphatic statement that the Bible is yet "but dimly understood" and her repeated assertions that as yet we have "but the first gleams of light" that are to spring forth from the Word, it is obvious she did not consider her writings as the Open Sesame to Scripture, or its infallible commentary. Such claims are unwise. See *Counsels to Writers and Editors*, 82.

But it is also nonsense to think that for seventy years of ministry, Ellen G. White was in the business of deceiving all and sundry. Her toils were gargantuan, and her sympathies large. She displayed a sturdy common sense in her writings, and behaviour impossible to reconcile with the fraudulent character ascribed to her by critics. Neither ease nor wealth was her reward, but one who could deceive as skilfully as some critics suggest could certainly have found a more profitable and less taxing milieu to pursue such a course. All who read her writings as she recommended they should be read — subject to Scripture and the explanatory canons of time and place — are immensely benefited. Those who claim otherwise need to remember perhaps that what readers draw from a book is dependent on what they bring to it. Said St. Thomas: "If an ass looks into a book, you can't expect an angel to look out." What type of people would we be if we followed the counsels of Ellen G. White? One word answers — saints.

It is very easy to criticize Mrs. White and to rid ourselves of one who seems to lay heavy burdens upon us by way of behaviour and duty. But first we should ask whether we, the critics, are not to a considerable extent, standing "upon her shoulders." The Adventism we seek to uphold owes many of its best features to the Lord's providences with Ellen G. White. Let us notice some of these providences.

After the disappointment of 1844 the role of "Adventist" was a difficult one to maintain. Most of the Millerites forsook it with great celerity. But the little group who were our spiritual forebears remained believers in the Advent faith as a result of the ministry of a weak girl in her late teens. She it was who insisted that the Lord had shown her that the light of the midnight cry was heaven's light, and that the leading of heaven in the Miller movement was not to be denied. Later, she espoused the Sabbath, and influenced others to do the same.

When fanatics threatened to wreck the little band, it was the same young woman who rebuked them and held back others from following their follies.

Ellen G. White encouraged the use of the printed page even though at that time all expected but a few months or years at the most to intervene before the return of Christ. Influenced by this conviction of the imminence of the Advent, one by one our pioneers were disqualifying themselves by over-labour and by the health-destroying habits of popular custom. Read the story by Spalding⁷⁷ and then marvel at the timeliness of the health emphasis given through Ellen G. White.

At a point when the spiritual health of the movement had reached its nadir she stood by the side of two young theological ~~in~~novators.” Not one of the older men at Minneapolis would cross the floor and say, ~~I~~am with you, Sister White.” Instead they joked about Waggoner and Jones being the pets of the prophetess, and wondered whether the latter was losing her perceptiveness. And so she went to Australia, setting her mark on the young church there, as she had previously done in Europe. Her energies and insistence resulted in the erection of Avondale College, and it has proved, as she foretold, a training school for missionaries to Africa, India and the islands of the sea.

When a whole conference was in danger through the ~~h~~oly flesh” fanaticism, it was the words of Ellen G. White which saved it, restoring the president and other leaders to the right path that the people might follow. But a few short years passed, and a large proportion of our General Conference leaders were being deceived by Kellogg’s subtle pantheism. Waggoner, Jones, Paulson, Magan, Sutherland, and a host of other prominent men were standing with Kellogg and against A.G. Daniells. Kellogg, at this time of crisis, exercised a hypnotic spell over prominent men which resulted in hundreds of workers being influenced by his errors. He had ceased to believe in the nearness of the Advent and other distinctive truths. The personality of the Deity and the reality of the divine dwelling-place were being questioned. But for Ellen White, this denomination might well have foundered in the first decade of the twentieth century.

About the same time, the ~~d~~aily” controversy was rocking the church, and Ellen G. White was frequently exhorted to cast an authoritative vote on the issue. This she refused to do, and urged all to study their Bible, and decide from that supreme authority rather than quote her writings. This paved the way for the right approach to similar doctrinal problems, offering the church a salutary paradigm.

None can deny that the key emphases of Ellen G. White are those which encourage holiness. She uplifted Christ and His Word in a way false prophets have never done. The law, expanded by her insights, became as a towering and threatening Mount Sinai that convicted ones might confess their inability and seek to Christ for mercy and strength. While the *Testimonies* ~~aff~~lict the comfortable,” her devotional writings such as the Conflict of the Ages series ~~com~~fort the afflicted.” True, some have read even these and seen only the law there, as though the promises were but footnotes. But the Bible is also thus read, and in neither case are the documents to blame. For those who have learned to distinguish between law and gospel, seeing in the first a standard rather than a method, even the most rigorous testimonies bring the challenge of ~~h~~igher yet.” Which one of the Old Testament prophets, or even John the Baptist, would have been comfortable to live with?

A true prophet must personify law, that the ever present disease of Laodiceanism might be purged. This messenger, however, offered also the balm of Gilead. Consider her gospel tones (post 1880) which equal or surpass anything that the most talented leaders of Adventism have

ever offered, and which certainly surpass the best efforts of her critics. See *Selected Messages*, 1:340-400, etc.

It is true that the writings of Ellen G. White have often been used to great detriment. But what good thing has not? A knife can be used to cut an apple or a throat, and electricity and fire are wonderful servants but dangerous masters. Consider how Scripture itself has been abused rather than used.

About one hundred years ago Frederic W. Farrar, canon of Westminster and chaplain to the queen, presented a series of lectures at Oxford on the interpretation of Scripture. In recording the lectures he declared:

A Book less sacred would have been discredited by the dangerous uses to which it has often been perverted; but no aberrations of interpreters have been suffered to weaken, much less to abrogate, the essential revelation which has exercised from the first, and will to the last syllable of recorded time‘ continue to exercise a unique power over the hearts and consciences of men.⁷⁸

Farrar summarized the inadequate exegetical methods of the past as follows:

I have allowed the History of Interpretation to suggest to us its own scheme, and to deliver for our guidance its own lessons. We shall see system after system — the Halakhic, the Kabbalistic, the Traditional, the Hierarchic, the Inferential, the Allegorical, the Dogmatic, the Naturalistic — condemned and rejected, each in turn, by the experience and widening knowledge of mankind. These erroneous systems arose from many causes. The original Hebrew of the Old Testament was for many ages unknown to the Christian Church, and when Greek also became an unknown language to all except a few, the caprice of interpreters was freed from important checks.

Religious controversy went to Scripture not to seek for dogmas but to find them. Mysticism interpreted it according to the mood of the moment and placed the interpreter above the text. A spurious and unenlightened idolatry for the letter of Scripture ignored its simplicity and universality, and sought for enigmas and mysteries in the plainest passages. A scholastic orthodoxy developed elaborate systems of theology out of imaginary emphases, and by the aid of exorbitant principles of inference. Some of these causes of error are removed, but we still meet the pale and feeble shadows of the old systems wandering here and there, unexorcised, in modern commentaries. They can, however, only be regarded with curiosity as anachronisms and survivals.⁷⁹

The history of interpretation has more than academic interest. Exegetical error has frequently had dreadful practical results. Religious leaders have made texts of Scripture both the command and excuse for deadly evils, such as wild fanaticism, dark superstition, antinomianism, burning hatred, and religious and civil oppression. Men have read the Old Testament apart from the New, and wrongly used its history and legislation. They have ignored Christ’s warnings in Matt. 5:41-43; 15:1-9; 23:1-23; Mark 2:18-28; 7:2-23; 10:2-12; Luke 9:51-56; 13:11-17; 13:11-17; John 8:1-11, and again and again have acted out their own passions using Scripture as their excuse. Again we quote Farrar:

How often the sanguinary supporters of mistaken shibboleths defended their outrages by the injunctions of the Pentateuch? The infamous assassinations of princes, or murderous plots against them, by a Ravaiillac, a Jaques Clement, a Balthazar Gerard, an Antony Babington, an Everard Digby, were preposterously justified by the examples of

Ehud and Jael. The Crusaders, thinking that they did God service by wading bridle deep in the blood of infidels who were often morally superior to themselves, justified their massacres by the exterminating wars in the Book of Judges, which Bishop Ulfila wisely delayed to translate into Gothic because he feared the effects they would produce upon the minds of his wild converts. Thousands of poor harmless women, maddened by torture into false self-accusations, were burnt to death by Sprenger as witches, on the supposed authority of a text in ... [Exodus]. A crime so atrocious as the massacre of St. Bartholomew was hailed by Pope Gregory XIII with acclamation, and paralleled by the zeal for God of ancient heroes.

Texts were used to crush the efforts of national liberty, and to buttress the tyrannies of immoral despotism. The murder of kings and passive obedience to them were alike defended by texts. The colossal usurpations of the Papacy in the days of its haughtiest audacity were maintained not only by spurious donations and forged decretals, but by Boniface VIII on the ground that the two swords of Peter meant the possession by Popes of temporal and spiritual dominion; and a century earlier, by Innocent III, on the ground that the Pope was intended by the sun to rule the day, and the Emperor only by the moon to rule the night.

When Innocent III was giving to the Abbot of Citeaux his infamous advice to entrap the Count of Toulouse to his ruin, he wrote, 'We advise you, **according to the precepts of the Apostle**, to use cunning in your dealings with the Count of Toulouse, **treating him with a wise dissimulation**, that the other heretics may be more easily destroyed.' Even the Spanish Inquisition — that infamy of Christendom — appealed to Scriptural warrant for the right to immolate its holocausts of victims, and the blood-stained Alva received from the Pope a jewelled sword with the inscription *Accipe sanctum gladium, munus a Deo*.

In the days of her persecution the Fathers of the Church had taught mankind that 'force is hateful to God'; but, in the days of her despotism, not only cursings and anathemas, but the axes, the stakes, the gibbets, the thumbscrews, racks, and all the instruments of torture kept in the dungeons of priests to deprave the heart of nations, and to horrify the world, were defended by scraps of texts and shreds of metaphor from the mercy-breathing parables of Christ. Texts have been used a thousand times to bar the progress of science, to beat down the sword of freedom, to destroy the benefactors of humanity, to silence the voice of truth. The gospel of peace, the gospel of knowledge, the gospel of progress, has been desecrated into the armoury of fanaticism, and the stumbling-block of philosophy. The gospel of light and love has been used to glorify the madness of the self-torturer, to kindle the faggot of the inquisitor, and to rivet the fetters of the slave.⁸⁰

Ellen G. White certainly never claimed to be the final arbiter regarding the meaning of any passage of Scripture. She forbade all to take such a presumptuous position.

To say that a passage means just this and nothing more, that you must not attach any broader meaning to the words of it than we have in the past, is saying that which is not actuated by the Spirit of God.⁸¹

Ellen G. White herself was still struggling to understand the Word. At Minneapolis she confessed herself uncertain as to certain areas on doctrine being canvassed. On occasions she changed her views, such as regarding the time to begin the Sabbath, the eating of pork, the

meaning of the shut door, the law in Galatians, the covenants, etc. Not until after the Minneapolis conference of 1888 do we find justification by faith pervading her writings.

By and large the conclusions of the scholars of this church are that the writings of Ellen G. White are for the purposes listed in 1 Cor. 14:3 rather than for the purpose of exegesis. Consider the representative statements found in our appendix, –Ellen G. White and Exegesis.”

Only a better understanding of the nature of inspiration can save this church from constant internal turmoil. **Ellen G. White’s own summary in Selected Messages 1:15-26, if taken seriously, could solve many of our problems. Likewise essential is her appraisal of herself as a “lesser light” compared with “the greater light” of Holy Writ. God’s attention and care is always proportionate to the importance of any single thing in the whole scale of being. Because the writings of Ellen G. White were not intended to be canonical, not purposed as applicable to all people in all places in all times, therefore the element of miracle associated with them is less than that associated with the writing of Scripture. This is not to say that there is within the canon “degrees” of inspiration. It is to say that outside the canon we should not expect the same precision as was necessary for the Word. Even within Scripture we find that inspiration does not guarantee the fulfilment of human ideas of perfection. For Bible writers, truth came and was reflected through their own culture. Thus the dreams of Joseph reflect Egyptian imagery, those of Daniel, Babylonian imagery, and those of Ellen G. White, nineteenth century Occidental imagery (such as trains and conductors — see *Early Writings*, 88).**

It is important to remember that inspiration is perfect for its purpose, and its purpose is stated in John 20:31; and 2 Tim. 3:16, 17. God is not on trial in logic, or rhetoric in Scripture, Ellen G. White tells us. As a Writer He is not represented. The writers of Scripture were not His pen but His penman. Thus Scripture chooses to use **idioms**, and **the language of appearance**, though it affronts modern scientific knowledge. The earth has four corners and four winds, the sun rises and sets, the hare chews the cud, the mustard seed is the smallest of all seeds, men think with their kidneys and their bowels rather than with their brains. Similarly, astronomers know nothing of a great open space in Orion, and the planetary moons numbered in an early Ellen G. White vision are no longer correct by modern knowledge.⁸²

But, say some, did not Ellen G. White claim that all her writings were precious light from the throne of God? This illustrates the common tendency to treat of generalizations as universal truths and statements of technical precision. Ellen G. White could endorse Crosier’s article despite its containing several positions she did not agree with. Similarly, she could speak well of Waggoner, though disagreeing with him on Points. She recommended works like *Pilgrim’s Progress* despite some erroneous positions such as on the state of the dead. Even prophets must use the earthly mint of human vocabulary and idiom, and Ellen G. White’s claims should not be understood other than as asserting that heaven had given her convictions as to right and wrong, as to what was to God’s glory and what was not. She is not saying she used no sources, or that her own personal beliefs were inerrant. She IS saying God had spoken to her and that heavenly light illumined what she wrote. The God who inspired Paul and yet was content to permit him to leave sentences unfinished, and to employ rabbinic argument, is the same God who prompted Ellen G. White to call the church to holiness through the vision of Christ, and yet who permitted her to err. The writings of the prophets are a test of character. Thus it is with all of Holy Writ and even the Person of Christ. As a moral test they sift out those who seek to have their own ideas of perfection met or else.

We should draw our conclusions regarding the nature of Ellen G. White's gift from the empirical evidence — through induction, not deduction. As we review her life and writings we find her, like the prophets of old, divinely led to counter contemporary perils. At a time when Adventists were still setting one date after another for the Second Advent, she wrote her statement on the ~~daily~~ in *Early Writings*, 74. In later years men forgot that the point of the statement had to do with prophetic time rather than the Advent, and wrongly applied her words in order to retain a traditional but erroneous concept of the ~~daily~~. To one who wished to oppose the use of swine's flesh, Ellen G. White sent a caution, but in later years when the church was more established, she herself urged what she had earlier condemned. Life insurance in the nineteenth century milieu was opposed, and the purchase of bicycles, and sundry similar items, but these are no longer mandatory other than in principle. Some people were told that eggs should not appear on their tables, and others were advised to eat them. Butter was affirmed as harmful, but in another setting is not condemned. Some Ellen G. White statements make very precise appraisals regarding food, but elsewhere she can say ~~we~~ make no precise lines as to diet." Time and place must ever be taken into account, as in Scripture. Who lives today by the laws and rules of the Pentateuch?

In the case of Albion Ballenger, Ellen G. White saw in him a representative of a widespread movement seeking to play down the distinctive features of Adventism. She linked him with Kellogg and others who were drifting into teachings contrary to basic Adventism. Kellogg she considered to be spiritualizing away the heavenly sanctuary, and Ballenger was in similar danger. Ballenger, by his teaching of a pre-cross sanctuary that had been operative for 4000 years, was opposing ~~mighty~~ truths held for ages," such as those expressed in Heb. 2:17; 5:1; 8:3. Ballenger's thrusts against the post-1844 position on the eschatological cleansing of the sanctuary inevitably earned her rebuke. **But we should distinguish, as did Don Neufeld, between the cleansing of the sanctuary and the investigative judgment. The latter was never a landmark of the church, but the former was and is. Ellen G. White had no vision on the investigative judgment as such.** Even divinely granted visions were not always immediately understood by her any more than Daniel understood his.⁸³ Thus we see a devout messenger of God inhibited by human frailty, yet led of God to oppose trends that would destroy the purpose of this divinely sponsored movement for the latter days. To take her pronouncements at times of crisis and apply them baldly ever afterwards, is to forget that circumstances alter cases and that ~~that~~ which God gives His servants to speak today would not perhaps have been present truth twenty years ago, but it is God's message for this time."⁸⁴

Ellen G. White is not our authority. That position only Scripture can hold. To divert from ~~the Bible and the Bible only~~ as the ~~sole~~ bond of union" and our only ~~creed~~, would be to cease to be either Biblical or Protestant, and could only result in splitting this church down the middle.

CONCLUSIONS REGARDING PIONEER (INCLUDING E.G. WHITE) VIEWS

What shall we then say about 1844 and the investigative judgment? On 1844 we shall say that in the providence of God, He brought to the birth the movement with the last message for the world — the third angel's message in verity, justification by faith. That message in all its elements of law and grace, obedience and faith, justification and sanctification, substitution, imputation, and representation, judgment, and the Second Advent — is beautifully enshrined in the symbolism of the sanctuary (particularly the Most Holy Place with its ark and mercy seat). This symbolism is used in the first books of Scripture, its chief Old Testament prophetic book and the final book of the New Testament. In claiming that Dan. 8:14 pointed

to the last judgment and the end of the world, we were miles ahead of our contemporaries; in seeing Dan. 9:24 and 7:9-13 as explanatory of 8:14 we were similarly advanced; and in fixing upon that commandment at the heart of the law in the centre of the sanctuary as the sign of the gospel, we offered a test of loyalty to the world which ultimately will decide the destiny of all.

1844 and the Advent movement are indeed a fulfilment of Dan. 8:14, an apotelesmatic fulfilment in the same sense that AD 70 was a fulfilment of Matt. 24, and John the Baptist of Mal. 4:5, 6; and Pentecost of Joel 2:28. But the revival of the truth of atonement must not be confused with the atonement itself, and Dan. 8:14 must be seen as applying chiefly to the end-time judgment ushering in a new and cleansed creation. Forensically, as set forth in 2 Cor. 5:17, this took place at the cross, but will be empirically consummated with Christ's return.

As regards the investigative judgment, we must point out that all inspired descriptions of the final judgment are metaphorical. There never will be a time when Christ gathers all who have ever lived before Him in order to separate them as sheep and goats. At His second coming, the righteous are raised in glorified bodies — there is no prior standing before the bar of their visible Judge. Their destiny had to be sealed before Christ finished His ministry as their High Priest — they had to be ~~found~~ "in Him" at the last day of their probation — a pre-Advent judgment indeed. The fact that Rev. 20 does teach two resurrections, with all the saints rising in the first as the release from the prison of death, makes it quite clear that their judgment is prior to Christ's return. And the fact that it is stated that not only must believers come before the judgment seat, but they must also as Christ's assistant assessors judge the world and wicked angels — this also demands a pre-Advent decision in their instance, prior to a judgment on the lost.

When Christ in Matt. 12:36, 37 spoke of judgment day He affirmed that all in that day must give account of every word. While this shall not be fulfilled in any empirical, visible, audible sense, it is entirely true, in that our Judge-Advocate reads our hearts and minds. Nothing is secret from Him with whom we have to do, and on the basis of His knowledge of us, as to whether we indeed have saving faith in His atonement, our destiny will be decided BEFORE His return.

When Ellen G. White gives her pungent searching description of judgment in *Great Controversy*, chapter 28, such a description is akin to those New Testament Passages which assure us by their references to judgment that the decision of faith must continually be made afresh, and that work evidences whether our profession of faith is genuine. The words of Leon Morris are pertinent:

But the New Testament will not leave religious man to rest in his complacent smugness. It prods him wide awake with its insistence that he, too, stands under judgment. Take the saying quoted in Heb. 10:30 (Dt. 32:36), ~~The~~ "The Lord shall judge his people." This brings the matter unpleasantly close to home. And it is even worse with 1 Peter 4:17, ~~the~~ "the time is come for judgment to begin at the house of God." Jesus assures us that people like the scribes, with religious pretensions, ~~shall~~ "shall receive greater condemnation" (Mark 12:40), and James reminds us that Christian teachers ~~shall~~ "shall receive heavier judgment" (James 3:1). Jesus tells us that in the judgment some will say, ~~Lord~~ "Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy by thy name, and by thy name cast out devils, and by thy name do many mighty works?" only to receive His sentence, ~~never~~ "never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity" (Matt. 7:22ff). Those with special privileges will be judged the more severely. As J.V. Langmead Casserley expressed it, ~~They~~ "They that take the gospel to themselves must either live by the glory of the gospel or perish beneath the

judgment of the gospel.” So far from getting off lightly in the judgment, religious man will find himself judged more strictly, precisely on account of his greater privileges. To ignore this is to overlook a truth which the New Testament reiterates again and again. It is worth noting that the people who will be surprised on that day are not the rank outsiders, but those who think themselves safe within the church.

The judgment of which Scripture speaks is one in which nothing can be kept hid. —“God shall judge the secrets of men” (Rom. 2:16). The Lord —“will both bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and make manifest the counsels of the hearts” (1 Cor. 4:5; cf. Mark 4:22; Luke 12:2f). Most of us could face the judgment calmly if we could be assured that certain things would remain hidden. But *all* our deeds stand under judgment, and there’s the rub. —“All” includes all the little evil deeds, as well as the big ones. —“Every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment” (Matt. 12:36). It is the far-reaching and all-inclusive nature of the judgment that makes it so frightening. At the same time, the thought that all we do matters in God’s sight helps make life worth living. It gives a dignity to even the most insignificant action, the most unimportant word. Even the giving of a cup of cold water will not go unnoticed.⁸⁵

Thus, as earlier stated, every description of the judgment has to be a metaphorical one because the judgment itself, belonging to things supernal, is ineffable. Matt. 25:31-46 will never be literally fulfilled, being not only parabolic but kaleidoscopic, embracing the separation between men from the time of the pre-Advent judgment till the end of the millennium.

As Ladd writes: —“The fact is that when Jesus speaks of the consummation, he always uses symbols.”⁸⁶ So we have the celebration of the marriage, the gathering of the harvest, angels collecting the elect, and judgment of the servants — all symbolism. **Ellen G. White in her investigative judgment chapter is speaking truly but not literally** when she refers to heaven’s careful survey of every thought, word, and deed, as well as the prompting motives. But the books are the memory of God, and the decision instantaneous according to whether a genuine trust in the merits of Christ (a trust which ever leads to obedience) is evidenced. Let none therefore ridicule this chapter, despite its linear rather than punctiliar view of the pre-Advent judgment — a view natural enough when the infant movement was trying to understand the mystery of the delayed Advent after 1844 and the shut door. Furthermore, let it be emphasized that our concept of the judgment, though immature, was far ahead of that held by most religious bodies who anticipated a thousand years of bliss before the general resurrection and general judgment. The Adventist view of two resurrections (both literal) is now an exegetical axiom for commentators on Rev. 20, which is a far cry from the situation in the decades after 1844.⁸⁷ As for the pre-Advent judgment, this is a logical deduction, inasmuch as only the saved are to come up in the first resurrection. Because even God’s children are subject to judgment, as clearly taught in the New Testament (2 Cor. 5:10; Rom. 14:10; Heb. 10:30), it is a necessity that they be found without spot through a final imputation of Christ’s merits while He is still priest prior to the decree of Rev. 22:11-12.

Thus, at a time when many denied that judgment had any significance at all for believers, Ellen G. White more Biblically affirmed the contrary. Her presentation of the minuteness of divine investigation of our lives is a homiletic application of the law to our souls, that we might search our hearts and turn to Him alone who can cover us by His righteousness. Let it be noted that in her exposition, Ellen G. White concludes with reference to those who through “**faith** in Christ are entitled” to the verdict of acquittal.⁸⁸ Other statements the same author has written must be kept in mind when reading *Great Controversy*, chapter 28, just as when

reading certain passages of Scripture such as Ex. 20 and James 2, others too, such as Rom. 3 and Gal. 2 must be remembered. Only the distinction between law and gospel and their respective purposes can save us from misreading Ellen G. White or Scripture.

We have always claimed to base our doctrine on Scripture alone. Thus our *Fundamental Beliefs* state, and thus Ellen G. White and our pioneers affirmed. It is time to take this claim seriously, and to realize that in the apostolic age ~~the~~ “faith” was once and for all given to the saints. See Jude 3 and Heb. 1:1. In the coming test God, according to *Great Controversy*, 595, will have a people standing on the Bible only.

Until then, let us build our framework of truth solely on the Word, but use with gratitude the counsels from His Spirit conveyed through Ellen G. White in these latter days, prophetic counsels meant to be for ~~up~~building and encouragement and consolation” (1 Cor. 14:3). Let us remember that ~~God~~ bestows the amount of divine attention ... proportionate to the rank assigned,”⁸⁹ and that the non-canonical prophets did not (in the providence of God) occupy the same vital place as the canonical ones — and yet remember also that destinies have been and will be settled according to whether one despises **any** of God’s gracious instrumentalities. 2 Chron. 20:20.

THE BOTTOM LINE

A. For those who wish to give Ellen G. White greater authority than Scripture.

A very natural reaction to this manuscript would be to ~~sit~~” on certain Spirit of Prophecy statements regarding the sanctuary and to affirm in essence, ~~Here I stand. I can do no other.~~”

I wish to suggest that such an attitude requires more than ~~standing~~” to validate it. It will indeed be necessary to do much ~~other~~,” including the following:

1. Demonstrate that where Ellen G. White and Scripture appear to conflict, veto power must always be given to Ellen G. White rather than vice versa.
2. Reject such clear Scriptures as Heb. 6:19, 20; 9:8, 12, 24-25; 10:19-20, etc., which plainly teach that Christ entered the Most Holy at His ascension.
3. Provide clear didactic Scriptures for the doctrine of the investigative judgment. Typological evidence as a basis for doctrine has never been valid — only typological illustration of doctrine otherwise proved.
4. Explain how it could be that Ellen G. White could sometimes misinterpret her own visions. For example, she understood her first vision to endorse the shut door doctrine — that probation had closed for the churches and the wicked world. ~~+~~“saw” often signifies a personal conviction — not a divine revelation. See its repeated use in the report of the Camden vision.
5. Explain how it could be that Ellen G. White could teach one thing one time, and yet change that view another time — e.g. her position on the law in Galatians, the covenants, time to close the Sabbath, etc.
6. Explain the several crystal clear Ellen G. White statements which speak of His entering within the veil at His ascension. See, for example, April 19, 1905, *Signs of the Times*; *Desire of Ages*, 757.

7. Explain how *Great Controversy* can be demonstrably wrong in certain exegetical positions and yet correct on the investigative judgment, when this is not demonstrably provable from Scripture, e.g. Ellen White's understanding of the sixth and seventh trumpet. She endorsed the Litch position, which is untenable exegetically and historically. For the revision in 1911 she changed her mind about Litch having given the "exact day" of the prophetic fulfilment.

As regards the seventh trumpet, in later words she placed its fulfilment as in the future, though *Great Controversy* applies it to the past.

The exposition of Rev. 11 regarding the French Revolution is not accurate exegetically or historically. There never was in France a three-and-a-half year period when the Bible was banned. Hundreds of hours of research by Ellen G. White apologists have failed to find any such thing. The opposite has been found.

Ellen G. White's endorsement of the Miller exposition of Matt. 25:1-13 is quite indefensible. The passage is not talking of 1844, but of the end of the world. The introductory word "Then" seen in the context of the preceding as well as the following verses, makes this quite plain.

8. Explain how Ellen G. White can use many Scriptural concepts which belong to the last things and apply them both to 1844 and thereabouts, as well as to the end of the world, e.g. the sealing, the shaking, the covering, the fall of Babylon, the cleansing of the sanctuary.
9. Explain Ellen G. White's statements: "The Bible and the Bible only is the source of doctrine," and that "never should the testimonies be carried to the front." "Let all prove every point of doctrine from the Scriptures." It is quite impossible to prove from Daniel, Hebrews, Revelation, or elsewhere that a judgment upon believers began as a result of a change of heavenly ministry in 1844.
10. Provide an apologetic whereby Adventists may go to the world and say: "We have a grand and important truth for you — a worldwide judgment session is now in process. We cannot show it to you from Scriptures, but we can show it to you from writings of one concerning whom you have never before heard. True, that writer said we should prove all doctrine from Scripture and not from her writings — but here is an exception — this basic distinguishing truth we cannot prove from Scripture but it is clear in the writings of Ellen G. White."

When these things have been done in a convincing way, then such exponents can on the basis of the Ellen G. White writings alone, and in opposition to Scripture, say "Here I stand, I can do no other." It may also be helpful at such a time to remember significant Ellen G. White affirmations.

"The Spirit was not given — nor can it ever be bestowed — to supersede the Bible, for the Scriptures explicitly state that the word of God is the standard by which all teaching and experience must be tested. ... Isaiah declares, To the law and to the testimony; 'if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them' (Isa. 8:20" (GC, 9). "But God will have a people upon the earth to maintain the Bible and the Bible only as the standard of all doctrines and the basis of all reforms" (GC, 595).

Inasmuch as Ellen G. White never originated a single doctrine, but only took her stand after others found such doctrines in Scripture (e.g. the Sabbath, health reform, righteousness by faith at Minneapolis, the "daily," etc.), and inasmuch as she refused to permit her writings to

decide doctrinal issues, but rather referred inquirers to Scripture (*ISM*, 164, 416), we can only say to those who still wish to re-echo Luther's declaration at Worms that his closing prayer is also appropriate for them — "God help me."

(These points are a protest, not against the reality of the gift of prophecy in Ellen G. White, but against undoing the utility of that gift by overdoing our claims for it through affirming the writings as inerrant, or as a basis for doctrine — even having prior place to Scripture. We would like to remind group A that Luther's prayer was uttered after his affirmation of *Sola Scriptura*.)

B. For those who wish to reject Ellen G. White.

Briefly, I wish to address another group who, to my mind, fall off the straight path into an abyss on the opposite side to that dealt with above.

I have friends who, perceiving that Ellen White's comments on the investigative judgment do not parallel Scripture, and learning of her wide use of sources, decide therefore that Ellen G. White must be dropped forthwith, and likewise any belief in her prophetic mission.

This seems to them consistent and logical, but so does much other reasoning which ultimately proves unreliable. My friends who pursue such reasoning are distressed that I refuse to join them in their conclusion and therefore I have for them, as well as the group addressed above, some questions.

1. Do they owe nothing of value to Ellen G. White? Would they be Seventh-day Adventists today had there been no Ellen G. White?
2. Would Seventh-day Adventism have survived such crises as that of the first decade of this century when Kellogg numbered among his followers a large proportion of our leaders, including Jones, Waggoner, Sutherland, Magan, Paulson, etc., had Ellen G. White not intervened?
3. Suppose there had been no Ellen White at the Minneapolis conference of 1888, would the teachings of Waggoner and Jones on righteousness by faith have ever reached our constituency and paved the way for that proclamation which being the third angel's message in verity is ultimately to lighten the earth with its glory?
4. Going back further still, when in the 1840's many of our forefathers were on the verge of surrendering their faith in the 1844 movement, would this church ever have emerged and consolidated but for the influence of Ellen G. White?
5. Our work is characterized by evangelistic, publishing, colporteur, educational, and health emphases. Which of these would have assumed its present shape and prominence without Ellen G. White?
6. Is it likely that God would have intertwined with our history for its first seventy years the work of one ultimately to be revealed as a fraud? Does God work in harmony with Satan? How likely is it that a person knowing her own hypocrisy could keep up her pretence for seventy years amid crises and gargantuan labours?
7. How much of your rejection of Ellen G. White grows out of a studied understanding of the Biblical teachings on revelation and inspiration?
8. For example, what do you understand the difference to be between these terms — revelation and inspiration? And what difference is there between them individually and illumination?

9. Has the church universal ever been agreed on the exact nature of inspiration? Do we find that creeds usually define it? Does the modern evangelical scene display unity on the matter?
10. Is the Bible written as we might have expected it to be? Does its content of history, poetry, and outdated legislature comply with our sense of fitness? Does its lack of creedal statements surprise us? Has God so written the Word that doctrinal issues are made crystal clear, and that unbelievers are quickly silenced?
11. Or to say the same thing another way: Is the Bible primarily given to convey information so as to satisfy the mind, or is it a specific moral test? That is to say, has God been content with a weight of evidence for the honest, or has He guaranteed that even the dishonest can be left without excuse?
12. Is there a parallel between the written Word and the Living Word? Did Jesus Christ also evidence some of the surprising features we find in Scripture? That is, did He come as we might have expected? Did He overwhelm all with the evidence that He was what He claimed? Were His statements unequivocal in meaning or sometimes ambivalent? Was He, too, a moral test for His hearers, rather than a great teacher chiefly?
13. Was Jesus both human and divine? And if so, might that also be the obvious nature of Scripture? Did Jesus possess human liabilities and weaknesses such as dependence on creaturely elements such as food, and drink, and rest? Did He ever need to ask questions to secure information? Were His 200 plus inquiries just a front?
14. Did Jesus work as we might expect a celestial visitor to work, or did He also confine Himself in some areas at least to cultural restrictions and limitations? Did He come speaking the language of heaven, or the language of Palestine? Was He dressed as a messenger of light, or as a Galilean peasant?
15. Did Jesus, in some of His expressions, fall short of technical precision, as when He declared the mustard seed to be the least of all seeds?
16. Was Jesus absolutely original in His oral presentations, or is it true, as one scholar has affirmed, that there is not a paragraph from His addresses which does not have its roots in the Old Testament? Is it true, for example, that every phrase of the Lord's Prayer is to be found in previous Scripture?
17. Do Christ's parables contain no difficulties? Are we fully comfortable with His use of hell-fire in the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus? Do we feel quite content with His commendation of the rascally steward?
18. How is it that the first three gospels differ so much from the fourth? How is it that they cover very similar ground for much of His ministry, and omit the different materials found in John's gospel covering the same time?
19. Can we explain how it is that the first three gospels not only have broad similarity, but even at times use exactly the same blocks of material, same phraseology, same words — even the same hiatuses?
20. Can any of us tell where the words of John break off and those of Jesus begin, and vice versa, throughout the fourth gospel? For example, in chapter three, which verse marks the close of Jesus' words to Nicodemus? Did Christ utter the famous John 3:16?
21. Why is it that the style of Christ's speeches in John is so far removed from His style as recorded in the other three gospels? Why is that style either identical or almost so with John's own style?

22. What was said at Christ's baptism: "**Thou** art my beloved Son" or "**This** is my beloved Son"? Or were both said?
23. Did the healing of the first leper take place before the Sermon on the Mount (Luke), or after (Matthew)?
24. Were there two Gadarene demoniacs (Matt. 8:28) healed, or one (Mark 5:2 and Luke 8:27)?
25. Was the healing of Bartimaeus before Christ reached Jericho (Luke 18:35), or after (Mark 10:46)?
26. Was Luke given by vision the names of the intertestamental ancestors of Christ, as recorded in Luke 3, or did he derive them from sources such as Luke 1:1-4 might indicate?
27. Where did Luke get his second Cainan from his genealogy of Christ? See Luke 3:36, 37 and compare Gen. 10.
28. Was Stephen's speech (Acts 7) inspired? If so, does it agree exactly with the Genesis account of the historical events he referred to?
29. Why was the inspired apostle Paul dependent upon news from Chloe for his information about the situation in Corinth? Why did God give it to him by vision?
30. What evidence is there in the cream of the New Testament — the epistles — that visions were given to facilitate their writing?
31. Were visions necessary for the writer of Proverbs as he conveyed some platitudes known and recognized from the foundation of the world — such platitudes as: the lazy man shall suffer want, a nagging woman is as unpleasant as continual rain, good news makes a person cheerful, bad emotions cause poor health, to have money is to have many ~~friends~~?"
32. Similarly, did the Psalmist need visions in order to exhort us to ~~—Come, worship, and bow down,~~" and to comfort us by the reminder that ~~—all the wicked shall God destroy~~?"
33. Were visions necessary for the chronicling of the well-known historical events in the ministry of Christ? Or for most of the annals of Judah and Israel? How many of the historical authors of Old Testament books ever hint that they received visions in order to make possible their writings? Why was a Paul chosen to set forth the theology of the New Testament? Would not a school boy or a fisherman have done as well under inspiration?
34. Is inspiration ~~—docetic~~" in its operation? Or is it true of the written Word, as of the living Word that it is just as much human as though not at all ~~—divine~~?"
35. Does inspiration guarantee equal value for all inspired documents? That is, would we miss the genealogies as much as the Sermon on the Mount? Does Scripture like a living body contain a heart, form, and limbs, so to speak, with some members more essential than others?
36. Is there an economy of miracle in the writing of Scripture? Does God ever do supernaturally what can be done naturally? Why did Christ have others fill the water pots with water, and roll away the stone of Lazarus' tomb?
37. Are the prophecies of Scripture completely unambiguous? Are they so plain that a child may understand them? Have all the details of Biblical prophecies been fulfilled? Are some of them conditional?
38. Is our real problem with Scripture what we don't understand or what we do?

39. When Jesus told His disciples that the real truth about Himself couldn't come from flesh and blood but was a divine gift, is this true also of Scripture, and other agencies of God? Do reason and human expectation have priority in determining what is a revelation from God? Can something be supra-rational without being irrational?
40. Does God usually bestow upon separate items just that attention which is proportionate to their importance in the scale of being? Is His work always complete in every way, or just adequate? Does the human organism demonstrate absolute perfection in its formation, or chiefly adequacy? Is the eye a perfect optical instrument? Does the memory function perfectly? Is the human mind infallible in its reasoning process? Has reason itself suffered from the Fall?
41. Can we explain any of the mighty works of God — creation, providence, miracle, regeneration, sanctification, atonement? If not, should we expect to have a thorough understanding of inspiration and revelation? If the Fall came through a lusting after forbidden knowledge, could it be that man's restoration involves repentance about such lusting, and the substituting of trust?
42. Is ~~ye~~ shall know them by their fruits" a simple practical rule that even the uneducated and immature can usually apply with success if honestly desiring to know the truth?
43. What did Jesus mean when He said, ~~If~~ any man is willing to do His will, he shall know of the doctrine"? Was He saying that it is the heart and not the head, which to the highest doth attain?
44. Is it true that two-thirds of life is conduct, and that God might not be so concerned about some theoretical issues as we are?
45. Is it true that Christ held in His hand the whole map of explored truth but only revealed enough for practical purposes?
46. Was Christ Himself a stone of stumbling and a rock of offense? And if so, could this be true also of some genuine forms of revelation besides Him?
47. Are apocalyptic visions such as those of Daniel, Ezekiel, and Revelation typical of Scripture or exceptional?
48. How much evidence is there in reading the Gospels or the epistles that the writers felt they had divine control and minute heavenly guidance?
49. How much of Ellen G. White advocates behaviour contrary to Scriptural standards? What sort of persons would we be if striving to live up to the standards of Ellen G. White? Is it possible that even the sections of Ellen G. White some of us find so taxing would be clarified if we understood the difference between law and gospel, and between law as a standard and law as a method?
50. If Scripture itself has been terribly abused, even employed for the purpose of murdering innocent millions, should it be surprising if illegitimate use be made of other of God's instruments of revelation?
51. How much danger would there be in advocating that God had used Ellen G. White as a messenger if we followed her own admonition to base all doctrine upon the Bible and the Bible only!
52. How much risk would there be in advocating that God has used Ellen White as a special messenger if we simultaneously confessed, as she did, that ~~God~~ and heaven alone are infallible"!?
53. How is it that when Ellen G. White chose a source which best expressed her views of inspiration she chose one which was at odds with the fundamentalist churches of the day

- one which advocated that the writers of Scripture were God's penmen, not His pen, and that in their use of rhetoric and logic God was not represented.
54. Is it possible that many who wish to reject Ellen G. White do so on the same basis that King Ahab rejected the prophet of his day — ~~I~~hate him; for he doth not prophesy good concerning me, but evil" (1 Kings 22:8)? And is it possible that others reject her because of a legalistic upbringing which misused Ellen G. White in advocating law without gospel?
 55. If Christ came to comfort the afflicted but also to afflict the comfortable, and if John, His predecessor, likewise rebuked hypocrisy and evil in the religious, and if both, like all other prophets, called for repentance, could it be that some who reject Ellen G. White's prophetic role do so on the basis that she makes them uncomfortable by her demand for repentance in specific areas?
 56. If you were choosing a surgeon, or a real estate agent, or a banker, would you feel most comfortable with one who valued the writings of Ellen G. White, or one who rejected them?
 57. Do you know the difference between the Greek and the Hebrew views of knowledge? Which one held that the ideal was to gather as much conceptual truth as possible about everything in order that we might be little gods in knowledge? Which one believed that knowledge was worthless unless practical, and doubly worthless unless related to piety? What is meant by ~~wisdom~~" in the book of Proverbs? Does that book mean by ~~fool~~" one with little intelligence? And is the ~~wise~~" man of Proverbs and elsewhere in Scripture someone with great intellect and powers of perception, or someone who reverences God and acts accordingly? When Ellen G. White says of Christ that He held in His hand the great map of unexplored truth but only disclosed that which had practical value, is she following the Greek or Hebrew view of knowledge? Is there a relationship between these concepts and the apparent carelessness of Scripture about some details of fact, for example, its use of round numbers (e.g. ~~Seventy~~ sevens" — Dan. 9:25; Matt. 18:22; ~~fourteen~~" — Matt. 1:17; ~~480~~" — 1 Kings 6:1; ~~ten~~" — Dan. 1:20; 7:24; ~~forty~~" — etc.)?
 58. Does the Scriptural use of figures of speech such as hyperbole teach us anything about the nature of inspiration? For example, is it literally true that if all Christ had done had been recorded, the world itself could not contain the books that would need to be written? Had the gospel been preached to every creature under heaven in Paul's day, and if so, why was he still planning to go to such places as Spain, and why does Rev. 14:6 picture a message yet to go to every nation?
 59. Are you, as a Western, completely happy with all of Paul's arguments? For example, see Gal. 3:16, where he plays on the plural and singular meanings of ~~seed~~"? Does his use of Hosea in Rom. 9:25f actually reflect what Hosea intended? Was Hosea forecasting the coming in of the Gentiles or the re-acceptance of forsaken Israelites? Do 2 Cor. 3 and the Old Testament source of the veil incident agree? Do you think that the law about not muzzling the ox was only written for our sakes, and not at all for the oxen? See 1 Cor. 9:8-10. How is it that Paul under inspiration gives a wrong account of his baptized converts in one place, and then remembers more a little later? 1 Cor. 1:14-16. And why does the Greek original of Galatians show that some of Paul's sentences were never completed?
 60. What is ~~the~~ bottom line" of inspiration? Is it abstract or practical in intent? Did Jesus on earth ever work unnecessary miracles, or did all His mighty works contribute to the meaning of salvation? Has God been content to be misunderstood in some things when

a little more effort on His part could have prevented such a thing? Has God really done everything He could to prevent unbelief or has He only done sufficient for those prepared to be honest? If we are all dying people, with but a remnant of time left, what do we need most from God? Has He provided it? 2 Tim. 3:16; John 17:3; 20:31.

These are some of the questions which could be considered by those who urge me to join them in their rejection of the ministry of Ellen G. White. As for me, I must make Scripture the sole basis of doctrine. But for that very reason, I must also be open to any manifestation of the gifts of the Spirit promised therein, including the gift of prophecy. If I find, as is the case with Ellen G. White, one who leads me to Christ and His Word as supreme in all things, and who exhorts to holiness, I should accept the messenger, but without surrendering the right to exercise the canonical test of Scripture. Believing in the priesthood of all believers as well as *Sola Scriptura* I will remember that “The doctrine that God has committed to the church, the right to control the conscience, and to define and punish heresy, is one of the most deeply rooted of papal errors” (GC, 293), and that no ecclesiastical creedal statement shall move me one whit if obviously contrary to the plain testimony of the Word of God. We can do no other.

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS BASED ON CHAPTERS ONE TO SIX

(These should not be appraised prior to reading the evidence for them in the preceding chapters. Prov. 18:13.)

Daniel 8:14

This verse is the high point of the symbolic presentations of Daniel and is the most important verse of the book. Given by the Son of God Himself in theophany, its theme is the ultimate vindication of the saints through divine judgment. It is the seed of all the later revelations of the book of Daniel concerning “the time of the end” and is also the root of all New Testament eschatology. Its study was recommended by our Lord in the Olivet discourse as particularly pertinent for those living in the last days of earth. Paul and John both apply it to the final crisis which is to decide the destiny of earth’s multitudes.

Dan. 8:14 is explained by Dan. 9:24, a passage applied by the New Testament to both advents of Christ — just as all Old Testament pictures of the kingdom merge the two comings. (Had Israel been faithful and prepared the world for the first coming — *Prophets and Kings*, 703-704 — there would never have needed to be a long gap in time before the return of Christ.) Dan. 9:24 takes the key terms of Lev. 16 (sins, iniquities, transgressions, atonement, Most Holy) to portray the antitypical Day of Atonement as the fulfilment of 8:14.

This writer wholeheartedly agrees with the Spirit of Prophecy, the *SDA Bible Commentary*, and numerous of our scholars, such as R. Cottrell, D. Neufeld, etc., that the long delay in our Lord’s return was not necessary, but caused by the failure of the church. See Matt. 24:14. As our own commentary says, Christ could have returned in the first century. And as the *Review* has published, the year-day principle is not a primary Biblical datum, but a providential strategy of God, only pertinent after the long centuries of unnecessary delay. In the plan of heaven, Bible scholars fixed upon 1844 as the fulfilment of Dan. 8:14, although the original plan provided for a much earlier fulfilment of that prophecy.

All prophecy has relevance for the people first addressed, thus the Olivet discourse first applied to AD 70, just as the primary Day of the Lord for people in Joel’s day was a local locust invasion. Dan. 8:14 has been recognized by many scholars amongst us as being originally pertinent to the great crisis during the days of Antiochus Epiphanes when the

Israelites were oppressed for approximately 2300 days, and the temple desecrated by the abomination of desolation — an idolatrous system of worship. The Jews, as shown by Maccabees and Josephus, so applied the prophecy, and so have the vast majority of Bible scholars over the centuries. But most of these same scholars saw that primary crisis as typical of later crises during the oppressions of pagan and papal Rome. That Antiochus Epiphanes is in the prophecies of Daniel has long been understood amongst us. Siegfried Horn has so believed for many years, and through his influence the *SDA Bible Commentary* affirmed the fact. Several of our scholars took the same position at the time of the 1919 Bible conference. But in view of 9:24, which interprets Dan. 8:14, the deliverance in the days of Antiochus prefigured the greater redemption by Christ who would make atonement for iniquity and cleanse the earth of its transgressions and defilement. (Similarly, the book of Isaiah in its last 27 chapters applies the redemption under Cyrus of Israel from Babylon to a greater redemption from sin through the Messiah. Daniel's prophecies in 8-12 give a close parallel.) Thus as surely as Mal. 4:5, 6; Joel 2:28; Matt. 24 had early and later applications, so with Dan. 8:14. Its ultimate meaning is eschatological, applying, as the context clearly declares, to ~~the~~ "the time of the end." While in the days of Adventism's original position on Dan. 8:14 most contemporary scholars rejected any eschatological meaning for that verse, the last half century has seen a significant reversal of that trend. Today many non-Adventist scholars recognize Dan. 8:14 as eschatological, applying to the establishment of the Kingdom of God, and being equivalent in significance to the judgment picture of Dan. 7:9-13.

In summary, Dan. 8:14 points to the same judgment as Dan. 7:9-13 — a judgment upon wicked powers resulting in the establishment of the kingdom of God, and the vindication of the saints. This event is the antitypical Day of Atonement which, while fulfilled at the cross, is consummated by the judgment of the end. Had all who laboured in the 1844 movement been faithful, the gospel would quickly have spread to the ends of the earth and Christ returned. Ellen G. White's many statements about time being almost finished, and that her contemporaries would witness the seven last plagues and the coming of Christ were, as conditional prophecies, also portrayals of what might have been. The events are sure, but not the timing. **It was no primary intention of God that there should be a judgment process stretching out over 136 years. Ellen G. White's statements about the Judgment beginning in 1844 are parallel to her belief that the door of mercy had shut then and that the final sealing and shaking had commenced and are all explicable on the basis that time could rapidly have come to its end in the 1840's or 1850's, had all Adventists been reflectors and proclaimers of the gospel set forth in the chief emblems of the Most Holy Place — the tables of the law, the blood-stained mercy seat, and our Judge Advocate Christ.**

The Significance of 1844

In 1844 God raised up a people to preach the everlasting gospel in the setting of eschatology. He directed them to a Scripture which combined both as it spoke of the sanctuary and ~~the~~ "the time of the end."

The sanctuary is God's parable of the plan of salvation. It teaches the great fundamental truths whereby we are saved; imputation, substitution and representation. According to Ezek. 5:5, Palestine was the centre of the world. Jerusalem was Palestine's heart, and central to that city was the sanctuary and its services. In the mid-point of that sanctuary was the Most Holy Place with its emblems of heaven and heaven's plan of rescue for guilty sinners. A law was in the midst of the ark within the Most Holy Place, and over that law was a golden mercy seat which received the drops of atoning blood — that God might view from His Shekinah glory

the broken law through the sacrificed life of man's Substitute, Surety, and Representative. If we link all the furniture of the sanctuary we have the cross. Similarly, with the four groups of tribes about the sanctuary, one to each point of the compass, from heaven above the whole encampment looked like a great cruciform army. The very fabric of the sanctuary was established upon redemption sockets made from the redemption money. Everything thus pointed to redemption and the cross.

God intended that in 1844 we should have recovered the everlasting gospel imaged in the sanctuary, long trodden down by Antichrist through the Dark Ages. In the centre of that law in the midst of the Most Holy was the commandment which set forth a weekly parable of the rest of heart procured by believing in the finished work of Christ. ~~—~~We which have believed do enter into rest." That law began with a statement of redemption. ~~—~~I am the Lord thy God that brought thee out of the house of bondage." Thereby it transformed all the commands into promises for the believer. ~~—~~THOU shalt not ... for I have redeemed thee."

It is no longer necessary to live according to the flesh. Freedom from sin's dominion comes simultaneously with deliverance from sin's guilt. The cross is the double cure: whoever looks and believes is immediately saved from condemnation, is being saved from all sinful ways and practices, and will be saved from sin's presence at the return of the Lord.

When one accepts one's acceptance freely offered by God on the basis of Christ's payment of our debt, then we can accept ourselves and others. Those who have great difficulty in living with their fellow men, who are ever critical of others, thereby demonstrate that they have not yet lost their guilt (Luke 7:47). Only as we accept our acceptance with God can we fruitfully live with ourselves and others too. At that point true missionary service begins, and no power can stop it or frustrate it.

The light that is to lighten the whole earth with its glory, the sweetest melody from human lips, the one topic that swallows up all others, is justification by faith, the third angel's message in verity. This glorious gospel of the imputed merits of Christ has been the spring of every spiritual revival the world has ever known and is yet to trigger the last and greatest. **Because justification by faith is the third angel's message in verity, it must be closely intertwined with the sanctuary which has been declared to be the very basis of our faith. So far we have divorced the two subjects, failing to see their relationship.** After 1844 we got lost in the trappings and failed to see the real meaning of the Most Holy Place where resided the emblems of the gospel. **Our presentation of the judgment was meant to exalt the merits of our High Priest in whom alone we as believers appear before the judgment bar.** Because the sacred infinite law, that foundation of the universe, and keystone of all existence, cannot be satisfied with anything less than absolute and uninterrupted fulfilment of its exacting requirements, only Christ's obedience is sufficient. Those who rely on that alone are declared righteous at the close of probation in Christ's pre-Advent judgment. This knowledge brings that perfect love which has no fear in judgment, because as God counts Christ to be, so are we reckoned in the final assize. This is the glorious good news of that everlasting gospel proclaimed by the third angel's message. That proclamation has been delayed by the cunning of the Adversary, but its power awaits our demand and reception. This could have happened in 1844, or at any subsequent stage that the cross was given its true place in the hearts and lives of the people of God.

The fact that in 1888 Ellen G. White, after attending thousands of meetings among the Advent believers could confess she had never yet heard the gospel from Seventh-day Adventists except in private conversation with her husband, illustrates that we like

Israel of old had wandered in the wilderness rather than march direct to Canaan. The messenger of the Lord indicated we would yet have to wander many more years. That wandering will only cease when we acknowledge that kneeling at the foot of the cross the believer has reached the highest place he can attain. Then the cross has indeed become to us what the sun is to the sky.⁹⁰ **The fact that exegetically the date 1844 rests on several assumptions impossible to demonstrate does not invalidate God's raising up of a special people at that time to preach "the everlasting gospel" in the sanctuary setting of salvation and judgment.** See section, "The uniqueness of Seventh-day Adventism."

Ballenger and Fletcher

These men were right in seeing that our expositions on the sanctuary were not without error, but they were wrong in not giving the 1844 movement its proper place, and in failing to see that the Day of Atonement applies not only to inaugurated eschatology at the cross, but also to consummated eschatology at the judgment.

Ellen White opposed Ballenger because he denied "mighty truths held for Ages" and because she perceived the effect of his teaching to be a lessening of confidence in the Advent movement as raised up of God to point to the antitypical Day of Atonement. Ballenger's chief emphasis as found in his nine theses presented in 1905 concerned a pre-cross ministry of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary for 4000 years. Thus he denied the "mighty truths" taught in Hebrews, that a priest had to be taken from among men and have a sacrifice to offer — in other words, Ballenger denied the fundamental truths of Scripture that Christ could not be a priest in heaven until after His incarnation and atoning death.

Ballenger was right in interpreting Heb. 6:19 as saying that Christ entered within the veil of the Most Holy at His ascension. Ellen G. White repeatedly asserted the same. But Ballenger had no thorough understanding of the apotelesmatic principle whereby prophecies and types may have a recurring fulfilment, and therefore he failed to recognize the clear teaching of the Apocalypse which applies the Day of Atonement to the final judgment. Ellen G. White saw Ballenger as part of a larger threat from pantheistic mysticism as popularized by Kellogg.

Fletcher never followed Ballenger in the heresy of a pre-cross ministry in the heavenly sanctuary, but like Ballenger, he saw the meaning of Heb. 6:19 and Heb. 9 and 10. He was partly wrong in his conclusions regarding our early history and the shut door, being much too sweeping in his appraisal. He also did not see the meaning of the testimony of the Bible's last book in its eschatological use of the Day of Atonement. One needs to read the study of Rolf Poehler to rightly understand the pioneer position on the shut door, and Ellen G. White's in particular. Both Fletcher and our apologists have given a prejudiced and inaccurate account, particularly as regards Ellen G. White's position. For Ellen G. White's chief statements against Ballenger see *Selected Messages*, 1:160-162 and the White Estate compilation on Ellen G. White and A. Ballenger.

The Investigative Judgment

The Scriptures indeed teach a pre-Advent judgment whereby the destiny of all men is settled while Christ is still our High Priest in the sanctuary above. The New Testament sets forth the judgment as a **process** in the now, a **decision** while Christ is still priest, and an **execution** at the coming of Christ. See particularly John 3:18, 36; Rom. 1:18; 1 Cor. 4:4; 2 Cor. 4:10; Rom. 14:10; Rev. 22:11, etc.

The fact that Scripture clearly teaches two resurrections with only the righteous coming up in the first, demands that their destiny be settled prior to Christ's coming, for they are released

from the house of death with immortal bodies. There is no judgment at that point of time. Similarly, the fact that there are two sets of texts about the saints as regards judgment — one stating that even they must endure the divine scrutiny, and the other that they will judge the wicked — requires a pre-Advent adjudication for them. Dan. 12:10 and Rev. 22:11 point to this — not a century-long process, but a recognition and acknowledgement by our High Priest of the names of those remaining in the book of life who through faith are entitled to final and irrevocable justification.

Our traditional method of explaining the pre-Advent judgment will not stand up to critical examination. There are no texts teaching an investigative judgment as we proclaim it. Dan. 8:14 is speaking of a judgment upon Antichrist and his hosts, not the saints. The same is true of the judgment in Dan. 7 and Rev. 12:7. In none of these does the context speak of the saints being investigated.

God does not need books and 140 years to settle the destiny of men. Neither do the angels or the unfallen worlds, or inhabitants of this earth stand to profit by an investigative judgment as we have described it. According to Ellen G. White, the angels already know the thoughts and intents of our hearts, and similarly God Himself certainly knows our spiritual estate and ~~those that are His.~~ He knows His sheep right now. Thus Scripture tells us of many whose destinies were settled in the long ago without any investigative judgment. Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, the prophets, the apostles, the worthies of Heb. 11, and the resurrected multitude at the first advent are set forth as ones whose destiny was settled ages ago. It is the visible judgment at the end of time that confirms the vindication of God accomplished at the cross, not an invisible judicial procedure which would be useless to the dead as regards informing them.

Our use of sanctuary imagery to support the investigative judgment concept has been faulty. Blood was never taken into the first apartment from the sin offerings of the common people. Blood cleanses, not defiles, according to Scripture, unless it is innocent blood shed by a murderer. Neither is there anything in Scripture to prove a first apartment ministry in heaven as a necessary precedent for the second apartment ministry. Heb. 9 tells us that the first apartment was symbolic of the temporary and limited Jewish era, while the second apartment was a symbol of the Christian era and of the heavenly ministry of Christ. The only cleansing of the sanctuary mentioned in the book of Hebrews is the one accomplished by Christ's death, and refers to the removal of the sins of the world. See John 1:29; Rom. 5:9, 10, 11, 18. Hebrews pictures the church waiting for Christ — not to go into, but to come out of — the Holy of Holies. See 9:28. His entrance into the ~~Most Holy~~ took place at His ascension. Heb. 6:19, 20; 10:19, 20; 1:3.

The wonderful truth, which is the ~~“baby”~~ of fact amid the swaddling clothes of the investigative judgment teaching, is that **saints do not in person physically appear before the judgment bar of God. They appear only in the representative Person of their great High Priest.** If one is trusting in the merits of Christ, as indicated by a life of dedicated obedience, then he is judged moment by moment as perfect before God through the merits of Christ. Because even Christians are less than what is demanded by the law, it is imperative that their destinies be settled while Christ is still high priest interceding and imputing righteousness. Thus it is now during probationary time that all men are judged according to their attitude to the cross of Christ. The Lord knows them that are His, and **at the close of probation those seen to be in Christ by faith are declared “righteous still” as the result of Christ's continued imputation of His merits. All others are judged as “filthy still.”** Then at the Second Advent, judgment is executed upon the living. That sentence is attenuated over the millenary era with the saints reigning and the wicked sleeping until the public

judgment at the close of the 1000 years. That public judgment vindicates the righteousness of God and the universe is subsequently cleansed. All this was foretold by the Day of Atonement as clearly stated in *Patriarchs and Prophets*, 358 and taught by Lev. 16, Dan. 8:14, 9:24; Zech. 3; and the many passages in the Apocalypse using Day of Atonement imagery.

The chief differences between the traditional presentation of the investigative judgment and the New Testament picture of the pre-Advent judgment is that the latter does not teach an assize commencing its operations in 1844, but the fact that all who hear the gospel are immediately recipients of the acquittal verdict of God or subject to His abiding wrath, and that these decisions are confirmed either by death or the close of probation through our High Priest's recognition of whether we are at that climactic moment abiding in Him or not. He that is holy is declared holy still for eternity, but he that is filthy remains such.

The Interpretation of Apocalyptic Prophecy

Apocalyptic prophecy always has "vindication" of God and the saints as its key motif. The cry "how long" lies at the very heart of all apocalyptic and is found in both Scriptural apocalypses.

Apocalyptic prophecy has ever to do with judgment, and the ushering in of the kingdom of God. The judgment is one upon the wicked, not upon the saints of God. Symbols are the very stuff of apocalyptic, and are not intended to be understood literally, nor applied with mechanical precision as though fitting only one point of time. Apocalyptic prophecy is cosmic rather than local, though a local situation can be its jumping-off point. The climax of the great controversy between good and evil is the interest of Scriptural apocalyptic.

Christ was not an apocalyptic, but accepted the teachings of Old Testament apocalyptic. He took the prophecies of Daniel and made them the basis of His teachings on eschatology. The themes of the kingdom of God, the Son of Man, the judgment, the ministry of angels, the resurrection, Antichrist, and the last conflict and final Advent — all were taken from Daniel. His own "apocalyptic" (so-called) discourse of Mark 13, Matt. 24-25, Luke 21 is a pesher [commentary] on Dan. 9:24-27 and thus demonstrates the apotelesmatic principle that prophecies may have more than a single application.

Paul also invoked the apocalyptic of Daniel in 2 Thess. 2 as well as presupposing in his whole theological structure the apocalyptic categories of the Old Testament. He, like Christ, applied Dan. 8:14 to the last crisis. John in the Revelation does likewise.

Apocalyptic prophecy is addressed to an immediate crisis though it can and does fit later crises of similar nature. Its use of numbers is not intended to be applied with chronological exactness. There is always a "concealed definiteness" about the time elements involved in apocalyptic.

Apocalyptic employs the apotelesmatic principle whereby prophecies may comprehend more than a single fulfilment. See our next section.

The Recurring Fulfilment of Prophecy and Prophetic Types

From the giving of the first prophecy of Gen. 3:15, key prophetic notes find echoing fulfilments. The first fulfilment of Gen. 3:15 was the conflict between Cain and Abel. In the following centuries the conflict continued between the worshippers of the true God and those who worshipped Him not, thus fulfilling the prediction about the enmity between the

serpent's seed and the seed of the woman. At the cross came the major fulfilment when Christ's heel was bruised by death, but the serpent's head was simultaneously legally crushed. At the second and third Advents, the second aspect, that of Satan's destruction, finds its consummation.

Similarly, other key prophecies such as Deut. 18:15; Joel 2:28; Mal. 4:5, 6 and Matt. 24 have more than one application. Ellen G. White frequently applies this hermeneutic. The "time of trouble" spoken of by Christ in the Olivet sermon, to her mind, applied to the siege of Jerusalem, the Middle Ages, and the final terror before the coming of the Lord. She also spoke of the second angel's message being fulfilled in 1844, but again to be fulfilled in the loud cry. She saw John the Baptist as the fulfilment of Malachi's Elijah prophecy, but also the remnant church. The stone of Dan. 2 she applies to the kingdom brought in at the first advent of Christ, but also to His Second Advent.

The New Testament takes the Old Testament prophecies of the kingdom and applies them to the kingdom inaugurated at Christ's first advent, and also to the kingdom consummated at the second. Such themes as eternal life, translation, resurrection, judgment, the destruction of Satan, ascension, sitting in heavenly places and others are applied to the Christian's immediate experience and also to his ultimate reward and its concomitants. Dan. 9:24 concerning Christ's atonement not only applies to the time of the cross, but is applied to Jesus Himself to the Second Advent, just as Dan. 8:13 is applied by Him both to AD 70 and the end of the world.

Christ applied the Jubilee, the Passover, and the harvest both to His own time when first among men and also to the end of the world. It is not strange, therefore, that both Romans and Hebrews apply the Day of Atonement in connection with the cross, while the Apocalypse applies it to the final judgment. Non-Adventist scholars have always applied the *Yom Kippur* type to Calvary, and neglected its final application. Adventists have done the reverse. But Ellen G. White applies the Day of Atonement in harmony with Romans, Hebrews **and** the Apocalypse. She sees it as applying both to the cross and to the judgment. It is time we, as a denomination, caught up with this insight from Ellen G. White which correctly reflects the clear teaching of Holy Writ. Only thus can we answer our critics and avoid embarrassment and distress for our ministers and informed laity. Only thus can we fulfil and represent the whole counsel of God.

Ellen G. White

Ellen G. White was a special messenger to the remnant, entrusted with the gift of prophecy. Her inspiration should be defined in the terms she herself used as "for practical purposes," "imperfect," not reflecting God "in logic, rhetoric," etc., not infallible or inerrant, but reliable for the divine purposes. Her writings constitute a "lesser light," and would not have been needed if we had made the Bible our study and understood it aright. Her testimonies are not to be brought to the front or used as Scripture. God has spoken through this erring mortal, but the gift of prophecy is not the gift of omniscience. God never did for her supernaturally anything she could do naturally for herself. Thus she read widely, and, according to convictions divinely granted, selected from a wide range of materials, gems of literary expression or convenient summaries that would be a blessing to the people of God. These selected passages were certainly not inerrant but useful for practical purposes, the chief of which is plainly stated in John 20:31.

There have ever been two views of inspiration among Bible-believing Christians. One group, espousing either verbal inspiration or something very akin to it, has looked upon inspired

writings as chiefly a conspectus of propositions and inerrant. A second group believes rather that inspiration is more dynamic in its operation, and intended to convey Christ to the reader rather than a mass of inerrant information. Propositional truth **is** conveyed, but such is not the primary practical purpose of the divine gift. 1 Cor. 14 makes it clear that prophets since the cross had as their task the ~~up~~building and encouragement and consolation of the believers.” See verse 3. They were not intended to add doctrinal content to that faith which was once for all time delivered to the saints. See Jude 3. Seventh-day Adventists have never officially taught the first view of inspiration given above. Our intimate acquaintance with one with the prophetic gift should have given us a more adequate understanding of the phenomenon of prophecy than possessed by others.

Ellen G. White’s understanding of truth was progressive. While in later years she could say that everywhere she preached, the imputed merits of Christ was her chief theme as the most important of all topics — this was not true of her early years. Similarly, in her early years she held certain doctrinal positions which she later revised. This was true, for example, concerning the doctrine of the covenants, and the law in Galatians. Only after 1888 do we find her speaking in detail and repeatedly on such topics as righteousness by faith, the nature of Christ, the atonement, etc. Ellen G. White often drew from the writings of her Adventist contemporaries when expressing doctrinal truth. She borrowed from J.N. Andrews and U. Smith for her chapters on the sanctuary and the investigative judgment. She also borrowed from Smith (for her chapter on the French Revolution) that which he had borrowed from the error-filled pages of Storrs. Similarly, in the history of *Great Controversy* she was largely dependent upon Wylie and D’Aubigne despite their imperfections.

Ellen G. White did not claim for her writings, nor did most of the early church leaders, what many SDAs now claim. She submitted them to men such as Waggoner and Jones for doctrinal correction and comment, and gladly accepted corrections also from such leaders as W.W. Prescott. She was definite in affirming that God had spoken to her supernaturally, but this claim was not one of infallibility. She never intended that her writings should be used as an addition to the canon, nor as primary evidence for doctrinal positions. After the church was organized, she refused to let her writings be used to settle doctrinal controversies. Time and again, over many years, she was asked to settle the dispute over the ~~daily~~” but refused.

This writer marvels at the wonderful manner in which Ellen White was led to avoid many pitfalls into which her contemporaries fell. She never taught antitrinitarian views, or the Arian concept of Christ, or attributed to Him our human depravity. Jesus’ was ever the centre of her proclamation, and at no time did she view salvation as being procurable through mere doctrinal affirmation. We do not find in her writings the whole package of errors perpetrated by men such as J.N. Andrews and Uriah Smith, although it would be wrong to say that error is totally absent from her presentations. While the Eastern question was very prominent among our leading preachers, she made very little of it. Never did she present Armageddon as an east-west conflict, or tell our people to expect the end of Turkey as the signal of the end. We do not find in the testimonies such applications or prophecy as were common among SDAs, applying Scripture to current events such as increase in scientific knowledge and the speeding up of travel. While J.N. Andrews could apply the ~~fire~~ “fire from heaven” of Rev. 13 to electrical inventions such as the telephone, Ellen G. White shunned all such applications.

Articles published by a number of our scholars have strongly affirmed the position that Ellen G. White never claimed to occupy the position of a definitive commentary upon Scripture. (See appendix, ~~Ellen G. White and Exegesis.~~) Exegesis was not her primary task, and it is obvious to all who have closely studied her writings that many of her applications were

pastoral and homiletic rather than exegetical. Thus most of her uses of John 5:39, and such passages as Isa. 13:12, are quite insupportable from the text itself, but appropriate for homiletic use. In many instances we find different applications of the same Scriptures. The true tabernacle referred to in Hebrews is the heavenly sanctuary in most of her uses of Heb. 9, but in some instances it is the church of God scattered over the four quarters of earth.

Of special importance to us today is the fact that while in *Great Controversy*, Ellen G. White equated Dan. 8:14 with Matt. 25:1-13, and pointed to 1844 as the fulfilment of both, in later writing on Matt. 25:1-13 she omitted that application entirely, and pointed rather to the end of the world for the fulfilment. Similarly, most of her later usages of the Day of Atonement link it to the cross of Christ, or to both advents, rather than just to 1844. Repeatedly we find her using the Day of Atonement type as a symbol of Christ's entrance into the Most Holy Place at His ascension.

It is particularly important that we place the *Great Controversy* comments upon Dan. 8:14 in their literary and historical context. This book is a defence of the 1844 movement, and traces the development of the Adventist interpretation of prophecy — “warts and all.” By the latter expression we mean that some positions taken on apocalyptic passages by the early Adventists were limited, and others were erroneous. Litch's application of Rev. 9:15 to Aug. 11, 1804, was quite wrong, as he himself admitted in later years. This has been known by our scholars for about seventy years. Similarly, the application made of the Rev. 11 prophecy to the French Revolution cannot be supported by either exegesis or history. Thus about half of the record concerning the revision of *Great Controversy* for the 1911 edition concerns the fruitless search for support of the position taken in chapter 15. Similarly, the Adventist application of Matt. 25:1-13 and the shut door in particular was wrong, and recognized to be such in later years. The same is true of the exegesis of Rev. 11:19 applying the seventh trumpet to 1844; and the accomplishment of the sixth seal by events of more than a century and a half ago. Yet another example is the incomplete interpretation given to 2 Thess. 2 on page 50 of *Great Controversy*. Compare with the final application of Antichrist to Satan at the time of his counterfeit of Christ's advent in *Great Controversy*, 624, 625. We might then anticipate that the position taken on the judgment might be less than perfect, and require updating in later years, as Ellen White updated her original position on the shut door; the law in Galatians, Matt. 25:1-13; time to open and close the Sabbath, the eating of pork, the primary importance of righteousness by faith, the Babylon of Rev. 14:8 and 18:1-4, etc.⁹¹

That God's church and His prophets are subject to incomplete understanding and even error should not surprise us. The early Christian church for years believed in a shut door whereby the Gentiles were excluded from the family of God. See Acts 1:6; 11:2; 15:6. It took a long passage of time, and a miracle from God, to correct the church on this issue. Similarly, John the Baptist, the greatest of the prophets, was in error regarding the nature of the kingdom Christ had come to set up. He also erred concerning the time of the establishment of that kingdom.

In 1919, our church leaders were very frank about the existence of errors or incomplete presentations in the Spirit of Prophecy. (See appendix, “Quotations From Church Leaders Relevant to the Topics of the Authority, Inspiration and Errancy of Ellen G. White.”) While loyal to Ellen G. White, they stressed that a crisis would come if we did not inform our people on the true nature of her inspiration. That crisis now confronts us. In every discipline our scholars feel hamstrung lest their expressions of scholarly conclusions should seem to contradict anything in Ellen G. White. This is a deplorable situation, and the church will make little progress until the situation is remedied.

The present writer found Christ through the writings of Ellen G. White. She has influenced him more than any other writer since John the Apostle. He thanks God for the spiritual help he finds in her writings, and acknowledges her as one of God's greatest saints, specially raised up and endowed to lead the weak and needy remnant into areas of service allotted by the counsels of heaven. He feels he honours her most if he accepts her own understanding of her inspiration and position, and therefore makes the Bible and the Bible only the source of his understanding of all doctrines binding upon the church.

The Uniqueness off Seventh-day Adventism

God did not destroy the antediluvian world before He warned it through Noah. Neither did He wipe out Sodom and Gomorrah before righteous Lot gave his warning with tears to those who might hear. Egypt was not visited with the ten plagues till God had given through Moses His invitation to repent. Similarly, in the Christian era, Jerusalem was not visited with judgment in AD 70 until she had rejected a generation of divine pleadings which began with the message of Christ Himself. It is not God's way to destroy without giving opportunity for the nemesis on sin to be avoided through repentance. Therefore, it is with good reason we believe that the whole world is to hear a final warning message before the Day of the Lord dawns. This message is found in Rev. 14:6-12. Immediately after its description we find the coming of Christ pictured.

This final message points to the work of Seventh-day Adventists in this generation. We are to invite sinners through ~~the~~ "the everlasting gospel" to receive the righteousness of Christ that they might be sheltered from the judgment about to overtake the evil world.

In the providence of God, Adventists were raised up in 1844, the very year in which Charles Darwin wrote his first sketch of *The Origin of the Species*. How appropriate that the Sabbath message should be renewed at the time of the launching of modern atheistic theories of man's chance origin! *The Communist Manifesto* was penned in 1845 — a documenting that became the basis for millions believing that law and morality are only bourgeois prejudices. Again, we note the appropriateness of a movement arising to stress ~~the~~ "the commandments of God" in an era launched upon a tumultuous sea of amorality and lawlessness. Right at the time when Satan was working with great power to prepare the way for his eschatological deception of the world, God also set in process a counterattack.

It was in the mid-nineteenth century that dark continents began to open to the gospel. Africa, China, and many other lands became accessible to the Christian gospel as never before. Thus God raised up the people of the threefold message of Rev. 14:6-12 with the mandate to preach to ~~every~~ "every nation, kindred, tongue, and people." Today Seventh-day Adventists have a missionary movement which for vigour and universality has no parallel in the world.

The mid-nineteenth century also began to pave the way for the phenomenon of mass conformity through mass media and totalitarian movements. In this light, the relevance of Rev. 13 and 14 becomes apparent. The message of Rev. 14:6-12 is to fear God rather than man, and to follow the commandments of God rather than the precepts of monolithic structures such as the beast, and its image. Only the everlasting gospel can nerve weak finite beings to resist the unparalleled pressures now being brought to bear upon the body, mind, and spirit of man.

But having said all that, we would emphasize that our uniqueness does not lie in any single specific doctrine, but in the appropriate, harmonious, complete, and balanced body of truth entrusted to us. We wish to illustrate this fact.

As the theological world settled into the cosy belief that a millennium of peace and prosperity would precede the coming of Christ, God stirred up witnesses proclaiming the pre-millennial Advent. This proclamation was most prominent in the USA under the leadership of William Miller. The fiasco of the 1844 disappointment might have intensified the comfortable slumber of almost all religious bodies but for the emergence of Seventh-day Adventists.

While only a tiny group, Seventh-day Adventists testified to the Biblical truth that increasing trouble and strife is to characterize the years immediately preceding the end of the age. Protestants and Catholics almost universally have substituted thanatology for eschatology, and the going of the soul to be with Christ is the pagan myth which has dislodged the Scriptural truths of the judgment, the resurrection, and the Advent. Eschatology for most, in the nineteenth century, was an unknown word, and certainly filled with only nebulous content at best. For example, most expositors rejected the plain teaching of Rev. 20 and anticipated instead only one general resurrection to precede the judgment of the last great day.

In the year 1844, Charles Darwin wrote his first sketch of the *Origin of the Species*. It was enlarged and published anew the next decade. This was the “scientific” support for rendering God unnecessary. Creation, instead of the root truth underlying worship, became a superstition. At this time, Providence gave the little group of Adventists truth regarding the forgotten memorial of Creation.

Any survey of theology, sociology, health and disease, education, of the nineteenth century finds a tragically defective anthropology. Man was regarded as possessing a jewel of a soul embedded in “a sack of dung” — the flesh. The treatment of the latter was quite unimportant, and almost irrelevant so far as the soul was concerned. Man was a schizoid creature consisting of at least two (body and soul) parts, or perhaps three (body, soul and spirit). This led to unbalanced living, unbalanced education, and poor stewardship of the body-temple, as well as a maintained ignorance of the truths that we now classify under psychosomatic medicine. But to Seventh-day Adventists, the Judaeo-Christian view of the nature of man was restored, with its far-reaching implications for individuals and society.

Burgeoning science and education in the latter half of the nineteenth century fostered materialistic and nihilistic philosophy which gradually permeated or at least influenced Protestant seminaries, resulting in a shift from the Word of God to the words of philosophers. Not the least of the ills resulting was the inevitable theological fruitage of a departure from supernaturalism — disbelief in revelation and inspiration, the incarnation, the atonement, the advent, and the judgment. What was needed was a revival of “primitive” Christian faith based on Scripture from Genesis to Revelation.

The practical outcome of the displacement of Scripture by human philosophies was the heteropraxy which ever accompanies heterodoxy. Chance had replaced law as the dominant factor of the universe, and therefore thinking was no more than itching, and morality but a superstition. The Ten Commandments for many were outmoded, and continued shackling by them unthinkable.

But the disappearance of God was followed by the disappearance of man, who was once thought to have been made in God’s image. Human beings were now recognized by a large part of society as animals only, and therefore the rule of tooth and claw was the most natural guide. But this dissolution of a theistic heritage also meant the loss of immortality and the death of hope. And the death of hope always spawns the hope for death. Meaninglessness became the characteristic mental disease of myriads, with the consequent engrossment in

chloroform masks of sexual excesses, war, drugs, and other soothers of the troubled spirit till one should cease to be.

No observer of the human scene in our existential, nihilistic era can fail to sigh for some remedy for the widespread and fatal malaise which has overtaken the race. In that despised book the Bible, and in one of its most despised portions — the Apocalypse — some feel they have found that remedy.

Rev. 14:6-12 offers the everlasting good news to a race sick with despair. It offers pardon for guilt, and the oil of joy for mourning, and everlasting life to replace nothingness. Meaning is offered at its highest level, for ~~that~~ this is eternal life, to know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ”

With this offer comes the reminder of man’s creatureliness and his indebtedness to his Maker. Atheistic evolution is challenged, and human responsibility affirmed. Apostasy from Scripture by adherence to the confused myths of Babylon is warned against, and to replace such myths ~~the~~ commandments of God and the faith of Jesus (gospel)” are set forth as the only option for those who seek life rather than death.

This ~~everlasting~~ good news” includes the message that man’s life, wisdom and righteousness, are not in himself but in Christ. He ~~that~~ hath the Son hath life, but he that hath not the Son hath not life.” To have Christ, to be ~~in~~ Him,” is to find glory — the glory of true wisdom, life, and righteousness. These treasures are all in the Saviour, and the immediate possession of those who accept the Pearl of Great Price Himself.

Thus all false views of the nature of man such as inherent immortality, dichotomy or trichotomy of being, hell and purgatory, natural goodness, etc., are condemned and the paste jewels replaced by the true. Only in the Creator, who is also our Redeemer, is genuine worth found. Thereby worship — worthship — is evoked.

Part of the threefold message to lost man concerns the law and its seal. Man can find no comfort without law. It is as impossible to live in an unpredictable universe as with an unpredictable person. We are all like little children who are only comfortable if disciplined and directed. Not being gods, we cannot endure total freedom. Linked with the truths of creation and the law is the Sabbath memorial — that wonderful primeval invitation to newly created man to find his rest, his true joy, in his Maker and his Maker only. For those who read both Testaments, Matt. 11:28ff is but the echo of Gen. 2:1-3. This conviction is deepened as one reads on to find that our Maker and Redeemer finished His saving work on the sixth day of the week, then falling into a deep sleep and having His side opened as did Adam the first. Because of the Saviour’s rest over the redemption Sabbath, that institution becomes a memorial of another finished work — the work of salvation. Similarly, the Sabbath of Israel had commemorated their redemption from bondage. Deut. 5:15.

According to Heb. 4:3 those who believe ~~enter~~ into rest.” They cease from dependence on their own works, for God has completed by His own toils all that is required for our redemption. Ours only to accept, and to maintain that acceptance — a response that leads to transformation of life. So in an age of guilt, the physical rest of the Sabbath tells of the rest of heart and conscience all may have who trust in the finished work of Another. Never has there been such an age of restlessness — never was the Sabbath as appropriate.

In the Sabbath, therefore, we have an image of the fruit of justification. The latter is not just a blessing of forgiveness at the beginning of the Christian life, but it overshadows us all our

days, being the verdict of the last judgment given in advance. The Reformers did not fully understand the eschatological nature of justification, but recent studies (particularly of the judgment terminology in Rom. 1-3) have made this plain. He who accepts Christ the Saviour has God's ultimate verdict concerning his destiny. Despite his sins, weaknesses, failures, he is without condemnation, accepted in the beloved, complete in Him, translated into the heavenly kingdom, and seated with Christ in heavenly places. None can condemn him. None can take eternal life from him. Provided he trusts wholly in Christ's imputed merits, he cannot perish. But neither can he cherish sin while he cherishes Christ. To receive the Second member of the Godhead means also to embrace the Third. The cross removes both the guilt and power of sin, for God always gives His gifts with both hands — justifying no man whom He does not also sanctify. Thus the Sabbath speaks of holiness of state as well as holiness of standing — with this difference only, that the former is an ideal towards which we ever strive, while the latter is a gift in which we unceasingly rejoice. But being "crucified with Him," we must also be "risen with Christ." Justification, sanctification, glorification, belong together for all who believe. While distinct, they are not separate. The righteousness of justification is 100% but not inherent, the righteousness of sanctification is inherent but not 100%, while the righteousness of glorification will be both 100% and inherent. Good news indeed — that all who believe are delivered from sin's guilt (justification), sin's power (sanctification) and sin's presence (glorification). The Sabbath, the image of the new world and redemption, creative power and love, points to all three.

Because those who accept the three-fold message thus affirm creation, they can have no share in Gnostic errors which look upon the things of sense with repugnance. We avoid both the platonic and manichean pitfalls, and rejoice in the good gifts of God, joyously using them, but by His grace refusing to abuse them. Creation and the Incarnation testify to the sacred nature of all material things, and those thus aware are the only ones equipped to be good stewards.

Such convictions have led us to the health reform message which is wonderfully appropriate for today's sick world, and a tremendous blessing for all who wish to serve God to the full. As stewards also of our mental faculties, Christian education becomes another major interest and privilege in an age where mass education encourages conformity, and prepares its devotees for the mark of the beast.

This doctrine of stewardship, which grows out of the basic truth of Creation, takes in the whole of man for the whole of his existence. It demands holiness of life with an intense concentration on God's viewpoint about everything. Sanctification of body, mind, and spirit is not an option for true stewards, but a necessity. Simultaneously, such stewards recognize in their material possession an entrustment from God. The practice of tithing is an outward sign of such recognized stewardship, not as though the other nine-tenths were ours to use as we would, but as a reminder that all ten-tenths are to be used to God's glory. The Great Commission is ever in the mind of Christian stewards and becomes the spring of missionary zeal to the ends of the earth, for we are debtors to all men.

We are repeatedly told in the writings of Ellen G. White that the most important message to the world for our day is that of Rev. 14:6-12. This appraisal is seen as appropriate as one perceives how the three angels messages challenge modern ideological heresies. Let us observe some typical examples of the way in which every philosophical and theological error of our day is countered by the message entrusted to the Advent people:

Atheism — Fear God. Worship Him that made heaven and earth.

Agnosticism — Fear God. Worship Him that made heaven and earth.

- Pantheism — Worship Him that made heaven and earth.
 Scientism — Worship Him that made heaven and earth.
 Determinism — Give glory to Him; for the hour of His judgment is come.
 Nihilism — Give glory to Him; for the hour of His judgment is come.
 Materialism — Give glory to Him; for the hour of His judgment is come.
 Manichaeism — Him that made heaven and earth.
 Gnosticism — Him that made heaven and earth.
 Darwinism — Him that made heaven and earth.
 Humanism — Fear God, and give glory to Him ...
 Ecumenism — Babylon is fallen ...
 Modernism-liberalism — ... the everlasting gospel ...
 Existentialism — ... the everlasting gospel ...
 Mysticism — ... the everlasting gospel ...
 Hedonism — ... the hour of His judgment is come ... Here are they that keep the commandments of God.
 Antinomianism — Here are they that keep the commandments of God.
 Roman Catholicism — Babylon is fallen ... the everlasting gospel ... the commandments of God ...
 Apostate Protestantism — Babylon is fallen ... the everlasting gospel ... the commandments of God ...
 Henotheism, polytheism — Worship Him that made heaven and earth ...
 Neonomianism — Here are they that keep the commandments of God ...
 Subjectivism — Fear God ... the everlasting gospel ... the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus.
 Communism — Fear God and give glory to Him ...
 Heathenism — ... the faith of Jesus ... the everlasting gospel...
 Antisupernaturalism — Fear God ...
 Pragmatism — ... the commandments of God ...
 Relativism — ... the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus.
 Legalism and Pharisaism — ... the everlasting gospel ...
 Spiritualism — ... the faith of Jesus ... the everlasting gospel ...
 Judaism — ... the faith of Jesus ...
 Freudianism — Fear God and give glory to Him ... the hour of His Judgment... the everlasting gospel ... the faith of Jesus.
 Empiricism — Fear God and give glory to Him ... Worship Him that made heaven and earth.
 Pentecostalism — ... the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus.

The list could be indefinitely prolonged, but the above may suffice to indicate the marvellous appropriateness of the last threefold message entrusted to this people.

Thus to Seventh-day Adventists has been entrusted a message of hope in an age of despair, a message of life in an age of death, a message of righteousness in an age of iniquity, a message of law in an age of lawlessness. To us has been given the truth of the unity of man's nature, and the sacred nature of all material as well as spiritual things. Our emphasis on judgment is salutary for the careless, and our prognosis of a time of mass conformity and religious

apostasy to come is but the spiritual parallel to the many warnings from sociologists about the trend towards amoral standardization of all behaviour. The Adventist faith in Holy Writ from Genesis to Revelation is a protest against the root error of substituting the words of the creature for the Word of the Creator.

In the sanctuary message we have the dramatized parable of the everlasting gospel — the illustrated storybook of the greatest story of all. In its services we have the types and symbols of substitution, imputation, representation — the great centralities of grace. There Christ our sacrifice, and Christ our great High Priest is placarded before us, and thus hope is excited, guilt removed, and obedience motivated. In the sacred year of the typical service is shadowed forth the history of the church with its climax in the wiping out of sin and the rejoicing of a universe of holy beings in Him who is not only King of Kings and Lord of Lords, but our Saviour and representative, and —our Righteousness” for ever and ever.

The special truth of the pre-Advent judgment is a graphic emphasis on the third angel’s message in verity. In teaching that our destinies are sealed while Christ is still our High Priest, through His eschatological imputation of His merits, the glory of —justification full and complete” (*GC*, 484) is underlined. The fact that we do not stand in physical personal presence before the great Judge (in contrast to the teaching of all other churches) but that Christ, who is our Judge-Advocate, is also our Representative in the judgment and thus gives us the verdict despite all the evidence from the —accuser of the brethren” — this is a precious truth indeed.

To know that we already from the moment of initial justification have —passed from death unto life,” and that we now possess —everlasting life,” and that there can be —no condemnation” while we abide in Him, because counted as complete in Christ and accepted in the beloved, enables us to —have confidence for the day of judgment” (1 John 4:17). We rejoice in the good news that —as He is so are we in this world” counted to be, every day, including judgment day. Such joy energizes us to witness to the unbelieving world with unquenchable zeal and efficacy.

We have sketched the glowing features of the child of truth entrusted to this divinely raised movement. The fact that that child came in swaddling clothes, which at this point of maturity no longer needed, is no occasion for discouragement or shame, any more than at Bethlehem long ago.

SOME IMPORTANT QUESTIONS ANSWERED BY LATER APPENDICES

Answer pages

1. Does the authority of Ellen G. White supersede that of Scripture?
App32: 683-686, 703-704; App34: 748-749
2. Is the authority of E.G. White on a par with that of Scripture?
App32: 704-705, 728-729
3. Is E.G. White the interpreter of Scripture?
App32: 683-686, App34
4. Is E.G. White inerrant?
App32: 683, 716-717, 727, 729, 731-732
5. How were some portions of the E.G. White books prepared?
App32: 679-683, 692-694, 721ff, 726, App33
6. Did any of our doctrines originate with E.G. White?
App32: 695, 712
7. Did E.G. White ever change any of her own doctrinal positions, resulting in different conclusions on Scriptural issues in earlier and later works?
App32: 736

8. Was it E.G. White's desire that positions be taken on her ~~say-so~~? *App32: 702*
9. Where did the substance of the GC chapter on French Evolution originate? *App32: 680*
10. Where did the substance of the GC chapters on the sanctuary originate? *App32*
11. What are the three points about the E.G. White writings ~~clearly~~ "established" by the research of the seventies? *App32: 683*
12. What factor in A.T. Jones' view of inspiration contributed to his downfall? *App32: 687*
13. Does the church show more concern over one's view of the nature of E.G. White's inspiration than one's view of the nature of Scripture? *App32: 689*
14. What attitude towards verbal inspiration was taken by GC president, A.G. Daniells? *App32: 691-692*
15. Was everything E.G. White wrote supernaturally revealed? *App32: 692, 710, 715*
16. Did editorial assistants at times play a significant part in the selected content of an E.G. White book? *App32: 692, 694*
17. Why did W.W. Prescott write a thirty-nine page document listing suggested changes for the new GC? *App32: 693, 729*
18. Did E.G. White, or the pioneers, believe in the verbal inspiration or infallibility of inspired writings? *App32: 702*
19. Did GC president Spicer believe that the Bible only is the Adventist rule of faith? *App32: 703*
20. Was he in agreement with such leaders as James White, W.C. White, W.W. Prescott, A.G. Daniells on this matter? *App32: 702, 704*
21. Have SDA's found it difficult in practice to apply ~~the~~ "Bible only" as the rule of faith? *App32: 705, 710*
22. Was E.G. White correct in endorsing Aug. 11, 1840? *App32: 711*
23. Did E.G. White always rightly interpret her visions? *App32: 730-732*
24. What is the ~~false~~ "light" in which some place the writing of E.G. White? *App32: 714*
25. What can bring a ~~deceitful~~ "peace" to the church? *App32: 715*
26. What were the two extreme positions regarding E.G. White according to Froom? *App32: 711*
27. Have we for many years avoided a number of fundamental questions? *App32: 716*
28. What part did Marian Davis play in the preparation of E.G. White books? *App32: 724ff*
29. Why was the tithing system originally opposed by some? Was E.G. White basically an exegete? *App32: 733-734*
30. Was E.G. White basically an exegete? *App34*
31. Are Adventists Protestants? *App32: 683, 685, 704-705; App34: 750*
32. How valid is the charge of plagiarism as regards E.G. White? *App36*
33. Why are many scandalized by the report that E.G. White used sources?
34. If we find such questions as these disturbing, what does that suggest regarding our own view of inspiration?
35. If we find the answers to these questions disturbing, would it then be consistent to reject E.G. White as the Lord's special messenger to this church?

} See chapter 6,
pages 405-417

ENDNOTES FOR CHAPTER SIX

- ¹ GC, 11.
- ² *Ibid.*, 611-612.
- ³ *Ibid.*, 36.
- ⁴ *Ibid.*, 39.
- ⁵ *Ibid.*, 49-50.
- ⁶ *Ibid.*, 624-625.
- ⁷ *Ibid.*, 625.
- ⁸ *Ibid.*, 553.
- ⁹ *Ibid.*, 593.
- ¹⁰ 4T, 594-595.
- ¹¹ GC, 389, 390.
- ¹² PP, 358.
- ¹³ L.R. Conradi, *The Founders of the SDA Denomination* (Plainfield, 1939), 11, citing S.S. Snow, *The Voice of Elias, or Prophecy Restored*, published Aug. 5, 1863.
- ¹⁴ EW, 41.
- ¹⁵ TM, 69.
- ¹⁶ E.G. White, *Minneapolis Talks*, mimeo copy, E.G. White vault, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich., 89, 88.
- ¹⁷ DA, 24.
- ¹⁸ AA, 33.
- ¹⁹ E.G. White, *Signs of the Times*, April 19, 1905.
- ²⁰ DA, 757.
- ²¹ E.G. White, Letter 230, 1907. Quoted in *SDABC*, 5:1109.
- ²² COL, 386.
- ²³ E.G. White, *Youth's Instructor*, June 21, 1900. Quoted in *SDABC*, 5:1109.
- ²⁴ Note that Ellen G. White used Hanna at this point.

—Within the holy place, kindling perhaps the many lights of the golden candlestick, some priests would be busy before the inner veil which between them and the holy of holies; that veil no thin, old, time-worn piece of faded drapery, but fresh and strong, and thickly woven, for they renewed it year by year; that holy of holies — the dark, secluded apartment within which lay the ark of the covenant, with the cherubim above it shadowing the mercy seat, which no mortal footstep was permitted to invade, save that of the high priest once only every year. How strange, how awful to the ministering priests, standing before that veil, to feel the earth tremble beneath their feet, and to see the strong veil grasped, as if by two unseen hands of superhuman strength, and torn down in the middle from top to bottom — the glaring light of day, that never, for long centuries gone by, had entered there, flung into that sacred tenement, and all its mysteries laid open to vulgar gaze. The Holy Ghost by all this signified that while ^as yet that first tabernacle was standing, the way into the holiest, the access to God was not yet made manifest; but now, Christ being come, to offer himself without spot to God, neither by the blood of goats nor calves, but by his own blood, to enter into the true holy of holies — even as he died on Calvary that veil ^{as} rent asunder thus within the temple to teach us that a new and living way, ^{Open} to all, accessible to all, had been consecrated for us through the rending of ^{the} Redeemer's flesh, that we might have boldness to enter into the holiest, and ^{might} draw near, each one of us, to God, with a new heart and in full assurance ^{of} faith. Little of all this may those few priests have known who stood that day gazing with awestruck wonder upon that working of the Divine and unseen hand — to them a sign of terror, rather than a symbol of what the death on Calvary had done. We read, however, that not long afterwards — within a year — many priests became obedient unto the faith; and it pleases us to think that among those who, from the inner heart of Judaism, from the stronghold of its priestly caste, were converted unto Christ, some of those may have been numbered whose first movement in that direction was given them as they witnessed that rending of the veil, that laying OPEN of the most holy place” (William Hanna, *The Life of Christ* [New York, nd], 750-751.).

- ²⁵ 4T, 122.
- ²⁶ Arthur White, *Facsimiles of the Two Earliest SDA Periodicals* (Washington, DC, 1946), 8.
- ²⁷ James White, —The Sanctuary, 2300 Days, and the Shut Door,” *Present Truth*, May, 1850, /(10), 78-79.
- ²⁸ David Arnold, —The Shut Door Explained,” *The Present Truth*, December 1849, /(6), 45-46.
- ²⁹ James White, *The Present Truth*, December, 1849, /(6), 46, 47.
- ³⁰ We have to admit the essential accuracy of the following criticisms from former Seventh-day Adventists.

—On March 24, 1849, Sister White had an extended vision directly on the subject of the 'shut door,' which vision appeared in the *Present Truth*, Vol. 1, No. 3, Aug., 1849. There is not a statement in it which disagrees with or which would modify the 'shut door' theory as presented by various writers in *Present Truth* during the years 1849 and 1850. To try to force the language of this vision to mean something different from what it seems to say and from what it is admitted that all of Sister White's Sabbathkeeping associates were teaching, is absurd. Such a forced interpretation was attempted in 1868 by Elder Uriah Smith in a booklet defending the 'Visions,' and again by Elder A.G. Daniells in an undated pamphlet *The Shut Door and the Close of Probation*. Both of these discussions are utterly inadequate inasmuch as they extract Sister White's words out of the setting of 'shut door' propaganda in which they appeared, and deal with them as a thing apart. When her words are read in the setting in which they were given, I do not see how anyone can doubt their import to be in perfect agreement with the other 'shut door' arguments of White, Bates, Rhodes, Edson, etc." (Harold E. Snide, —The Development of My Ideas Concerning the Divine Inspiration of Mrs. E.G. White, A Personal History, Par 11" [E.H. Ballenger Library, nd], 3.).

True Story of the Beginning of Seventh-day Adventism and of Mrs. Ellen G. White's claims, by Robert B. Tower.

—After the passing of the time of expectation, in 1844, (when Christ's second advent was expected) Adventists still believed the Saviour's coming to be very near; they held that they had reached an important crisis, and *that the work of Christ as man's intercessor before God, had ceased*. Having given the warning of the judgment near, they felt that their work for the world was done, and *they lost their burden of soul for the salvation of sinners ...* All this confirmed them in the belief that probation had ended, or, as they expressed it, The door of mercy was shut' —(*Spirit of Prophecy*, Vol. 4, [1884], 268.). They remained united in this belief for only a matter of a few weeks, after which they began, a few at a time, to give up the view that probation for the world had really ended. *By mid-December nearly all had given it up, including Ellen Harmon herself*.

It was then that she had her first vision. *This changed her thinking*. She then felt it her duty to tell the vision to her friends, but lacked the courage to do so, until, upon urging, she told it to one, Joseph Turner. To her surprise and joy, she learned that he believed and was teaching in harmony with what the vision revealed. She then related the vision to others and most, believing that it was from God, accepted it as light from heaven. Joseph Turner had *not* given up the idea that the door of mercy was shut as most of them had. As a result of this and later visions, belief in the shut door again took root and continued in this group — who later took on the name of Seventh-day Adventists — for from seven to ten years.

There is considerable early literature clearly supporting this picture. The following letter written by Ellen G. White to Joseph Bates, July 13, 1847, is perhaps *the most revealing*:

Gorham, Maine

July 13, 1847

Dear Brother Bates:

As James is at work and sisters are from home tonight thought I would employ myself in writing a line to you. My health is quite good for me. My faith is still strong that that very same Jesus that ascended up into heaven will so come in like manner as He went up, and that very soon.

I have had many trials of late; discouragement at times has laid so fast hold upon me it seemed impossible to shake it off. But thank God, Satan has not got the victory over me yet, and by the grace of God he never shall. I know and feel my weakness, but I have laid hold upon the strong arm of Jehovah, and I can say today I know that my Redeemer liveth, and if He lives I shall live also.

O how good it would be to meet with a few of like precious faith to exhort and comfort one another with words of holy cheer from the word of God. The sheep are now scattered, but thank God they are about to be gathered to a good pasture.

O how sweet it will be to meet all the blood-washed throng in the city of our God. 'Tis then we'll sing the song of Moses and the Lamb as we march through the gates into the city, bearing the palms of victory and wearing the crowns of glory.

Brother Bates, you write in a letter to James something about the Bridegroom's coming, as stated in the first published visions. By the letter you would like to know whether I had light on the Bridegroom's coming before I saw it in vision. I can readily answer, No. The Lord showed me the travail of the of the Advent band and midnight cry in December, but He did not show me the Bridegroom's coming until February following.

Perhaps you would like to have me give a statement in relation to both visions. *At the time I had the*

vision of the midnight cry I had given it up in the past and thought it future, as also most of the band had. I know not what time J. Turner got out his paper. I knew he had one out and one was in the house, but I knew not what was in it, for I had not read a word in it. I had been, and still was very sick. I took no interest in reading, for it injured my head and made me nervous.

After I had the vision and God gave me light, he bade me deliver it to the band, ^{but} I shrank from it. I was young, and I thought they would not receive it from me. I disobeyed the Lord, and instead of remaining at home, where the meeting was to be that night, I got in a sleigh in the morning and rode three or four miles and ere I found Joseph Turner. He merely inquired how I was and if I was in the way of my duty. I said nothing, for I knew I was not.

I passed up [to the] chamber and did not see him again for two hours, when he came up, asked if I was to be at meeting that night. I told him, no. *He said he wanted to hear my vision* and thought it duty for me to go home. I told him I should not. He said no more, but went away.

I thought, and told those around me, if I went I should have to come out against his views, thinking he believed with the rest. I had not told any of them what God had shown me, and I did not tell them in what I should cut across his track.

All that day I suffered much in body and mind. It seemed that God had forsaken me entirely. I prayed the Lord if He would give me strength to ride home that night, the first opportunity I would deliver the message he had given me. He did give me strength and I rode home that night. Meeting had been done some time, and not a word was said by any of the family about the meeting.

Very early next morning Joseph Turner called, said he was in haste going out of the city in a short time, and *wanted I should tell him all that God had shown me in vision.* *It was with fear and trembling I told him all.* *After I had got through he said he had told out the same last evening. I rejoiced, for I expected he was coming out against me, for all the while I had not heard any one say what he believed.* He said the Lord had sent him to hear me talk the evening before, but as I would not, he meant his children should have the light in some way, so he took him.

There were but few out when he talked, so the next meeting I told me vision, and the band, believing my visions from God, received what God bade me to deliver to them.

The view about the Bridegroom's coming I had about the middle of February, 1845, while in Exeter, Maine, in meeting with Israel Dammon, James, and many others. *Many of them did not believe in a shut door;* I suffered much at the commencement of the meeting. Unbelief seemed to be on every hand.

There was one sister there that was called very spiritual. She had traveled and been a powerful preacher the most of the time for twenty years. She had been truly a mother in Israel. *But a division had risen in the band on the shut door. She had great sympathy, and could not believe the door was shut.* I had known nothing of their difference. Sister Durben got up to talk. I felt very, very sad.

At length my soul seemed to be in an agony, and while she was talking I fell from my chair to the floor. It was then I had a view of Jesus rising from his mediatorial throne and going to the holiest and Bridegroom to receive His kingdom. They were all deeply interested in the view. They all said it was entirely new to them. The Lord worked in mighty power, setting the truth home to their hearts.

Sister Durben knew what the power of the Lord was, for she had felt it many times; and a short time after I fell she was struck down, and fell to the floor, crying to God to have mercy on her. When I came out of vision, my ears were saluted with Sister Durben's singing and shouting with a loud voice.

Most of them received the vision, and were settled upon the shut door. Previous to this I had no light on the coming of the Bridegroom, but had expected him to this earth to deliver His people on the tenth day of the seventh month. I did not hear a lecture or a word in any way relating to the bridegroom's going to the holiest.

I had but very few privileges in 1842, 3, and 4. My sisters both went to the camp meetings in New Hampshire and Maine, while my health prevented me from going to but one, in Maine. I knew the light I received came from God, it was not taught me by man. I knew not how to write so that others could read it till God gave me my visions. I went to school but very little on account of my health. I do not think I went to school a day after I was twelve years old, and did not go then but a few days at a time, when sickness would cause me to take to my bed for weeks and sometimes for months. The first I wrote anything that could be called writing was after I had been sick the prayer of faith was put up for me, and healing. [Here the sheet ends and the remainder of the letter is gone.] — Letter 3, 1847- (From *Ellen G. White and The Shut Door Question*, by A.L. White, 49-51.)

So much for her testimony in the year 1847. One short quotation from her husband, James White, must be here introduced, which shows complete harmony with her above testimony:

—When she received her first vision, December, 1844, she and all the band in Portland, Maine, (where her parents then resided) had given up the midnight cry, and shut door, as being in the past. It was then that the Lord shew her in vision, the error into which she and the band in Portland had fallen. She then related her vision to the band, and about 60 confessed their error, and acknowledged their seventh month experience to be the work of God” (*A Word to the Little Flock*, May 30, 1847. 22.).

³¹ Advent Source Collection, Washington, DC, No. 3188. See Gilbert M. Valentine's study (Andrews University, 1979), —The Camden Vision Reconsidered.”

³² *A Word to the Little Flock*, 1847, 14.

³³ R. J. Poehler, —. And The Door Was Shut, Seventh-day Adventists and the Shut-Door Doctrine in the Decade After the Great Disappointment.” Unpublished manuscript, Andrews University, 1978, 106-107.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 137-139.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 151-155.

³⁶ *GC*, 427.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 398.

³⁸ The *COL* positions are not entirely new for Ellen G. White, though they represent a different emphasis to *GC*. The kernel of the *COL* position is found in *GC*, 428.

³⁹ Forum address by Dr. D. McAdams, *GC*, Dallas, 1980. See any detailed history of the French Revolution. The Lord apparently has permitted errors of fact and exegesis in Ellen White lest we put her over and above Scripture. See the later section on —Erroneous Concepts.”

⁴⁰ *GC*, 433.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 639.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 670.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 673.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 674.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 676.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 678.

⁴⁷ *ISM*, 374.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 342.

⁴⁹ *PP*, 353.

⁵⁰ Leon Morris, *The Biblical Doctrine of Judgment* (London, 1960), 71.

⁵¹ Letter from A.G. Daniells to W.C. White, Jan. 3, 1910. 11 Bk. 46, 393. *GC* Archives.

⁵² Calvin J. Roetzel, *Judgment in the Community* (Leiden, 1972), 81.

⁵³ See appendix by Don McAdams.

⁵⁴ *ISM*, 21.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 20.

⁵⁶ Letter from W.W. Prescott to W.C. White, April 6, 1915.

⁵⁷ Balding and Magan's Unpublished Manuscript Testimonies Ellen G. White, p. 167.

⁵⁸ *GC*, 426.

⁵⁹ See *Adventist Review*, Feb. 14, 1980, 15.

⁶⁰ See Ron Graybill's —Analysis of E.G. White's Luther Manuscript,” 6, and the manuscript on the Huss chapter by Dr. D. McAdams.

⁶¹ *CWE*, 33-41. (Extracts only)

⁶² Quoted by Harold Snide, —The Development of My Ideas Concerning the Divine Inspiration of Mrs. E.G. White” (A Personal History, Part 1), White Estate.

⁶³ D. Elton Trueblood, *Philosophy of Religion* (New York, 1957), 42-46.

⁶⁴ E.G. White, *Minneapolis Talks*, 89, 88.

⁶⁵ Letter from M.L. Andreasen to J.L. McElhany and W.H. Branson, Dec. 25, 1942.

⁶⁶ *GC*, 9.

⁶⁷ —If the Testimonies speak not according to the word of God, reject them” (51, 591). Thus for Ellen White and our pioneers, Scripture alone is the supreme authority for doctrine.

—There is a class of persons who are determined to have it that the *Review* and its conductors make the views of Mrs. White a test of doctrine and Christian fellowship. It may be duty to notice these persons on account of the part they are acting, which is calculated to deceive some.

—What has the *Review* to do with Mrs. W.'s views? The sentiments published in its columns are all drawn from the Holy Scriptures. No writer of the *Review* has ever referred to them as authority on any point. The *Review* for five years has not published one of them. Its motto has been, —the Bible, and the Bible alone, the only rule of faith and duty.”

—Then why should these men charge the *Review* with being a supporter of Mrs. W.'s views?

—Again, how has the Editor of the *Review* regarded Visions and the Gifts of the Gospel Church for more than eight years past? His uniform statements in print on this subject will satisfactorily answer this question. The following is from a Tract he published in 1847: [He refers to “*A Word to the Little Flock.*”]

—The Bible is a perfect and complete revelation. It is our only rule of faith and practice. But this is no reason why God may not show the past, present, and future fulfilment of His word; in these last days, by dreams and visions, according to Peter's testimony. True visions are given to lead us to God, and to His written word; but those that are given for a new rule of faith and practice, separate from the Bible, cannot be from God, and should be rejected.'

—Again, four years since, he [J.W.] wrote on the Gifts of the Gospel Church, republished in the *Review* for Oct. 3d, 1854, from which I take the following:

—Every Christian is therefore in duty bound to take the Bible as a perfect rule of faith and duty. He should pray fervently to be aided by the Holy Spirit in searching the Scriptures for the whole truth, and for his whole duty. He is not at liberty to turn from them to learn his duty through any of the gifts. We say that the very moment he does, he places the gifts in a wrong place, and takes an extremely dangerous position.'

—Now if these paragraphs were not in print, his enemies might accuse him of changing his position; but as one was printed eight years since, they are nails driven in right places. Slandrous reports must fall powerless before facts of this character.

—Again in the *Review Extra*, published March, 1855, is the following statement from the Church that had been personally acquainted with the facts of the case for three years:

—This certifies that we have been acquainted with Bro. and Sr. White, and their teachings, and labours in church trials, and have never known them to urge the visions on any one as a portion of religious faith, or make them a test of fellowship. In behalf of the Church; —

J. T. Orton, S. T. Belden, T. B. Mead, Deacons.'

—The publishing committee have also spoken upon this subject, yet some persons will have it that the Visions are made a test. This same story was repeated over and over by the HARBINGER, to raise prejudice against the Sabbath. These men have now taken it up, if possible, in a meaner style. They have relieved Eld. Marsh in this department, and some of them out-strip him in zeal and malice.

—But what deserves special attention here is the unrighteous use some are making of the Visions. They take the advantage of the common prejudices against visions, misrepresent them, and those who are not ready to join them in anathematizing them as the work of Satan, then brand any view held by the body of Sabbathkeepers as the “*Vision View*,” and not the Bible view of the subject. In this way an unhallowed prejudice can be excited in the minds of some against any view, and even all the views held by the body of Christians called Advent Sabbathkeepers.

—This course has been, and is being, pursued on the subjects of the two-horned beast, sanctuary, time to commence the Sabbath and period of the establishment of the kingdom of God on the earth. It should be understood that all these views as held by the body of Sabbathkeepers, were brought out from the Scriptures before Mrs. W. had any view in regard to them. These sentiments are founded upon the Scriptures as their only basis.

—E. R. Pinney held as early as 1844 that the kingdom of God would not be established on the earth till the close of the seventh millennium. The editor of the *Review* has taught the same since 1845, five years before Mrs. W. had a view of this subject — that the saints would go to heaven at Christ's second advent, [John 7:33; 8:33, 36; 14, 15:1-3, 28; 1 Peter 1:3-8; Rev. 5:10] That the 1000 years reign of the saints in judgment [Rev. 20:4; Matt. 19, 28] would be in the “*Father's house*,” above — New Jerusalem — which Jesus has gone to prepare for his followers, while the earth remained desolate, [Jer. 4, 19-26; 25:15-33; Isa. 28-31, 22; Zeph. 1:2-18; 3:6-8; Isa. 13:9-11; — —

And at the end of the 1000 years Jesus would return to the earth with his SAINTS to execute Judgment upon all from Cain to the latest ungodly sinner, which cannot be until the second resurrection, when all ungodly sinners will be raised.

Now Mrs White's view of this subject was not till 1850; yet the view of this subject held by the body of Sabbathkeepers before and since 1850 is now branded as “*the vision view*,” and those who hold it are represented as forsaking the Bible and taking another rule of faith. A brother writing from the West to a brother in N.Y., on this subject, says, 'God will as certainly reject James White if he rejects His word as he has rejected Himes and Marsh.' Now it has come to this, that in order to be sure to avoid the charges of

infidelity and heresy these men, it is necessary to renounce every point of religious faith with which Mrs. W.'s views are in harmony. Every friend of truth and right should protest against so unrighteous a course. Brethren, be on your guard against the crafty mode of action to divide the Church of God. Let the visions stand upon their own merits. It is our duty to teach, and to hold up the hands of those who teach the word of God; also to mark those who cause divisions.

—But these men are not willing to leave the visions on their own merits, and let people alone who believe them who take the Bible as their only rule of faith and duty. No, some among them pursue them with deception, and slander. The publishing and preaching of such is an issue of bitterness against the visions and those who will not join them in their work of death. They make the visions a test. Their principal theme, even before an ungodly rabble, is opposition to, and ridicule of, the Visions, and their highest ambition and glory, it to disaffect persons and divide churches and families. Of this they boast from place to place, and in their sheet of scandal. All persons may now see who it is that make Mrs. W.'s views a test. While we take the Bible, and the Bible alone, as our rule of faith and duty, and are rigidly devoted to teaching the Word, these persons, as they go out from us, seem to become at once enraged against the visions, and imbued with bitterness against their former brethren (R. Hicks is a good example) and engage with rash zeal to divide churches, and separate the nearest and dearest friends. What is their test in this work? — The Visions.

—Now we shall go right along believing and teaching the word of the Lord. This is our business. And if we choose to believe Mrs. W.'s views which harmonize with the Word, this is our business and nobody's else. But if we should leave the Word, and look for a rule of faith and duty by some new revelation, then it would be the business of the church to silence me as a religious teacher.

—We have exposed some of the false statements of these men, and supposed this was sufficient. We care not a straw for their slanderous falsehoods on our own part; but if those who are prepared to show up their falsehoods think the cause demands their exposure, let them forward their testimonies to the office, and we will thoroughly expose them. This may be best" (James White, —A Test," *Review*, Oct. 16, 1855, 61, 62.).

We are aware that James White wrote this statement when the *Review* was extraordinarily sensitive to the matter of publishing E.G. White materials, and wrongly applied a correct principle. Later, the brethren repented of such sensitivity, but they nevertheless continued to echo the doctrinal position of James White as here expressed, as the following statements from Butler and Smith show.

—Our enemies try very hard to make it appear that we make the visions a test of fellowship. They must know themselves that this charge is false. Our leading men have never done this, and the visions themselves teach that it should not be done. It would be most absurd and impossible to do so, even if we would do it. With people in all parts of the world embracing our views who never saw Sister White or heard of her, how could we make them a test of fellowship? By their own admissions, our opponents have shown that we do not do so. They claim that there are many among us who do not believe the visions. This is true, yet these are in our churches and are not disfellowshipped. They have claimed in this —Extra" that Elds. Smith, Canright, and Gage did not believe the visions; yet all of them are members of our churches, two of them hold credentials as ministers, and one of them holds very important offices. Why will men talk so foolishly and unreasonably as to even show they are not consistent in their own statements? Hatred blinds the mind, and destroys their good sense. No; we do not make the visions a test, and never have. But we do claim the right to believe them, to talk about them freely, and to read them in private and in public, and shall no doubt continue to exercise that right, regardless of the spite of those who hate us" (George I. Butler, *Review Supplement*, Aug. 14, 1883.).

—An Explanation. By Eld. U. Smith.

—As my name is quite freely used in the —Extra" to which this Supplement has reference, a word may be expected from me in regard to it. I am not at all solicitous to say anything on the ground that I have given any occasion for the use which is made of my name in the above-mentioned sheet; for I feel well assured that I have not.

—I have always maintained the doctrine of the perpetuity of spiritual gifts, theoretically. I have believed, and do still believe, that the visions of Sister White are a practical illustration of that doctrine. But I have not believed, as past volumes of the *Review* will testify, that these, or any other manifestation of spiritual gifts, stood on a level with the Scriptures, or that they should be made a test of fellowship. I see as yet no occasion to change my views in any of these respects" (*Review Supplement*, Aug. 14, 1883).

With this statement Uriah Smith appended an item showing that Ellen G. White on one occasion reproved an innocent man, and also named the wrong town. This was to justify his statement that Sister White's

words were ~~not~~ on a level with the Scriptures," hence ~~should~~ not be a test of fellowship." Here is the item added:

—Through a misunderstanding, I happened to be the person rebuked, in the place of the one for whom the rebuke was intended, and who justly merited it. Were all the facts known, it would leave no room for even the slightest disrespect for the motives that influenced her, as she had, as she supposed, the best of reasons for believing that her informant had told her the truth. And indeed he had, but had made a mistake in the name of the person; all that she had said was true of another, though the incident did not occur at Parma. More than this, Mrs. White told me plainly that this report came from a gentleman whose acquaintance they had formed when travelling in the West.

—Those who fight against Mrs. White and spiritual gifts would do well to forge their weapons of something more substantial than flying reports.

—E. P. Daniels
Rankin Post Office
Genesee Col, Mich."

⁶⁸ 5T, 512.

⁶⁹ Ev, 256.

⁷⁰ 1T, 327-329.

⁷¹ 1SM, 164.

⁷² E. G. White, *Review and Herald*, Jan. 20, 1903.

⁷³ 5T, 663, 664.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 665.

⁷⁵ See Gen. 14:1, 9 and PP, 134; Gen. 5 and PP, 82, of SDABC, 1:246.

⁷⁶ As an instance in point, the reader could compare Ellen G. White's *How to Live* with L.B. Cole's *Philosophy of Health*. Dr. R. Schwartz suggests that Ellen G. White's denial of dependence upon such sources was a pardonable literary hyperbole." See *Spectrum* (January, 1977), 5(2), 19. As for the parallel with Edersheim's chapter titles, it is not nearly as precise as some have suggested.

⁷⁷ Spalding, *Captains of the Host* (Washington, DC, 1949), 304-310.

⁷⁸ F.W. Farrar, *History of Interpretation* (New York, 1886), 9, 10.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 11, 12.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 39-41.

⁸¹ *Review and Herald*, Oct. 21, 1890.

⁸² See J. N. Loughborough, *The Rise and Progress of the Seventh-day Adventists* (Battle Creek, 1892), 125-128.

⁸³ Dan. 8:27; 12:8.

⁸⁴ Second Minneapolis sermon by Ellen G. White. See appendix, "Through Crisis to Victory."

⁸⁵ Leon Morris, 63-64.

⁸⁶ G.E. Ladd, *Theology of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, 1974), 205.

⁸⁷ The words of Alexander Reese, written a century after Miller, document the great change that has taken place in the exegesis of Rev. 20 since our birth as a movement.

—I have had to lay aside a plan dealing with the complete victory in modern exegesis of the plain, literal interpretation of Rev. 20:1-6; even an abridgement of it has had to be omitted. I can only hope for leisure to write a tract showing the revolutionary change of attitude in the exegetes of Germany, Britain, and America to the vision of the millennium. Here one can but make the arbitrary statement that the post-millennial interpretation of Origen, Jerome, Augustine, and the majority of the Church's theologians ever since, is now as dead as Queen Anne, and just as honourably buried. Though one remembers seeing an American theologian, clad in medieval armour, contending valiantly for the faith — ~~on~~ the grave thereof."

—Peak's commentary of the Bible says that the figurative or allegorical interpretation is 'dishonest trifling,' and 'playing with terms,' which is excessively severe. Dr. Beckwith, in a commentary that reminds one again and again of Alford's great work, says of the non-literal interpretations: 'Recent scholars are very generally agreed in rejecting such interpretations as impossible' (p. 738). The voice of modern scholarship is fairly represented in the verdict of Dr. S. D. F. Salmond in his great work, *The Christian Doctrine of Immortality* (p. 352):-

—However the circumstance is to be accounted for, and however it is to be related to the general teaching of the New Testament, it must be admitted that this remarkable paragraph in John's Apocalypse speaks of a real millennial reign of Christ on earth together with certain of His saints, which comes in between a first resurrection and the final judgment.

—Dr. Salmond's testimony gains in weight from the consideration that he resists the millennial interpretation all through his exposition of the Scriptures. But when he comes to the classic passage he lays down his arms.

—The same setting-aside of the figurative or allegorical interpretations from the hoary past is to be found in *The Century Bible*, *The Cambridge Bible*, *The Cambridge Greek Testament*, *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, *The International Critical Commentary*, and in Peake's *Hartley Lecture* series. In Germany it is the same story; Bousset in the *Meyer* series; Holtzmann-Bauer in the *Handkommen-tar*; Lohmeyer in the *Handbuch*, Weiss-Heitmüller in the *Schriften*, Theodor Zahn in his own series, and Adolph Schlatter in his *Erläuterungen* — all proceed upon the presupposition that the figurative interpretations have passed away. So also the N.T. Theologies there. (Feine, Holtzmann, Schlatter, and Zahn.)

—In one or two cases the writers rationalize; but the argument is unaffected. It is conceded that the Apocalypse presupposes that the Lord will begin to reign in power at His Coming.

—Not only that; the world's scholarship is telling us that Paul has the doctrine of a kingly rule of Christ ... between the resurrection of the dead in Christ and the absolute End, when the Son gives up the sovereignty to God; there is agreement between Paul and John, except that Paul is silent on the length of the Messianic reign. This is substantially the position taken by Johannes Weiss, Schmiedel, Lietzmann, Bousset, Bachmann, and Schlatter respectively, in the series mentioned above. There is no space even to quote the verdict of H. J. Holtzmann to the same effect, after surveying German and foreign exegesis and theology on the great passage in 1 Cor. 15:22-28 (*Lehrbuch der Neutest. Theologie*, vol 2, 228). There is less need to do this since there are two or three works in English that give the gist of German exegesis; first, *The Mysticism of the Apostle Paul*, by Dr. Albert Schweitzer (chap. 5 —“Eschatology”); the second is Peake's paraphrase of that passage in Paul, in his Commentary Cf. Thackeray's *The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought*. Dr. Peake, it may be said, was quite frigid on programmes of the End; indeed, in his *Plain Thoughts on Great Subjects* (118-121) he discusses the necessity of surrendering (to the Anthropologists) the whole conception of the Second Coming; though he makes the valuable admission that ‘the reappearance of Christ in bodily presence on earth involves no more difficulties than His departure from it’ (Alexander Reese, *The Approaching Advent of Christ* [Grand Rapids, 1975], 306-307.)

⁸⁸ GC, 422.

⁸⁹ E.G. White, *My Life Today*, 292.

⁹⁰ See AA, 208, 209.

⁹¹ In 1911 the word —alone” was inserted on page 383 of *Great Controversy*, changing the meaning considerably. While it is true that E.G. White applied Babylon to the Roman church, on page 383 she is definitely thinking of the —daughters” of Babylon as the whole page makes clear. This is in harmony with the position of the pioneers generally and is reflected in several articles in the early years of the *Review*. The argument in the changed sentence of page 383 now does not make sense. The original affirmed that the moral fall announced could only apply to churches comparatively pure before 1844 — something not true of the Roman church. To add —alone” says that the Roman church, although —in a fallen condition for many centuries,” fell in 1844. But the —moral” of Ellen White's change is that she never saw her original or later positions as inerrant.

APPENDIX ONE

Waggoner On The Investigative Judgment

Waggoner On The Investigative Judgment

A long time ago I found that the only way to avoid misunderstandings in Bible discussions was to keep clear of theological terms not found in Scripture, and hence not susceptible of Bible explanation. A brief consideration of the Judgment in general will show that there is no place for an “investigative” Judgment before the coming of Christ. You will pardon me for quoting several passages of Scripture in full, instead of merely giving the references. I want the truth that they contain to stand out so boldly that it will be apparent what a libel upon God it is to assume that He is under the necessity of investigating the record of men’s lives and characters, in order to ascertain whether or not He can take them to Heaven.

“Known unto God are all His works from the beginning of the world.”

“Can any hide himself in secret, that I shall not see him? said the Lord. Do not I fill heaven and earth? saith the Lord.”

“The word of God is living, and active, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, of both joints and marrow, and is a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart. And there is no creature that is not manifest in His sight; but all things are naked and laid open to the eyes of Him with whom we have to do.”

“O Lord, Thou hast searched me, and known me. Thou knowest my downsitting and mine uprising. Thou understandest my thought afar off. Thou searchest out my path and my lying down, and art acquainted with all my ways. For there is not a word in my tongue, but lo, O Lord, Thou knowest it altogether.”

“The foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, the Lord knoweth them that are His.”

“Jesus did not commit Himself unto them, because He knew all men, and needed not that any should testify of man; for He knew what was in man.”

“Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who should betray Him.”

In the face of this truth so often repeated, how can any thoughtful believer of the Bible teach that it is necessary for God to spend years in searching records, to find out who are true followers of Him, and who are not? **We are expected to teach as a fundamental article of faith, that it has already taken God, assisted by hosts of angels, almost seventy-two years to go over the records (several times longer, by the way, than it was supposed would be required), and still the work is not done. It brings God down to the level of man.**

But is there not to be a Judgment? Most certainly; for the Scriptures teach that “when the Son of man shall come in His glory, and all the holy angels with Him,” then He shall sit upon the throne of His glory, and the dead, small and great, of all nations, shall stand before Him to be judged; but they nowhere say anything about any Judgment before Christ’s coming.

The object of the Judgment is not that God may learn all about men, but men may learn the truth about God. They will not learn it through the preaching of His Word, so they must see everything for themselves, just as it was in relation to every other thing, so that every knee, even Satan’s, shall involuntarily bow, and every tongue confess to God,

acknowledging that Jesus Christ is our Lord. Everyone that is cut off must acknowledge that his punishment is just; and even the righteous, who have trusted God and believed in His goodness and justice, without understanding all things, must have all things set before them so clearly that there will be no possibility for any doubt or question ever to arise.

Seventh-day Adventist teaching concerning the sanctuary, with its “Investigative Judgment” to precede the blotting out of sins, is virtually a denial of the atonement. True, much is made of the “antitypical day of atonement” beginning in 1844; but that very thing minimizes, if it does not nullify, the value of the blood of Christ, in that it teaches that a man may receive the blood — the life — and not receive the atonement.

Let me note, by the way, an inconsistency on the part of those who insist that everything must “fit the type.” In the type, the atonement day was just one day out of 360 days — the last day of the year. According to SDA teaching, Christ was in the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary from His ascension till 1844, or 1810 years, which time corresponded to the yearly service in the tabernacle, leading up to the day of atonement. The 1810 years corresponded to the 359 days in the type. Now 359 days is to one day as 1810 years is to five years and fifteen days. Therefore if the type were to be followed exactly, the “antitypical day of atonement” ought to have ended some time in 1849. Why insist on following the “type” so closely in other respects, and ignore it in the important matter of time?

But to come to the really serious indictment, I have said that the teaching that atonement for sins was deferred until 1844, and that no sins were blotted out till then, the sins of the living not being blotted out even yet, minimizes or even nullifies the value of the blood of Christ. It makes a distinction between things that do not differ, and teaches that the blood — the life — of Christ received by a person exercises only a portion of its virtue at the time of its reception, — that it is divided in its action. Seventh-day Adventists do believe in the forgiveness of sins. At least it is taught in the denomination, and is believed by many. But forgiveness is obtained only by the reception, consciously, of the life of Christ, which is given freely on the cross for all men. We are “justified [made righteous] freely by His grace, through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus.” This forgiveness is reconciliation to God, for it was our “wicked works” that constituted our enmity to God, and Christ has reconciled us in the body of His flesh, through death. Col. 1:21, 22. Justified by His blood is the same as reconciled by His death (Rom. 5:9, 10), and this is the atonement. By Christ “we have now received the atonement.” I know that there is an attempt to evade this truth, by using the word “reconciliation,” which is given in the margin; but the fact remains that reconciliation and atonement are identical. Reconciliation implies previous enmity. In this case the enmity was all on our side; we were enemies of God, who is the Friend of sinners. It is we who are reconciled to God, by the destruction of the enmity that was in us. Once we hated His way; now we love and yield to them, and are at one with Him. We have received the atonement, namely, the life of God in Christ.

And this is the blotting out of sins. How can it be otherwise, when the enmity is destroyed, “slain,” and the enmity is the body of sin? “It is the blood that makes atonement for the soul,” and this blood — life — is not divided. I am sure that you still sing with as much fervour as when we used to sing it together twenty-eight years ago,

“Amazing Grace! ,tis heaven below
To feel the blood applied;”

and I hope that sometimes even yet Adventist congregations join in singing from the old hymn book,

“My sin, O the bliss of the glorious thought!
My sin, not in part, but the whole,
Is nailed to His cross, and I bear it no more;
Praise the Lord, praise the Lord, O my soul!”

and also from “Christ in Song,”

“Christ has for sin atonement made;
What a wonderful Saviour!
I am redeemed, the price is paid;
What a wonderful Saviour!”

I know that hymns do not establish doctrine; but my joy in singing these lines comes from the knowledge that they are Scriptural. “We have received the atonement.” We should not dare come into the presence of God as law-breakers knowing that our sins were charged up against us; but we can come with boldness to the Throne of Grace, when we have this gracious assurance and invitation: “I have blotted out, as a thick cloud, thy transgressions, and, as a cloud, thy sins; return unto me, for I have redeemed thee.”

I think there is no disagreement as to the fact that the blotting out of sins is the atonement. What I object to is the denominational teaching that this is only a book transaction. That makes the atonement not a personal matter at all, but something which can take place without in the least affecting the individual concerned. It is like blotting out extreme hot or cold weather by breaking the thermometer. What possible difference can it make to a man what is done with a record of his sins, written in a book, when he himself has had them removed from him “as far as the east is from the west”? A sick man is taken to a hospital and treated. When he enters his condition is noted, and every day that he is there a careful record of his case is made. Every rise of temperature is set down, together with every unfavourable symptom. By and by he is discharged, cured. That record of the course of his disease will remain on file in the hospital as long as the hospital stands; but the man knows nothing and cares nothing about it. He is freed from the disease, and that is all that he cares about. Just as little can the man who is forgiven and cleansed from sin care for or be affected by any record of his former sins. In saying this I am not implying that there will be retained forever the record of men’s sins. What I do mean is that the blotting out of sins is a vital thing in the sinner himself, and not a mere matter of bookkeeping.

I have often gone into a Roman Catholic church during the celebration of the mass, and it seemed to me that it was an exact picture of the SDA idea of Christ’s work as a priest. The people were all down in the body of the church, and the priest stood at the altar, far away from them, and with his back to them, going through forms and saying words of which they understood nothing. The priest’s mummery had no manner of connection with the people for whom he was supposed to be ministering. Even so the denominational teaching separates the work of Christ from the people — making the atonement consist of forms and not of fact. I believe you will agree with me, that the following lines by Van Dyke were Scriptural:

“Though Christ a thousand times in Bethlehem be born,
And not within thy heart, thy soul shall dwell forlorn.

The cross on Golgotha thou lookest to in vain,
Unless within thyself it be set up again."

The idea of making a man's salvation depend to any degree whatever upon his belief, or the fact, of whether or not Christ stood for a certain number of years upon one side or the other of a partition wall would be childish, if the matter were not so serious. Will nothing ever emancipate the denomination from the bondage of the observance of "days, and months, and times, and years"? Will they forever encumber and smother the glorious message of the everlasting Gospel with endless details of ceremonialism? Must the whole Levitical system be transferred to heaven till the end of time, and it be continually taught that God regards even His own followers as mere ticket-of-leave men?

What do I mean by this? I have reference to the teaching that no matter how humbly and contritely a man may confess his sins to God, how heartily he accepts Christ as his sacrifice and Saviour, his sins are only provisionally forgiven; that they are held against him to see how he will "hold out." What is this but to make him a ticket-of-leave man? It is at best but suspended sentence. You don't forgive your children that way. No real man forgives an offender in such a manner, but whole-heartedly, letting the evil of the past be as though it had not been. Why should Christians charge God with doing that which in them would be unchristian? Why not be content with the teaching that if we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness? And that "as far as the east is from the west, so far hath he removed our transgressions from us"?

The whole theory of a postponed blotting out of sin seems to be based upon the superficial reading of Acts 3:19. You know, of course, that the proper reading of that text is found in the Revised Version: "Repent, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, that so seasons of refreshing may come from the presence of the Lord." There is no intimation that the blotting out of sins is to be delayed indefinitely after the repentance and conversion, for such a thing is an impossibility. The blood of Christ cleanses from all sin, when we repent, and then we have "fellowship" with the Father and the Son. We are at one with them. Where are the sins after we have been cleansed from them? Where was the leprosy after Christ touched the leper, and cleansed him from it? Where was Peter's wife's mother's fever after Jesus touched her hand, and it left her? Where did it go? And where was it kept stored up? Where is the pain after the healing balm has been administered? Where is the hunger after the nourishing food has been eaten? Where is the thirst after the refreshing draught? Where was the man's blindness after his eyes were opened? Where was the man's lameness after his feet and ankle bones received strength, and he leaped and walked? Where is the sin, after a man becomes a new creature?

Just the other day I picked up an old volume of "*Thoughts on Daniel*" and read that the work of Christ since 1844 "consists in the remission of the sins of those who should be found worthy to have them remitted." I pass by the teaching that the remission of sins depends on a man's worthiness. That is too baldly evangelical to need threshing out again. But we are taught in the Bible that remission of sins is something that is received by whosoever believeth in Jesus. Acts 10:43. Christ, in imparting the Spirit to the apostles, said: "Whose sins soever ye remit, they are remitted." There is no teaching of a future remission. The remission of sins is as real a thing as the healing of disease, and cannot take place apart from the individual.

The objection is raised, that to teach that Christ made atonement for sins on the cross is to teach the doctrine of indulgence, the forgiveness of sins before they are committed. That objection does not hold, so far as I am concerned, and does not lie against Scripture teaching. Christ does make atonement for sins on the cross; for, as I have set forth, the cross is an ever-present reality. How else could Paul say, "I am crucified with Christ"? Or how could he reproach the Galatians for their defection, "before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been set forth, evidently crucified among you"? Do not Seventh-day Adventist preachers ever appeal to sinners to "come to the cross"? Where else but at the cross can the bonds be loosed, and the burden of sin be removed?

Well, I might as well stop here, although the temptation is strong to go on with many other lines branching out of this. All that I wanted was to let you know where I stand, and the reason for it. I couldn't stand otherwise, and believe the Gospel. Yet I know that you believe the Gospel and at the same hold, nominally, at least, to the denominational teaching on the sanctuary. I know that you are very busy; but I wish that for the sake of old times you would point out to me where I am wrong.

How could I honestly hold my place as a preacher and teacher in the denomination so long as I did, if I feel that my views would keep me out of the denominational ministry now?

For one thing, my views were not so sharply defined as they are now, since they were a gradual growth. Moreover, the lines are drawn much more closely now than they were then. You know that men have been retired from the ministry for differing on so uncertain a matter as the interpretation of Dan. 11. What, then, would be the fate of a man in the ministry who should announce his dissent from the denominational teaching on the "Sanctuary Question," which is considered to be the keystone of the whole arch? Besides, I was never a belligerent, and as I always held, and do still, what I deemed to be the really essential truths of the message, I contented myself with teaching them, and holding my peace concerning things that I knew were not Biblical. Of course, I was often accused of "not preaching the message;" but things would be tolerated in one already long in the work, that would not be in one just entering it, or re-entering it after long absence. You know that in spite of my non-militant attitude, I was in hot water a good deal of the time.

E.G. Waggoner, "Confession of Faith," pp. 22-29.

★ ★ ★

APPENDIX TWO

The Problem Of Dan. 8:14 And Its Context

by

Desmond Ford

The Problem Of Dan. 8:14 And Its Context

A criticism of our key doctrine of the sanctuary is being increasingly met, namely — that our interpretation of Dan. 8:14 by reference to the investigative judgment of the saints entirely ignores the context. The case is put forward usually somewhat like this: In the eighth chapter of Daniel, an impious power is shown doing despite to the sanctuary, and the question is then asked as to how long such iniquity shall prosper. The answer, therefore, of verse 14, cannot be applied to another subject altogether, namely, when shall the professing people of God have their cases investigated by a heavenly court? Such an interpretation, say our critics, has nothing whatever to do with the context. On the other hand, that interpretation which gives an exposition of Daniel 8 according to the historical events of Maccabean times — chiefly the profanation of the temple by Antiochus Epiphanes and its cleansing by loyal Jews, makes obvious sense, and is in complete harmony with the surrounding verses.

In answer to this criticism, we would first point out that the interpretation of Dan. 8:14 rests upon a larger context than that chapter alone. A close study of the whole book of Daniel reveals that 8:11-14 is the climax of a major theme of this prophetic volume. The very first verses of Daniel bring to view Babylon's attack upon the sanctuary. In the 5th chapter, the vessels of the sanctuary are again profaned by a wicked Babylonian king. In the 7th chapter, the law which was in the heart of the sanctuary, is ~~changed~~ by a power which is labelled in the New Testament as Babylon. Daniel's prayer of the 9th chapter is that God will ~~cause~~ his face to shine upon the sanctuary which is desolate" and the closing verses of the chapter present that Messianic prophecy which is dated from the rebuilding of the sanctuary in Jerusalem and which extends to the inauguration of the services of the heavenly sanctuary and the ascended Priest. The tenth chapter of Daniel presents the conflict between the angels of God and those wicked powers endeavouring to influence Persian rulers to prevent that rebuilding of the sanctuary promised in the prophecy of Dan. 9. In Dan. 11:31 the prophet points again to the work of antichrist in ~~polluting~~ the sanctuary of strength," and the reference is similar in Dan. 12:11. Considering these emphases throughout Daniel, it is evident that the theme of the 8th chapter, verses 11-14, is the motif of the entire book. Those who contend that Dan. 8:11-14 finds its complete fulfilment in the historical episode regarding Antiochus Ephiphanes are aligning themselves with the modernists who would derate Daniel to the status of forgery made in the second century BC. Such thereby take issue with Christ's own endorsement of the prophet, and the Saviour's own interpretation of Dan. 8:11-14 as yet future in His day. See Matt. 24:15.

Rather, in view of the recurring references to the sanctuary throughout the book, we conclude that Dan. 8 is the climactic symbolic presentation of the chief theme of the prophet — the great controversy between good and evil as shadowed forth by the conflict between Babylon and the Jewish sanctuary and its host in Old Testament times, and spiritual Babylon (Rome) and the Christian church in this dispensation.

Let us now consider what the present writer believes to be the heart of this matter.

The New Testament In Rev. 12, 13 & 14 Interprets Dan. 8 For Us.

Note the following:

DANIEL 8

—And it waxed great even to the host of heaven and it cast down some of the host and of the stars to the ground.” v. 10

—The host was given over” v. 12 (margin)
—He shall destroy the mighty and the holy people.” v. 24

—He magnified himself to the Prince of the Host.” v. 11

—And the place of his sanctuary was cast down.” v. 11

—And his power shall be mighty but not by his own power.” v. 24

—Unto 2300 days, then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.” v. 14

—He shall be broken without hand.” v. 26

REV. 12, 13, & 14

—And his tail drew the third part of the stars of heaven and it cast them to the earth.” 12:4

—It was given unto him to make war with the saints and to overcome them” 13:7

—He opened his mouth in blasphemy against God.” 13:6

—Opened his mouth in blasphemy against ... the tabernacle (or sanctuary).” 13:6

—The dragon gave him his power ...” 13:2

—Fear God and give glory to Him, for the hour of His judgment is come.” 14:7

—And the angel ... gathered the vine of the earth and cast it into the winepress of the wrath of God.” 14:9 See also 14:14.

No one questions that Rev. 12 and 13 has to do with the great controversy between Christ and Satan, but it has not always been recognized that the same is the case in Dan. 8. This should have been seen by the reference to the —Prince of princes” in this chapter and by virtue of the fact that this prophecy, as with the last one in Daniel, is apocalyptic in form, and therefore cosmic in scope. Commentators have been so busy gazing at Antiochus Epiphanes that this key phrase —Prince of princes” has not been seen in its true significance. Likewise, it has often been recognized that Rev. 12 and 13 allude to Dan. 7 (particularly 7:25), but what has not been noticed is that there is no specific mention of the tabernacle in this latter passage. The reference to the tabernacle or sanctuary in Rev. 13 is based on Dan. 8, just as the reference to blasphemy in Rev. 13 springs not only from Dan. 7:25 but also from Dan. 8 (vs. 23-25). Thus Dan. 8:14, as well as Rev. 13:5, 6, deals with the age long warfare against God and not merely with an incident during the second century BC.

It is interesting to observe that the Nestle edition of the Greek New Testament has a reference to Dan. 8:10 appended to the margin of Rev. 12:4 in order to show the source of the Revelator’s terminology.

Many non-Adventist interpreters have pointed out that the dragon of Rev. 12, besides representing Rome in the secondary sense, primarily refers to Satan. Verse 9 declares —and the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the Devil and Satan which deceiveth the whole world was cast out into the earth and his angels were cast out with him.” Similarly, in Dan. 8, the symbol that stands for Rome represents also the wicked spiritual power which energizes it. That Isa. 14 and Ezek. 28 in their references to the rulers of Babylon and Tyre signify Satan primarily, has long been a commonplace with Bible students, and we should recognize that this same principle is found in the 8th chapter of Daniel. No mere episode in

intertestamental history is here being focused upon by the prophet, except possibly in an apotelesmatic sense. The interpretation which understands the prophet to be employing a symbol which refers both to an earthly power and Satan working through it is not a novel viewpoint, but rather one based upon inspired procedure found in both the Old and the New Testaments.

Further support for this view is found in a closely related chapter of Dan. 10, which beyond all question depicts the great controversy between Christ and Satan, rather than events of only national significance. Inasmuch as Dan. 10 is introductory to a prophecy which elaborates the preceding prophecy of the 8th chapter, an understanding of it casts light on the present problem. ~~In~~ this chapter, as perhaps nowhere else in Scripture, the veil that separates heaven from earth is drawn aside, and the struggle between the powers of light and darkness is revealed.” (*SDABC*, 5:860).

The main import of this chapter, Dan. 10, seems to be to introduce the final prophecy found in the two following chapters, and this introduction is effected by giving to the prophet evidence that movements on earth were but the outcome of prior spiritual activity on the part of the supernatural beings. The same two heavenly beings mentioned in the 8th chapter figure in the present one, and again at the close of this prophecy in Dan. 12:5-7.

Let us note particularly the words of Gabriel to Daniel in 10:12, 13.

~~Fear~~ not, Daniel; for from the first day that thou didst set thine heart to understand, and to chasten thyself before God, thy words were heard, and I am come for thy words. But the prince of the kingdom of Persia withstood me one and twenty days: but, lo, Michael, one of the chief princes, came to help me; and I remained there with the kings of Persia.”

The word translated ~~prince~~” in this passage is often used by Daniel in connection with supernatural beings (8:11, 25; 10:13, 21; 12:1), [*SDABC*, 5:859] and the name Michael appears in the Bible ~~only~~ in apocalyptic passages ... where Christ is in direct conflict with Satan.” This is significant indeed when we remember that Dan. 10-12 is but a further expansion of Dan. 8, as chapter 8 is of chapter 7, chapter 7 is of chapter 2.

Typical comments by exegetes on this passage include the following:

Pulpit Commentary on Daniel 10:13

While in the lower plane of history the nations themselves do these things; in the higher sphere it is their angels who are the actors.

Ellicott's Commentary on Daniel 10:13

Perhaps no single verse in the whole of the Scriptures speaks more clearly than this (v. 13) upon the invisible powers which rule and influence nations ... revelation points out that as spiritual beings carry out God's purpose in the natural world (Ex. 12:23; 2 Sam. 24:16) and in the moral world (Luke 15:10), so also they do in the political world. From this chapter we not only learn that Israel had a spiritual champion (v. 21) to protect her in her national life, and to watch over her interests, but also that the powers opposed to Israel had their princes, or saviours, which were antagonists of those which watched over Israel. The ~~princes~~” of the heathen powers are devils, according to 1 Cor. 10:22. ... Further passages in the New Testament bearing upon the question are 1 Cor. 8:5; Col. 1:16.

Wordsworth's Commentary on Daniel 10:13

The prince of the kingdom of Persia, that is, one of the angels, who, under Satan, the prince of the powers of the air, the ruler of the darkness of this world ... exercises power in this lower world, especially in thwarting the advancement of the Kingdom of God, and in disturbing the peace, and in marring the prosperity of His Church. ...

Daniel here reveals to us (what is more clearly displayed in the New Testament) that the Evil One has still great power in this lower world; and that he has evil angels which do his work in the kingdoms of earth. Satan knew well that the return of the Hebrew people to Jerusalem, and restoration of the Temple at Jerusalem, were steps in advance toward the Advent of Christ, and toward the evangelical dispensation of His acts and sufferings, by which Satan's own kingdom would be destroyed, and toward that future final consummation in which all the kingdoms of this world will become the kingdom of the Lord and of His Christ. (Rev. 11:15).

E. G. White: Prophets and Kings, 571-572

While Satan was striving to influence the highest powers in the kingdom of Medo-Persia to show disfavour to God's people, angels worked in behalf of the exiles. The controversy was one in which all heaven was interested. Through the prophet Daniel we are given a glimpse of this mighty struggle between the forces of good and the forces of evil. For three weeks Gabriel wrestled with the powers of darkness, seeking to counteract the influences at work on the mind of Cyrus; and before the contest closed, Christ Himself came to Gabriel's aid.

In connection with these statements we should recall that Daniel contains that type of prophecy known as apocalyptic, which is specially characterized by its cosmic quality, its viewing of earthly events from the standpoint of the great spiritual controversy between Christ and Satan. (*SDABC*, 7:723) These facts with reference to chapter 10 cast great light on the cryptic phrase regarding the works accomplished by the little horn. **—And his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power.**” Rome, in her persecutions, was but the earthly manifestation of Satan's wrath against ~~the~~ woman” and ~~her~~ seed.” See Rev. 12:4, 13, 17; and Gen. 3:15. The fallen archangel, rather than merely a worldly kingdom, is the focus of Dan. 8:11-13, as surely as the sanctuary of the following verse primarily applies to the spiritual sanctuary of heaven rather than the literal visible one.

As certainly as Satan and his work are found prefigured in Dan 8, so are Christ and His redemptive activity. ~~The~~ daily” stands for His continual ministry as the saints' High Priest. The ~~prince~~ of the host” referred to in verse 11 is identical with ~~Messiah~~ the Prince” in Dan. 9, and ~~the~~ prince of princes” of Dan. 8:25. To apply Daniel's expressions merely to Onias the Jewish high priest is practically blasphemy. The context of the allusion to the ~~prince~~ of princes” includes reference to the time of the end of all things. The eschatological expression employed here links with the symbolic picture of Dan. 2:44, 45 where the kingdom is depicted as the coming of a stone cut out without hands. Compare Dan. 8:25 with Dan. 2:45.

The question of Dan. 8:13 thus becomes ~~how~~ long shall Satan be permitted to oppose the work of Christ and to oppose the saints through earthly counterfeit powers, how long will it be before God intervenes?” Such a question is often found in Scripture. Compare with Dan. 8:13; Psalm 6:1-4; 13:1-4; 94:1-6; Zech. 1:12; Hab. 1:2; Rev. 6:10. In each instance the question ~~how~~ long?” is a heartfelt desire for God's interruption of the course of iniquity and His punishment of evildoers and His justifying of the oppressed saints who for so long a period are made to appear as ~~the~~ offscouring of all things.” The ultimate fulfilment of such

requests is the final judgment of God, the way for which is paved by the closing work of the everlasting Gospel. These both involve proceedings in the heavenly sanctuary, for the sanctuary of Rev. 13 which is blasphemed by the little horn is the sanctuary that houses the throne of God and His law.

Rev. 13 states that not only the sanctuary of tabernacle, but the name or character of God have been blasphemed. Thus the justifying of the sanctuary is the clearing of God's character from the slanders of Satan, the unmasking of Satan before the universe, and the terminating of his attacks upon the saints on earth below and in heaven above. It should ever be kept in mind that the meaning of devil is ~~–slanderer~~, and what we find him doing through his serpent medium in the opening pages of Holy Writ is identical with his initial attack in heaven and all his subsequent activities. To Eve, God was pictured as a hard taskmaster, and this has been perpetuated by the antichrist of history with its doctrines of salvation by works, purgatory, hell fire, etc. These have indeed ~~–blasphemed~~ God's name." Therefore, the justifying of the sanctuary must involve a work which will reveal God as holy and righteous, and a message setting forth the true gospel. No other transaction but the judgment could trace fully all God's dealings through the centuries and vindicate His actions and character before the universe. When Dan. 7 and 8 are set out in parallel fashion it is made further apparent that Dan. 8:14 points to the same event pictured in verses 9 and 10 of the 7th chapter of Daniel. Let us notice the sequence:

DANIEL 7

Babylon

Medo-Persia

Greece

Rome

–The judgment was set and the books were opened."

DANIEL 8

— — — —

Medo-Persia

Greece

Rome (the little horn)

–Then shall the sanctuary be justified (cleansed)."

Similarly, as in Dan. 7 and 8 the description of the work of the antichrist is followed by the judgment which vindicates the saints and issues in destruction for the wicked, so in Revelation following chapters 12 and 13 we have the proclamation ~~–Fear~~ God and give glory to Him, **for the hour of His judgment is come.**" The verses which follow this statement in Revelation are identical in import with the description of the destiny of the righteous and the wicked which follow Dan. 7:9, 10 and Dan. 8:14. (See Dan. 7:22, 26, 27; 8:25; 11:45; 12:1-3; 13; and compare Rev. 14:12, 16, 19-20). Thus the sequence in both Daniel and Revelation is identical: the work of the antichrist against the people and truth of God, the judgmental vindication of the saints and the true gospel; the respective rewards distributed to the righteous and the wicked.

We should note well that to apply Dan. 8:14 only to the investigative judgment of the saints is to limit the significance of this verse. Seen in context it becomes evident that the judgment here brought to view is the entire work, both investigative and executive, including the judgmental privileges of the saints during the millennium when all will have an opportunity to have the questions of long years answered by the books of record. Dan. 8 has clearly revealed the **saints** as being trodden under foot as well as the sanctuary and the truth of God, and thus the justification called for in verse 14 involves a clearing of the character of the saints as well as a clearing of God's name and uplifting of that cast down law. Complete vindication for God, however, can only come with the destruction of the powers permitted to operate until their true character becomes manifest to all created beings.

C.S. Lewis in his book *Reflections on the Psalms* has a chapter on the meaning of judgment as used in the Old Testament, and his words are pertinent to our interpretation of Dan. 7:9, 10, and Dan. 8:14. Lewis points out that, in Old Testament thought, to vindicate and to judge are linked. Jewish judgment showed not so much who was righteous but who was ~~in~~ the right.” Says Lewis:

The ancient Jews, like ourselves, think of God’s judgment in terms of an earthly court of justice. The difference is that the Christian pictures the case to be tried as a criminal case with himself in the dock; the Jew pictures it as a civil case with himself as the plaintiff. The one hopes for acquittal, or rather for pardon; the other hopes for a resounding triumph with heavy damages. Hence he prays ~~judge~~ my quarrel,” or ~~avenge~~ my cause”. ...

We need not therefore be surprised if the Psalms, and the Prophets, are full of the longing for judgment, and regard the announcement that ~~judgment~~” is coming as good news. Hundreds and thousands of people who have been stripped of all they possess and who have the right entirely on their side will at last be heard. Of course they are not afraid of judgment. They know their case is unanswerable — if only it could be heard. When God comes to judge at last it will.

In the same chapter Lewis also says:

The Divine Judge is the defender, the rescuer. Scholars tell me that in the *Book of Judges* the word we so translate might almost be rendered ~~champions~~,” for though these ~~judges~~” do sometimes perform what we should call judicial functions many of them are much more concerned with rescuing the oppressed Israelites from Philistines and others by force of arms. They are more like Jack the Giant Killer than like a modern judge in a wig. (C.S. Lewis. *Reflections on the Psalms* [London, 1958] 15-17).

It is interesting to notice that Ellen G. White in speaking of the judgment in *Christ’s Object Lessons* presents the same concept as C.S. Lewis.

... the prayer, ~~do~~ me justice of mine adversary,” applies not only to Satan, but the agencies whom he instigates to misrepresent, to tempt, and to destroy the people of God. (p. 170)

He who dwells in the heavenly sanctuary, judges righteously ... Every act of cruelty or injustice toward God’s people all they are caused to suffer through the power of evil’ workers, is registered in heaven. (p. 176)

The Lord will interpose to vindicate his own honour, to deliver his people and to repress the swellings of unrighteousness. ... There is a God in Israel who will maintain his law and vindicate his people.

... Men who claim to be Christians may now ... indulge their satanic hatred because they cannot control the consciences of God’s people. But for all this God will bring them into judgment. ... Not long hence they will stand before the judge of all the earth to render an account for the pain they have caused to the bodies of his heritage. (p. 178)

... from the downtrodden millions of so-called Christian lands, the cry of human woe is ascending to God. That cry will not long be unanswered. God will cleanse the earth from its moral corruption.

From garrets, from hovels, from dungeons, from scaffolds, from mountains and deserts, from the caves of the earth and the caverns of the sea, Christ will gather his children to himself. On earth they have been destitute, afflicted, and tormented. Millions have gone down to the grave loaded with infamy because they refused to yield to the deceptive claims of Satan. By human tribunals the children of God have been adjudged the vilest of criminals. But the day is near when ~~God~~ "God is judge himself." Then the decisions of earth shall be reversed, ~~the~~ "the rebuke of His people shall He take away." White robes shall be given to every one of them. And, ~~they~~ "they shall call them the holy people, the redeemed of the Lord." (p. 179)

Whatever crosses they have been called to bear, whatever losses they have sustained, whatever persecution they have suffered, even to the loss of their temporal life the children of God are amply recompensed. ~~They~~ "They shall see his face; and his name shall be in their foreheads." (p. 180)

Such an understanding of the judgment referred to in Dan. 7:9, 10 and 8:14 is in complete harmony with the theme so often emphasized in the book, namely, the ushering in of the kingdom of God with its attendant destruction of the wicked and rewarding of the saints. God is to be justified and vindicated and so are His people. It should never be forgotten that the Hebrew word translated ~~cleansed~~ or ~~justified~~ is forensic in nature, that is, it has judgment connotations. The universe is to be cleansed from all sin, and Satan and his charges ever refuted. Thus in Dan 7, immediately after the antichrist is pictured and his devastating work, we read the promise that ~~the~~ "the judgment shall sit and they shall take away his dominion to consume and to destroy it to the end. And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High whose kingdom is an everlasting dominion and all dominions shall serve and obey Him." Dan. 8, after the presentation of the desolating work of antichrist, points to the justifying of the sanctuary as God's ultimate rebuttal of evil. And in Dan. 11, the same wicked power is pictured in verse 31 as polluting the sanctuary of strength and persecuting the saints, and exalting himself and magnifying himself above every God. But next it is affirmed that this state of affairs will continue only ~~until~~ "the indignation be accomplished" (11:36). This indignation, the wrath of God, is revealed in 11:45 and 12:1, where the antichrist is shown as coming to his end immediately before the saints awake to their everlasting reward.

Thus repeatedly in Daniel we have judgment — God rescuing and vindicating His people as He brings destruction to the wicked whose deeds are manifest before all as satanic. The final judgment is marked not only by the bestowing of eschatological justification upon the saints, but also by the confession of every lost soul before the universe to the effect that his punishment is just. In Isa. 45:23 we read, ~~I~~ "I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, that unto me every knee shall bow every tongue shall swear." This will be the fitting finale of the great controversy between good and evil, between Christ and Satan.

It is therefore, no arbitrary exegesis which has led Seventh-day Adventists to link with Dan. 8:14 that solemn final ceremonial of the Jewish economy which prefigured the complete extinction of sin and the cleansing of the universe from every stain of evil. As certainly as Christ and Satan figure in Dan. 8 rightly understood, so both are found in type in the Day of Atonement — thus casting of lots, ~~one~~ "one for Jehovah and one for Azazel" Lev. 16.

Others besides Seventh-day Adventists have seen in the closing events of the Day of Atonement the prefiguring of that day when all the universe will see that Satan alone is

responsible for the episode of sin. On page 85 of *The New Standard Bible Dictionary* we read concerning a major purpose of the Day of Atonement that it ~~was~~ used to express the thought that sin belongs to a power or principle hostile to Jehovah and its complete purgation must include its being sent back to its source.” Similarly in Eadie’s *Bible Cyclopaedia*, page 577, we read:

... the sins of the believing world are taken off them and rolled back on Satan, the prime author and instigator. Though the penalty is remitted to believers, it is not remitted to him who has brought them to apostasy and ruin. The tempted are restored but the whole punishment is seen to fall on the archtempter.

Rev. 20, which describes the close of the great controversy, also alludes to the Day of Atonement by its picture of Satan being fettered in the wilderness of this barren world. The desolated earth becomes his ~~grave~~” for a thousand years. Commentaries such as the *Expositors Greek Testament* have pointed to this as the antitype of the fettering of Azazel in Lev. 16. (5:471.) Similarly, aspects of the judgment of Dan. 7, 9 and 10, and 8:14 are referred to in verses 4, 11 and 12 of Rev. 20. It is because the judgment will manifest the righteousness of God and demonstrate that the blame for sin belongs to the great Azazel that we find at the close of Scripture the recurring ascription to God of justice and holiness (see Rev. 15:3; 16:5; 19:2). To this vindication of the Creator and those who have sided with Him, Dan. 8:14 points.

Dan. 8:11-14, rightly viewed, has ramifications extending from Genesis to Revelation. It expands the prophecy of Gen. 3:15, with its prediction of long sustained conflict between Christ and Satan and their followers, and points to those closing events in the great controversy pictured in Rev. 11-22. Such an interpretation will not suit those who, reasoning from the premises of naturalism, cling to a merely human Bible, dissected by unbelieving critics, but it will recommend itself to the judgment of all who believe Christ’s witness, that the Scriptures throughout testify of Him and His saving ministry for the saints (John 5:39).

★ ★ ★

N. B. This article was written about 1962, and studied by the Problems in Daniel committee. The same is true of my articles on the Year-day Principle, Dan. 9, and Dan. 10-12.

APPENDIX THREE

The Chequered History Of The Phrase “Within The Veil”

By

Norman H. Young

The Chequered History Of The Phrase “Within The Veil”

A. A Brief History of Adventist Interpretation

A recent writer has described Luke-Acts as “a storm centre in New Testament Scholarship.”¹ The Epistle to the Hebrews may well warrant the same epitaph within Adventist New Testament interpretation. The phrase “within the veil,” tucked away in this Epistle in chapter 6:19, has experienced a notoriety and attention within Adventist history seemingly beyond its intrinsic importance.

As early as O.R.L. Crosier’s definitive article on the sanctuary back in 1846,² difficulty was experienced with this text. Heb. 6:19f. “is supposed to prove,” Crosier states, “that Christ entered the Holy of Holies at His ascension, because Paul said He had entered within the veil.”³ Crosier in reply points out that the tabernacle had two veils, and the one which separated the holy place from the most holy place is specifically designated as the “second veil” (Heb. 9:3). Thus, with challengeable logic, he concludes that the veil in “chapter 6, being the first of which he speaks, must be the **first** veil, which hung before the Holy / Place /.”⁴

In 1877 no less a pen than that of Uriah Smith gave attention to this phrase.⁵ Smith parades some arguments which can only be termed fatuous. For example, he argues, on the basis of the holy place being twice the size of the most holy place, that “if the earth is the holy place of the true sanctuary, and Heaven the most holy, it follows, the proportion being maintained, that this little diminutive earth, ... , is twice as large as all Heaven!”⁶

Aside from such rationalistic aberrations, Smith relies on a linguistic defence. In his opinion the same Hebrew word and the same Greek word are applied to both the outer curtain at the entrance of the tabernacle and the inner curtain which divided the most holy from the holy place. Thus because the word for veil in the Old Testament (Hebrew and Greek) is ambivalent, Smith feels that “inasmuch as he (i.e., Paul)⁷ once specifies the second veil when he refers to that, we must understand him as referring to the first veil when not thus specified.”⁸

These explanations did not satisfy the searching criticisms of the former Adventist D.M. Canright. “Within the veil” means “within the most holy place,” Canright declares;⁹ and according to Hebrews 6:19 Jesus went into it at His ascension eighteen hundred years before A.D. 1844.¹⁰

An even greater challenge on the particular point of the phrase “within the veil” was made by another former Adventist, A.F. Ballenger. Ballenger spent fifteen pages of a small pamphlet¹¹ demonstrating that “within the veil” means within the second veil, i.e., in the most holy place. An answer was rather quick in forthcoming from E.E. Andross.¹²

Andross’s apologetic represents a significant shift from the position of Crosier and Uriah Smith. Andross accepts that Heb. 6:19 does refer to the second veil and that Jesus at His ascension did enter into the holiest. However, this was only momentarily. Andross, claiming the support of Heb. 9:21, sees this initial entrance into the holiest as an act of dedication of a heavenly sanctuary by means of the blood of Jesus. Following this act of consecration our great High Priest went out from the holiest and began His work in the first apartment.¹³

Another apparently original defence was made by the Australian W.W. Fletcher. Fletcher gave a series of Bible Studies at the Australasian Union Conference in 1925 on the subject of the sanctuary.¹⁴ In addition to the frequent Adventist argument from Heb. 9:3, that the inner

veil is qualified by the term "second veil," Fletcher argued cogently that in Num. 18:7 the very phrase "within the veil" is used in a general way of the sanctuary as a whole. Fletcher supported his contention by paralleling the verses as follows:

"The vessels of the sanctuary and ... the altar" (v. 3). "The sanctuary and the altar" (v. 5). "The altar, and ... within the veil" (v. 7).¹⁵

Fletcher thus took the phrase "within the veil" as an equivalent expression for "the sanctuary" (v. 5) and "the vessels of the sanctuary" (v. 3), hence his contention that in this instance the phrase has general reference to the sanctuary as a whole. Interestingly enough Fletcher at this time was having personal difficulties concerning this very point. These doctrinal doubts finally led him to present his views before the Australian leadership. After discussions in Australia and in Washington, D.C., U.S.A., he finally left the church in 1930. One of the basic causes of his secession was presented in the first of his three propositional declarations of his beliefs. It reads:

That it was the immediate unveiled presence of God as manifested in the Holy Shekinah that constituted the inner apartment of the earthly sanctuary the most holy place, and that consequently when at the time of His ascension the Lord Jesus Christ sat down at the right hand of God, thus „appearing in the presence of God for us,“ He entered the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary. There can be no place in heaven more holy than the place of the unveiled presence of Almighty God.¹⁶

A somewhat belated reply to D.M. Canright came out in 1933 from the pen of W.H. Branson. Branson's reply was the now familiar effort to refer Heb. 6:19 to the outer veil at the entrance of the tabernacle.¹⁷ To Fletcher's position on Heb. 6:19 a swifter answer was published. Though C.H. Watson's book on the atonement of Christ was a general treatise and makes no claim to be a formal refutation of Fletcher, there can be little doubt, however, that Fletcher's recent stir in Watson's home division was very much on his mind at places. He devotes a whole chapter to the topic "within the veil."¹⁸

Rather interestingly the main emphasis of Watson's argument is identical to that presented by Fletcher in 1925, five years prior to his secession. The details correspond so exactly that it is quite likely that Watson used Fletcher *contra* Fletcher.¹⁹ From the evidence of Numbers 18:7, Watson concludes:

In view of God's use of precisely the same expression with reference to the first veil, it is reasonable to conclude that when a New Testament writer uses these same words without qualification, they should be understood to refer to the same veil as that to which God has plainly applied them in the Old Testament.²⁰

Watson added to Numbers 18:7 a reference to Lev. 21:23, claiming that this latter, along with the former, is an example where the word „veil“ describes the curtain at the entrance of the tabernacle. These two texts form the basis of an identical apologetic in an article in the *Ministry* by W.E. Howell.²¹

B. The Biblical Facts

It is certainly true, as Uriah Smith noted, that the Greek word for veil in Heb. 6:19 (*Katapetasma*) is used indiscriminately in the Septuagint for *masak* and *paroketh* i.e., the hanging at the courtyard gate, at the tabernacle entrance, and between the holy places.

It is also true that Lev. 21:23 and Num. 18:7 are the only possible references out of the some twenty-four occurrences of *paroketh* (veil) which do not refer to the inner veil.²² The Septuagint, it should be noted, always translates *paroketh* by *katapetasma*.²³

The word itself then is hardly capable of deciding the issue over which veil is referred to in Heb. 6:19. There are some other factors, however, which can be considered as decisive.

1. The outer veil of the tabernacle was cultically unimportant, it was the inner veil which possessed the real significance.²⁴ The Epistle to the Hebrews is more likely to make reference to this theologically meaningful veil, than the more innocuous curtain at the tabernacle's entrance.²⁵
2. The inner veil played a cultically rich role on the day of atonement. The Epistle to the Hebrews draws heavily upon the day of atonement imagery in portraying Christ's self-offering and high-priesthood and thus presumably has the inner veil and its day of atonement role in view.
3. The immediate context of Heb. 6:19f. speaks of Jesus' entrance "within the veil" as the act of one who has "become a high priest forever after the order of Melchizedek." The only place in the Old Testament where it is said that the high priest enters "within the veil" is on the day of atonement (Lev. 16:2, 12, 15), and it here has reference to the Holy of Holies.
4. The Epistle to the Hebrews has a penchant for the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament. The actual phrase *to esoteron tou katapetasmatos* (the inner of the veil) occurs in the Septuagint only in Ex. 26:33; Lev. 16:2, 12, 15 and refers always to the inner veil. We should notice that three of the four occurrences are found in the chapter referring to the day of atonement. The Hebrew phrase behind the Septuagint in these places, *mibeth haparoketh*, occurs in one other place, Numbers 18:7. This text probably refers to the outer veil as Fletcher, Watson and Howell assert, though some scholars do not agree. But Num. 18:7 does not give the same relevant background to Heb. 6:19 that the day of atonement chapter (Lev. 16) gives. What rules Num. 18:7 completely out of the question, however, as the source of the phrase "within the veil" in Heb. 6:19, is the fact that the Septuagint has *to endothen tou katapetasmatos* not *to esoteron tou katapetasmatos* as in Heb. 6:19.

We conclude, therefore, on the ground of these considerations of Old Testament usage, Septuagint language, and the context of Heb. 6:19, that the phrase "within the veil" in Heb. 6:19 means "within the holy of holies."

The *S.D.A Commentary* (Vol. VLL, p. 437f.) senses the weight of these arguments and offers three views:

1. The veil referred to is the inner curtain but Paul is speaking of Christ's entrance into the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary in order to dedicate it.

This is apparently the same as Andross's position and implies Christ later came out into the first apartment. This is unlikely because, as noted, the phrase "within the veil" has a day of atonement background, it is never used in connection with the dedication of the sanctuary. Hebrews assimilated the dedication ritual to the day of atonement (Heb. 9:21-25) while this position tends to do the reverse.

2. "Within the veil" is a figure of speech, and means simply to be in the presence of God.

One may well describe this as Fletcher's view, and even Ballenger's. This is undoubtedly the correct view provided we do not lose sight of the fact that the figure of speech which the writer is using is the annual entrance of the high priest on the day of atonement into the holy of holies.

3. The "veil" in Heb. 6:19, unlike Heb. 9:3, is unqualified and must refer to the curtain at the door of the tabernacle.

This view goes back to Crosier and Uriah Smith, and is reiterated by every Adventist apologist since 1846. In fact "veil" *is* further described, namely by the word "within" (*esoterous*), and this indicates unequivocally the inner veil.

C. The Problem of E.G. White's Usage

I set forth my thoughts here tentatively and invite the contributions and criticisms of my fellow believers.

It is beyond question that E.G. White occasionally uses the phrase "within the veil" not for the inner but for the outer curtain. Thus she writes:

The ministration of the priest throughout the year in the first apartment of the sanctuary, „within the veil“ which formed the door and separated the holy place from the outer court, represents the work of ministration upon which Christ entered at His ascension.

She then goes on to speak of the disciples' hopes centring in the holy place "within the veil" (Heb. 6:19 is quoted). The reference is clearly to the first apartment for she adds, "For eighteen centuries this work of ministration continued in the first apartment of the sanctuary."²⁶

Yet it is also incontestable that even as early as February, 1845, E.G. White quite realized that the phrase "within the veil" referred to the inner curtain. Speaking of the new sanctuary teaching she says, "I saw the Father rise from the throne, and in a flaming chariot go into the holy of holies within the veil, and did sit."²⁷ She also rather frequently speaks of the saints' prayers or hope entering to that "within the veil,"²⁸ and one gains the impression she here means into the holiest.

In all these latter references, of course, E.G. White is speaking of the post A.D. 1844 situation, nevertheless, it indicates that she fully realized what Heb. 6:19 meant by the phrase "within the veil." If, then, she knew that the words "within the veil" meant the inner curtain, and did herself so employ the phrase for the situation after A.D. 1844, why did she use Heb. 6:19 in *Great Controversy* to describe Christ's ascension and passage through the first curtain into, the holy place?

The answer is that for the writer of Hebrews the bifurcated tabernacle was a symbol of the two ages, two religions (Judaism and Christianity), two priesthoods (Aaron's and Christ's); while for E.G. White the two-part tabernacle is a symbol of a two-phased ministry of the risen Christ. Because of this different outlook, E.G. White used phrases from the Book of Hebrews with prophetic freedom without any thought of exegeting the text, but in order to project her own viewpoint.²⁹ For Hebrews the holy place represented pre-Christian Judaism; that which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, that which decays and waxes old and is

ready to vanish away (Heb. 9:10; 8:13). For E.G. White the holy place represented "the work of ministration upon which Christ entered at His ascension" (*Great Controversy*, p. 420).

Neither writer literalized the location with this symbolic usage, they do not contradict each other, they merely employ the same symbol to describe quite different spiritual realities. Hebrews maintains that at the ascension Christ entered not into a figure of the true but into the very presence of God, not for a moment as the earthly high priest, but for ever. E.G. White when speaking of Christ's ascension can also speak in this way (see below); but in connection with the Adventist exposition of Daniel 8:14 she used the language of entering the holiest on the day of atonement, not to proclaim the end of the earthly priesthood and the entrance of Christ into the divine presence as Hebrews does, but to proclaim a turning-point in the ministry of the risen Lord.³⁰

When declaring the privileged access that Christ's death has made available, rather than the prophetic symbolism of the two-part tabernacle, E.G. White writes in the same vein as the Epistle to the Hebrews: For example:

The great sacrifice has been made. The way into the holiest is laid open. A new and living way is prepared for all. [cf. Heb. 10:19]. No longer need sinful, sorrowing humanity await the coming of the high priest. Henceforth the Saviour was to officiate as priest and advocate in the heaven of heavens.³¹

The mercy seat, upon which the glory of God rested in the holiest of all, is opened to all who accept Christ as the propitiation for sin, and through its medium, they are brought into fellowship with God. The veil is rent, the partition walls broken down, the handwriting of ordinances cancelled. By virtue of His blood the enmity is abolished. Through faith in Christ Jew and Gentile may partake of the living bread.³²

This last statement, paralleling the rent veil and the broken down partition walls, makes it plain that the following quotation is also to be understood to include the two compartments of the temple.

Christ came to demolish every wall of partition, to throw open every compartment of the temple, that every soul may have free access to God.³³

Again we have a homily on Heb. 10:19 similar to the one quoted from *The Desire of Ages*:

A new and living way, before which there hangs no veil, is offered to all. No longer need sinful, sorrowing humanity await the coming of the high priest.³⁴

D. Conclusion

When E.G. White quotes from scripture we must not think that this is necessarily a literal exposition of the text. As is well known the New Testament uses the Old Testament in a creative manner³⁵ and no Old Testament scholar feels bound to exegete the Old Testament text precisely in the manner of Matthew or Paul. Likewise, we must allow E.G. White the same creative freedom. E.G. White uses the language of Hebrews in three distinct ways. First, in describing Christ's entrance into the holiest at His ascension; secondly, when referring to His ascension viewed as the first phase of a two-part heavenly ministry; and thirdly, for the inception and continuance of His A.D. 1844 ministry. It is only in the second usage that she limits "within the veil" to the outer curtain; her purpose in doing so to clarify the prophetic interpretation of a twofold ministry of the risen Christ. Paul can ring the

changes on his use of such metaphors as „temple“ (cf. 1 Cor. 3:16; 6:19f.); the same license must be allowed to E.G. White in her usage of „veil.“

The harmonization of Heb. 6:19 and *Great Controversy*, pp. 420f., is simply that one speaks of the access into the holiest (i.e. the presence of God) made available through the death of Christ, while the other speaks of the beginning of the pronouncement of a pre-Advent judgment and the final ministry of Christ.

Our reluctance in the past to face the meaning of Heb. 6:19 is really based on the groundless fear that it contradicted the message of Adventism.

¹ W.C. Van Unnik, "Luke-Acts: A Storm Centre in Contemporary Scholarship," in *Studies in Luke-Acts*, ed. L.E. Reek and J.L. Martyn (Nashville, 1966), pp. 15ff.

² O.R.L. Crosier, "The Law of Moses," *The Day Star* (Feb. 7th, 1846), p. 41. Despite Crosier's effort and the solutions proffered in the intervening years since 1846, Norman F. Doubt still uses Heb. 6:19 as an argument against Adventist Sanctuary doctrine, see Norman F. Doubt, *Another Look at Seventh-day Adventist*, (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1962), p. 108.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ U. Smith, *The Sanctuary and the Twenty-Three Hundred Days of Daniel VIII*, 14 (Battle Creek, Mich.: Steam Press, 1877) pp. 221ff. Smith's earlier work *The 2300 Days and the Sanctuary* (1854), has not been available to me. Smith virtually repeats his arguments of 1877 verbatim in *Looking Unto Jesus* (Chicago: R.H., 1898), pp. 126ff.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 222.

⁷ The Pauline authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews was universally accepted by early Adventist writers.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 227.

⁹ D.M. Canright, *Seventh-day Adventism Renounced* (New York: Revell, 1889), p. 122. He appeals to Ex. 26:33; Lev. 16:2, 12, 13 (an error for v. 15)

¹⁰ Canright cites as further proof, Ex. 27:21; 30:6; 40:22-26; Lev. 4:6, 17; 16:15; 24:3; Num. 18:7; Matt. 27:51.

¹¹ A.F. Ballenger, *Cast Out For the Cross of Christ* (Riverside, Cal.: sometime after 1905). I have not had access to this pamphlet. Ballenger's views were kept alive through the periodical *The Gathering Call*, which was edited by himself and later by his brother E.S. Ballenger beginning in 1915 and current up till at least 1951.

¹² E.E. Andross, *A More Excellent Ministry* (Mountain View, Cal.: Pacific Press, 1912).

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 53. James White had earlier explained Dan. 9:24 in a similar way *Bible Adventism* (Battle Creek, Mich.: N.D.), p. 167.

¹⁴ W.W. Fletcher, *Studies on the Subject of the Sanctuary* (Cooranbong, Aust.: 1925).

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 81f.

¹⁶ *Idem.* *The Reasons For My Faith* (Sydney, Aust.: 1932), p. 11.

¹⁷ W.H. Branson, *Reply to Canright* (Washington, D.C.: R.H., 1933), p. 222f.

¹⁸ C.H. Watson, *The Atoning Work of Christ* (Washington, D.C.: R.H., 1934), pp. 181-191.

¹⁹ Both writers, for example, parallel vv. 3, 5, and 7 from Numbers 18, and as well use Fenton's mistranslation of *mibeth laparoketh*, „house of the veils“ instead of „within the veil.“

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 185.

²¹ W.E. Howell, "The Meaning of the Veil," *The Ministry* 13 (1940), pp. 13ff.

²² Koehler-Baumgartner, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*, s.v. *paroketh*.

²³ The phrase *paroketh hamasak* (= the veil of the screen) occurs four times (Ex. 35:12; 39:34; 40:21; Num. 4:5). The LXX does not translate Ex. 39:34; Ex. 35:12 is rendered *katapetasma* (= the veil), for Ex. 40:21 for *katakallumma tou katapetasmatos* (= the covering of the veil) and for Num. 4:5 for *katapetasma to suskiazon* (= the shading veil). In these constructs the LXX always translates *paroketh* by *katapetasma*, this is so even in Ex. 40:21 where the genitive *tou katapetasmatos* probably represents the construct *paroketh*, and thus mistranslates the Hebrew.

²⁴ C. Schneider, "katapetasma," *TDNT* III, p. 629.

²⁵ An entrance into the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary would hardly represent the "better" motif that the author labours to project; for this would be less than what the Aaronic priest hood annually accomplished.

²⁶ *GC*, pp. 420f. Cf. *SG I*, p. 159; *EW*, p. 251.

²⁷ *To the Little Remnant Scattered Abroad*, quoted by F.D. Nichol, *Ellen G. White and Her Critics* (Washington, D.C.: R.H., 1951), p. 178. Cf. *EW*, p. 55.

-
- ²⁸ *IT*, p. 566; *57*, p. 113; *SD*, p. 354; *MYP*, p. 89; *COL*, p. 1; *SDABC* VII, p. 930. Often she further qualifies the phrase in these contexts by adding „second“ to „veil,“ cf. *Present Truth* (March, 1850), p. 64; *EW*, p. 72; *SG* II, p. 291. The reference to the metaphor of hope as an anchor in some of these texts makes it clear that Heb. 6:19 is quoted.
- ²⁹ It is rather a dangerous description of E.G. White's writings to call them „a divine commentary,“ that is, if this description means her exegesis makes all other efforts superfluous or invalid.
- ³⁰ *PP*, p. 357.
- ³¹ *DA*, p. 757, Cf. the different way that Heb. 9:12 is used in *GC*, p. 421.
- ³² Letter 230, 1907 (Quoted in *SDABC* V, p. 1109).
- ³³ *COL*, p. 386. The context of letter 230 and the *COL* quotation are identical, both speak of the breaking down of the barriers between Jew and Gentile. Cf. *MS* 101, 1897 (quoted in *SDABC* V, p. 1109)
- ³⁴ *YI*, June 21, 1900 (Quoted in *SDABC* V, p. 1109)
- ³⁵ See C.K. Barrett, "The Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New," in *The Cambridge History of the Bible* I, ed. P.R. Acroyd and C.F. Evans (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), pp. 390 ff.

APPENDIX FOUR

CUC Course Outline On The Sanctuary And 1844

CUC Course Outline On The Sanctuary And 1844

Seminar in Contemporary Theology Course #491

(Section Three: Contemporary Adventist Theology)

Note: Having completed the previous section of contemporary problems in Adventist theology on righteousness by faith, we now turn our attention to a doctrine in the theological arena which is uniquely Seventh-day Adventist, the belief that in 1844 Christ began a phase of His ministry in the heavenly sanctuary not previously included in His intercessory work.

- I. The historical basis of the 1844 doctrine has its roots in the Millerite movement of the mid-nineteenth century.
 - A. A quick glance at our already familiar history, places the 1844 doctrine in an awakening climate similar to the times of Jonathan Edwards with the added eschatological dimension that Christ was coming soon.
 1. The centre of this eschatological awakening was William Miller, a layman who had accepted Christ as his personal Saviour from sin after years of scoffing at Scripture and Christianity.
 2. Without much formal education and untrained in the intricacies of theology, Miller devoted himself to the study of Scripture and when inadvertently asked to preach, shared his convictions of Christ's imminent return with his congregations which soon thrust him into religious prominence.
 - a. Miller's convictions of the imminent return of Christ were based on scriptures taken primarily from the books of Daniel and Revelation, particularly the eighth chapter of Daniel.
 - b. With Dan. 8:14 as his basis, Miller interpreted the termination point of the 2300 day-year prophecy to be "about the year 1843" and to be synonymous with the end of the world which would occur between March 1, 1843, and March 21, 1844.
 - c. When the year 1843 and the spring of 1844 passed and Christ did not return as expected, the Millerites restudied the 2300 day-year prophecy and reset its termination date to Oct. 22, 1844, which Miller eventually endorsed.
 - d. When once again Christ did not come as expected, this "great disappointment" led Miller to admit to errors in his prophetic calculations, but with the confidence that Christ would come "today, today, today."
 - B. After having agreed twice to possible dates when Christ would come and after having been disappointed both times, Miller affirmed until his death in 1849 that the 1844 awakening movement was not a fulfilment of the Dan. 8:14 prophecy as some were then teaching, but that the actual fulfilment of termination of the 2300 day-year prophecy would be the literal and soon coming of Christ.**
- II. The Scriptural basis of the modified 2300 day-year prophecy known as the sanctuary doctrine has its roots in the Millerite interpretation of Dan. 8:14 terminating on Oct. 22,

1844, and in the significance given this date by First-day Adventists after the Great Disappointment.

- A. The perimeter of contemporary Adventist theology for this course excludes examination of the Scriptural verification of 1844 as the actual termination date of the 2300 day-year prophecy and of the textual reliability of the numeral translation of Dan. 8:14 for these problem areas are not currently in question within Adventism. (For familiarity with these problems see *SDABC*, 10 under related articles.)

B. Contemporary debate in the Adventist Church centres on such questions as whether or not the meaning attached to Oct. 22, 1844, immediately after the “disappointment” by First-day Adventists is textually sound and verifiable from Scripture.

1. The “cleansing of the sanctuary” meaning attached to the 2300 day-year prophecy claiming that the Advent awakening movement with its threefold message is the fulfilment of Dan. 8:14 had its beginning in New England.
 - a. Hiram Edson, who like William Miller was a farmer with little formal education and no training in Biblical theology, while walking across his cornfield on the morning of Oct. 23, 1844, following a night of study and prayer with other disappointed Adventists, was “convicted” that the day before Christ had entered the Most Holy of the heavenly sanctuary.
 - b. Owen R.L Crosier, wrote out the Scriptural basis for Hiram Edson’s conviction from the results of a small study group and published them first in 1845 and more extensively in the *Day-Star Extra*, Feb. 7, 1846.
 - c. Ellen White confirmed Crosier’s Scriptural basis of the “sanctuary” doctrine in a letter to Eli Curtis, April 21, 1847 and subsequently published in *A Word to the Little Flock*, which is still available.
2. The sanctuary doctrine as developed from the study of Scripture by the First-day Adventists focused on numerous texts in both the Old and the New Testament by which they substantiated their position.
 - a. The nearly full reprint of Crosier’s article in the *Day-Star Extra* can be found in *The Advent Review*, numbers 3 and 4, published by James White in 1850.
 - b. The confirmation of Crosier’s position by Ellen White in her letter to Curtis is found on pp. 12 of *A Word to the Little Flock*, available in the library.
 - c. A fuller treatment of the Adventist position on the meaning of the sanctuary doctrine can be found in *The Great Controversy*, 409-432, the *SDABC*, 10, and such books as *Christian Beliefs*, by Jemison.
3. The key texts that serve as the basis of the sanctuary doctrine are: Dan. 8:14; 9:24-27; Num. 14:34 with Eze. 4:6; and Lev. 16:1-34 coupled with Heb. 8:1 - 9:28.
 - a. **The question some contemporary Adventist theologians are raising is whether or not the interpretation given these key texts by First-day Adventists is Biblically sound.**

- (1) Currently there are two views being discussed on Dan. 8:14, the “traditionalist” view and the “neo-Adventist” view.
 - (a) Traditionally Seventh-day Adventists have interpreted Dan. 8:14 to mean that the termination of the 2300 day-year prophecy in 1844, substantiated by the sixty-nine and seventy weeks of Dan. 9:24-27, would signal the beginning of the investigative judgment and the “cleansing” of the sanctuary as Christ enters the Most Holy Place in the heavenly tabernacle.
 - (b) The challenge to traditional Adventist teaching on the meaning of Dan. 8:14 and 9:24-27 is that the context of these verses beginning with chapter seven is not concerned with the “cleansing” of the sanctuary to deal with the sin-problem of the saints, but addresses itself to the problem of “vindicating” God’s truth symbolized by the sanctuary over-against the onslaught of evil symbolized by the little horn.**
- (2) There is also a question on the interpretation of Num. 14:34 together with Eze. 4:6 as they are applied by the “traditional” view to Dan. 8:14 and 9:24-27.
 - (a) Traditionally Adventists have used Num. 14:34 and Eze. 4:6 as the key to unlock the mystery of the 2300 day-year prophecy, turning prophetic days into literal years.
 - (b) Neo-Adventist theology challenges the day-year hermeneutic principle as the key to unlock the meaning of the 2300 day prophecy and points out that neither Num. 14:34 nor Eze. 4:6 have an eschatological context; in Num. 14 Israel is being punished for its disobedience corresponding in years to the days the spies searched the land and in Eze. 4 Jerusalem is being punished with destruction for its special guilt during the previous forty years.
- (3) Furthermore there are dissimilar understandings of the meaning of the “holy place” and the “holiest” as found in Lev. 16:2, 3 and in Heb. 9:3, 4.
 - (a) Adventists currently teach that at the termination of the 2300 day-year prophecy Christ entered the Most Holy Place or the holiest of all in the heavenly sanctuary to begin the judgment phase of His ministry in addition to His daily intercessory work typified by the holy place in the earthly sanctuary.
 - (b) The challenge to this interpretation by some Adventist scholars centres on the inconsistent use in Scripture of the words “holy place” and “most holy place” which are used interchangeably for either compartment (cf. Lev. 16:2, 3 with Ex. 26:33) and the non-permanency of God’s presence in the Most Holy Place in the heavenly sanctuary (cf. Acts 7:55 and Heb. 9:24).
4. **If key texts such as Dan. 8:14 which are used to prove the Adventist position are not contextually sound, what is the basis of the sanctuary doctrine as taught and proclaimed by the Adventist Church!** Is it the non-Biblical face-saving device to cover William Miller’s miscalculations that non-Adventist scholars say it is?

- a. If the authority of a few non-Adventist theologians are invoked to help confirm our sanctuary position, are these sources of authority adequate to stand in opposition to the traditional Christian interpretation of Christ's heavenly ministry begun in 31 AD which excludes the relevancy of 1844 to the end of time?
 - b. If the authority of a non-canonical inspired writer like Ellen White is invoked to help substantiate the Adventist sanctuary position, doesn't this extra-Biblical authority place our revelational theology in question and/or place our interpretation of Ellen White in question?
- III. The authority to interpret Dan. 8:14 and other key texts to substantiate our modification of the Millerite understanding of the 1844 event known as the sanctuary doctrine is not as much a contextual problem as a problem of the use of extra-Biblical sources employed to this end.
 - A. The scope of this course is not pervious to discuss the problem of Ellen White's spiritual gift as an inspired writer speaking for God. It is assumed that her spiritual gift and authority is accepted.
 - B. The central question of the current theological discussion between Adventist theologians and laymen is whether Ellen White as an inspired writer speaking for God has the authority to take texts such as Dan. 8:14 out of context to help confirm the Adventist position, which raises the whole question of "the Bible and the Bible only" as our guide.**
 1. In order to discuss whether or not inspired writers have the authority to take texts out of context, the New Testament affords the only primary source available to investigate the practice of inspired persons.
 - a. Matt. 1:23 affords one such example of an out-of-context application when he quotes Isa. 7:14 as proof that Christ because of His virgin birth fulfilled the first of many Messianic prophecies. The context rather than being a prophecy of Christ's birth is a sign of Ahaz that Pekah and Rezin to the north would not subdue Jerusalem.
 - b. Berkhof in his *Principles of Biblical Interpretation*, 54, says, "New Testament authors, in quoting from the Old Testament, occasionally alter the passages quoted somewhat, or apply them in a sense that is not apparent in the Old Testament. This can hardly be defended, except on the presumption that the Holy Spirit is, in the last analysis the author of the whole Bible, and naturally had the right to quote and apply His own words as He saw fit."
 2. To discuss the question of authority in the light of the oft used phrase , "the Bible and the Bible only," would require more class periods than this section of our course allows. However, there are two viewpoints on this that should be mentioned as contributing to contemporary Adventist theology and is related to our sanctuary doctrine and Ellen White's role as the DNA molecule is to development and growth.
 - a. One position on the meaning of the phrase "the Bible and the Bible only" excludes all extra-Biblical sources as a means of substantiating Bible truth, including Ellen White.

-
- b. The other position states that the phrase “the Bible and the Bible only” stands in opposition to those doctrines in Christendom that are based on tradition, but that extra-Biblical sources of authority such as inspired writings due to spiritual gifts are included in the phrase and are needful to properly understand Scripture and to disentangle it from tradition.
 - c. Some related questions to the two above positions on the meaning of the phrase “the Bible and the Bible only” are: If the writings of Ellen White as a product of the spiritual gift of prophecy are not given equal weight with Scripture as a Scripturally derived authority, does this not lead to the acceptance of levels of inspiration? If Ellen White’s writings as God’s instruction for us is given equal weight with Scriptural authority, though derived from Scripture, how then is Scriptural authority unique and normative? Furthermore, is it possible that Adventist theologians are denying Ellen White the right to re-interpret Scripture making it relevant to our day, while assuming that prerogative for themselves? Is there a danger that the Adventist Church can establish a theological hierarchy making their interpretation of Scripture normative? Finally, is there a difference between re-interpreting Scripture and clarifying or disentangling it from false concepts? And whichever needs to be done, who should do it?
- C. If Ellen White is used as an extra-Biblical source to re-interpret Scripture or disentangle it from false concepts, her writings must then be interpreted by the same hermeneutical principles employed in interpreting Scripture.
- 1. As with the Bible so with Ellen White’s writings, the reader must take the plain meaning of what is said unless otherwise indicated by time, place, context, or other Scripture.
 - 2. Uninspired persons have no right to take inspired statements out of context whether in Scripture or in the writings of Ellen White except if previously done so by another inspired person.
 - 3. When studying Biblically quoted statements or statements quoted from Ellen White’s writings substantiating a theological position the reader should research the context of each quoted statement for many times inspired writers will use Biblical phraseology as a homiletical device rather than as a doctrinal statement.
- IV. Concluding this third and last section of the course and bringing this introductory class to a close, having acquainted you with current theological problems and leaving the hard investigation of truth to other times, places, and instructors; permit me to share with you my position in the current theological discussion of the meaning of 1844 as I shared with you my position on righteousness by faith in the first part of this section.
- A. I believe that the phrase “the Bible and the Bible only” means taking a stance over-against tradition, seen as an authority authorizing the observance of Sunday and displacing the seventh-day Sabbath, and that this phrase includes the inspired authority of the spiritual gift of prophecy. As theologically difficult as the problem of this extra-Biblical use of authority is to explain to the intellectual satisfaction of others, I see less of a problem in this position than I do in admitting to “levels of inspiration” which I cannot and will not admit to. (See PP, xiii-xii).

- B. I believe the sanctuary doctrine and the meaning of 1844 as explicitly delineated by direct revelation in several successive chapters in the book *Great Controversy* and as currently taught by the Seventh-day Adventist Church rather than in a modified understanding of the meaning of 1844 based on isolated statements from various writings of Ellen White and/or passages from Scripture whose interpretations are open-ended.
- C. I subscribe to a literal heavenly sanctuary rather than a spiritualized truth about it, not because of the mortar and brick importance of it all, but because to do otherwise would be denying the first principle of hermeneutics to take the Scripture as it reads and to accept as literal what the Scripture says unless it is mandatory to symbolize it to retain credibility with the rest of Scripture.

Columbia Union College
1977-78 School Year
(Not for class distribution)

J.J. Blanco

★ ★ ★

APPENDIX FIVE

Quotations On The D. A. In Hebrews

Quotations On The Day of Atonement In Hebrews

It has been often pointed out that this chapter is the best illustration and explanation we possess of the meaning of Leviticus 16, just as it may be said that the best explanation of this chapter is found in Leviticus 16. Four parts of the High Priest's work on the Day of Atonement are used here to express spiritual realities in Christ. The High Priest superintended the offering of the sacrifice outside the tabernacle. Then he entered into the Holy of Holies with the sacrificial blood. Thereupon he presented the blood by sprinkling it on and around the Mercy Seat. And afterwards he returned out of the tabernacle, having accomplished his work. These four actions can be well described as indicating and symbolizing our Lord's Atonement, Access, Appeal, and Advent.

Griffith Thomas, *Let Us Go On* (Grand Rapids, 1944), p. 121.

★ ★ ★

It is important to observe why the high priesthood of Jesus with the Christ must be approached through Jesus, son of Jehozadak, why, that is to say, Hebrews cannot lead us straight to Melchizedek and to Psalm 110. It is imperative for his whole argument that Jesus should be **high** priest, and this title he cannot derive from that psalm because Melchizedek is called priest and not high priest. The Day of Atonement is to loom large in his exposition. Were Jesus only priest, the argument would not run. All depends upon his being high priest.

F.C. Syngé, *Hebrews and the Scriptures* (London, 1959), p. 22.

★ ★ ★

The ritual of the Day of Atonement, „the Day“ (*Joma*), is present to the mind of the writer throughout this section of the Epistle.

B.F. Westcott, *Hebrews* (London, 1889), p. 281.

★ ★ ★

The language which describes Christ's atoning action is coloured with the phraseology of the Jewish Day of Atonement. Christ is the High Priest. He offers His own Blood. He passes "into" or "through the Tabernacle," "through the heavens" (ch. iv. 14).

E.C. Wickham, *Hebrews* (London, 1910).

★ ★ ★

On the great day of atonement, the whole ritual centred and culminated in offerings to which an expiatory significance is distinctly ascribed. At specified times, therefore, during the year, and at the commencement of every month, expiatory sacrifices for sin were offered for the whole people. It is, however, the great annual expiation that was specially present to the writer of this Epistle.

R.W. Dale, *The Jewish Temple and the Christian Church* (London, 1871), p. 196.

★ ★ ★

For the ritual of the Day of Atonement there is a detailed explanation in the Epistle to the Hebrews. The very heart of that inspired letter deals with the atoning work of Christ, our Great High Priest; and in its climactic ninth chapter all the figures and symbols are drawn from the ritual recorded in this sixteenth chapter of Leviticus; and, strange to say, reference to this ritual is found in no other place in the Old Testament.

C.R. Erdman, *Leviticus* (New York, 1951), p. 71.

★ ★ ★

The Epistle is largely a parallel or contrast between the Old Testament sacrificial ritual and ways in which the death of Christ may be viewed. The culminating point of the Old Testament ritual was the sacrifice on the Day of Atonement. Here the high priest took part, and the atonement was for the sins of the People. And it is with the ministry of the high priest on this day, in its place, action, and offering, that the high-priestly ministry of our Lord is chiefly compared.

This typology mainly runs upon the line of the high priest's ministry in the holiest, to which Christ's offering of Himself is parallel.

He even throws out fragments of what might be called other typological systems, that cannot be harmonized with the main system of the Day of Atonement nor fitted into it.

A.B. Davidson, *Hebrews* (Edinburgh, 1882), p. 196.

★ ★ ★

In making his unique use of the ritual of the Day of Atonement the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews dwells in particular on two of its main features, the shedding of blood and the entrance into the Holy of Holies: "But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, ... neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, ... into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us" (Heb. 9:11,12,24). "Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he liveth to make intercession for them" (Heb. 7:25).

As when the atoning ritual had been fulfilled, when the blood had been sprinkled, when the ceremony within the veil had ended, Aaron, arrayed in his glorious garments, came forth from the tabernacle and again appeared to the expectant people, "so Christ also having been offered to bear the sins of many shall appear a second time apart from sin, to them that wait for him, unto salvation" (Heb. 9:28 RV).

C.R. Erdman, op. cit. pp. 76, 77.

★ ★ ★

He is writing to Hebrews and, throughout his Epistle, expounding the Hebrew Scriptures, and especially those relating to the law governing the ceremonies of the Day of Atonement.

A.C. Downer, *The Principle of Interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews* (London, ND), p. 102.

★ ★ ★

It is the less necessary that we should enlarge on the correspondence between this most important service of the Old Testament dispensation, and the work of Christ under the New, since it is the part of the Mosaic ritual which of all others has received the most explicit application from the pen of inspiration. It is to this that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews most especially and frequently refers when pointing to Christ for the great realities which were darkly revealed under the ancient shadows. He tells us that through the flesh of Christ, given unto death for the sins of the world, a new and living way has been provided into the Holiest, as through a veil, no longer concealing and excluding from the presence of God, but opening to receive every penitent transgressor (of which, indeed, the literal rending of the veil at Christ's death was a matter-of-fact announcement); that through the blood of Jesus we can enter not only with safety, but even with boldness, into the region of God's manifested presence; that this arises from Christ Himself having gone with His own blood into the heavens, that is, presenting Himself there as the perfected Redeemer of His people, who had borne for them the curse of sin, and forever satisfied the justice of God concerning it; and that the sacrifice by which all this has been accomplished, being that of one infinitely worthy, is attended with none of the imperfections belonging to the Old Testament service, but is adequate to meet the necessities of a guilty conscience, and to present the sinner, soul and body, with acceptance before God.

P. Fairbairn, *The Typology of Scripture*, Zondervan reprint (Grand Rapids, ND), p. 342.



APPENDIX SIX

Quotations Regarding Hebrews 9:6-9

Quotations Regarding Hebrews 9:6-9

The Holy Spirit himself shows so clearly, by both the division of the Tabernacle into a Holy and a Holy of Holies and the nature of the ordinances that were prescribed for the whole Tabernacle services, that all this is only a temporary thing, a figure and parable of the time when God brings the right arrangement. This time is now here. We now have the final High Priest and the ministrant in the heavenly Sanctuary (8:1, 2).

τοῦτο is emphatic: “this” is what the Holy Spirit indicates by the arrangement of the old Tabernacle and the priestly services for which it was designed, “this,” namely “that not yet (at that time) has there been made manifest the way to the (final) Holy Place” in heaven; we have the infinitive in indirect discourse (R. 1048) in apposition with **τοῦτο** (R. 1078). God ordered the whole construction, arrangement, and services of the Tabernacle (8:5); since all of this was for the sanctification of Israel, the writer now says that “the Holy Spirit” indicates what this Tabernacle, etc., really signifies regarding the heavenly Sanctuary and the High-priestly ministration of Jesus, the Spirit being the Sanctifier. The perfect tense of the infinitive extends over the whole time during which the Tabernacle arrangement stood as a figure; during all of that time the Spirit said: The way to the heavenly Sanctuary “has not yet been made manifest” by me, the real High Priest has not yet come.

The genitive absolute: “the first Tabernacle still having its position,” points out the significant feature that the way to the heavenly Sanctuary remains unmanifested while the division between the first and the second Tabernacle, i.e. between the Holy and the Holy of Holies, still stands (see v. 1-3).

The readers are acquainted with Matt. 27:51, know that by rending the inner veil the Spirit himself indicated the end of what the Tabernacle in the wilderness prefigured. When the sacrifice of Jesus on Calvary was complete, when he entered the heavenly Sanctuary with his expiating blood, all that the figure foreshadowed had come, the way to the heavenly Sanctuary was manifest at last. In the heavenly Sanctuary there is no longer a Holy Place and a Holy of Holies with a veil between them.

ἥτις — “the first Tabernacle,” the Holy Place before the Holy of Holies, and **παραβολή** is the predicate; the copula is omitted as being unnecessary: “which (first Tabernacle) a figure regarding the present period.” In what respect is it such “a figure”? The entire **καθ’ ἣν** clause explains. The qualitative relative says that this first Tabernacle is only a “parable.” “The true Tabernacle” (8:2), the heavenly one, cannot have a division, a Holy and a Holy of Holies, it can consist only of a unit Sanctuary for the High-priestly act of our “great High Priest” (4:14). This earthly Holy Place has only a parabolic significance, one that is effective only for the time that it is needed. As a parable or figure it points forward to the time when it will be no longer needed, when the one heavenly Sanctuary will be manifested, when all parabolic pointers will be forever superseded.

R.C.H. Lenski, *Hebrews* (Columbus, 1946), pp. 282-285.



The exclusion of the very priesthood from the Holy of Holies, the appointment of a chamber of inferior sanctity as the place where the most sacred rites of the ceremonial service, with only one exception, were to be observed, is declared to have signified

“that the way into the Holiest of all had not yet been made manifest.” That “first tabernacle,” — separated from the Most Holy Place by heavy curtains which were never drawn aside except by the High Priest, and by him only once a year, and even then in connection with an unusual ritual of most oppressive solemnity, — would have been altogether unnecessary, if there had been free access to God. While it stood, priests and people were constantly taught that though God was nearer to them than to all mankind besides, they could not yet enter into the closest and most blessed communion with Him.

I think that this inspired and authoritative interpretation of what was meant by the division of the Jewish sanctuary into the first and second tabernacles, the Holy Place, and the Holiest of all, is of the very greatest value in illustrating the principles which should guide us in considering all the parts of the Levitical system.

What the Holy Ghost **“signified”** by excluding not only the people but the priests from the inner sanctuary, might have been seen by any Jew of ordinary intelligence. There was nothing recondite in the arrangement. It was intelligible to men wholly ignorant of the truth which was unrevealed before the coming of Christ. It must have produced, even upon those who never asked themselves its meaning, the designed impression. Every Jew knew that even the High Priest was permitted to enter the Holy of Holies only once a year, and that the other priests were never permitted to enter it at all; every Jew, therefore, would feel that free and habitual access to the immediate presence of God was checked by Divinely-appointed institutions. This impression he would have, in spite of any arbitrary and fanciful meanings which his religious teachers might suppose they discovered in the structure of the Holy Place and its relations to the Holiest of all; and this impression would have been naturally produced on our own minds had no inspired writer told us what the Holy Ghost signified.

We have here an authoritative illustration of the manner in which we should interpret the symbolic institutions of Judaism; and an illustration which plainly discourages the fanciful and arbitrary principles of some typical commentators.

R.W. Dale, *The Jewish Temple and the Christian Church* (London, 1871), pp. 205-206, 207.



But the admission of their highest representative in holy things on one solitary day in the year taught them that the most Holy Place was a place with which they had to do, and at the same time showed it to be a place very difficult of access. The ceremonial of the great day of atonement said in effect: “You need to get in here, but it is barely possible to get in. You can be admitted only by deputy, as represented by your officially holy man; and even he may enter only at rare intervals, and with fear and trembling, with blood in his hands to atone for his and your sins. The door of the second tabernacle is all but shut against you; open just enough to keep alive in your hearts at once a sense of your need to get in, and the painful consciousness that your desire for admission is rather whetted than satisfied.”

“The Holy Ghost this (or by this arrangement) indicating that the way of (into) the Holy Place has not yet been manifested, while the first tabernacle has a standing” (ver. 8). The idea is, that the exclusion from the inner part of the Jewish tabernacle, and the all but entire restriction of religious service to the outer part, signified, “perfect intercourse

with God not yet granted, the highest and therefore abiding form of religion a thing yet to come.” The writer would have his readers see, in the mere fact of such a division of the tabernacle into a first and second chamber a Divine intimation that there was a higher boon, a nearer approach to, a more intimate fellowship with God in store for men, which for the present was denied. “The first part of the tabernacle,” he would say, “is yours; the second in its spiritual significance belongs to the future, to the time of Messiah, when all things are to undergo renovation. To cling to legal worship, then, as something that must last for ever is to shut your ear to the voice of the sanctuary itself, by its very structure bearing witness to its own insufficiency, and saying to all who have ears to hear: „I am not for aye. I have a first and a second chamber, a Near and a Nearer to God. The first and the Near is yours, O people of Israel, for daily use; the second and the Nearer is as good as shut against you. When that which is perfect is come, the Nearer will be accessible to all, and the veil and the place outside and all the services that now go on there will cease to exist.”

In some such sense as this are to be understood the words in the first clause of ver. 9: “Which (the existence, i.e., or standing of the tabernacle as a first chamber) is a parable for the time being.” The sense is, that the outer part of the tabernacle, by its position as a first chamber, was a parable, not a word but in a fabric, teaching the temporary, shadowy, imperfect nature of the dispensation.

A.B. Bruce, *Hebrews* (Edinburgh, 1899), pp. 320-321.



The arrangement of the earthly sanctuary as such points to a serious lack, namely, the sharp separation of the Holy from the Holy of Holies, which creates the differences in the relation of men toward God.

The “first tent,” the Holy Place, is a hindrance toward coming to God. Hence its elimination is desirable. The relation toward God must be newly ordered and in such a way that everybody, whoever he is, has immediate access to God. The “layman” must receive a priestly right. Only where **all** the members of the redemptive fellowship have the immediate access, where **all** have become priests of God, has the true order been realized. Thus the order of the Old Covenant can only be judged as the “counter-picture,” which points to the present, for the true way to fellowship with God had not yet become manifest, as long as the tabernacle (Moffat: the Dwelling in the Trysting Tent) continued to stand (v. 8).

J. Schneider, *Hebrews* (Grand Rapids, 1957), pp. 79-80.



His argument runs very sweetly. The temple, in that it has a first and a second tabernacle, declares by its very structure that the first is to be outdated. For what is first, *πρώτη*, is out of date, the firstness of the first tabernacle asserts the greater importance of the second.

As long as you have a temple in two halves, so the Holy Spirit declares to the present time, it is patent that the sacrifices and offerings that go on there are inadequate and are to be replaced by something better.

The argument hinges, and hinges very smoothly, upon the existence of the first, the declaratory-of-out-of-dateness tabernacle.

Hebrews is determined to make clear the distinction. It follows that in heaven there are not two tabernacles or two halves to a tabernacle.

Nothing is made of the fact that the high priest had to go through the first shrine in order to reach the second; the point made is that only the high priest can enter the Holy of Holies and that he cannot stay there, and that the symbol of the ineffectiveness of the Levitical high priest's ministry is the existence of the first shrine.

F.C. Sygne, *Hebrews and the Scriptures* (London, 1959), pp. 27-28, 29.



The very division of the Holy Place from the Holy of Holies and the restricted access allowed to the latter were a confession that a meeting-place of God and man was not yet found. It was the same with the ordinances of service, all was imperfect, material, typical.

But when we pass from sanctuary to ordinances of service, how narrow the limitations! After all this elaborate provision, it is only to the outer chamber that even the priests have access. Into the inner one penetrates one person only, the High Priest, once a year, with awful precautions, with the blood of sacrifice offered for himself as well as for the people. What was the meaning which by such restrictions the Holy Spirit designed to impress? Surely that, while there was room for that abrupt division of the Tabernacle, a real meeting-place of God with man had not been found. The division itself was a parable — a parable to last as long as the dispensation lasted. It was part and parcel of a system of imperfect typical atonements, such as could never cleanse the conscience — bound up with ceremonial rules as to things to eat and to drink and times to wash — carnal ordinances which were as a burden on men's shoulders till the time should come for putting things on a better footing.

E.C. Wickham, *Hebrews* (London, 1910), pp. xxvi, xxxvi.



The veil, which formed one wall of it, cut off entrance into the holiest; only by its removal, that is, by the destruction of the holy place, could the holiest be thrown open. In this way it was a parable of the whole Levitical system, through which, while a certain access to God was granted, real access into His presence was hindered and deferred till it should be taken out of the way (ver. 9).

Ver. 9. **A figure ... time then present**, rather, which (holy place) is a parable for the time present. The Author still uses present tenses, speaking from the point of view of the record in Scripture. The word **then** correctly enough describes "time present" as the Old Testament period, the time prior to the appearance of the High Priest of the good things to come, but must be omitted if the descriptive language of the writer be reproduced. The holy place is a parable, a similitude or symbol; it is this **for**, that is, not for the instruction of, but, **in reference to**, in connection with, the time present, the whole Old Testament pre-Christian age, which is present from the point of view of the recorded Law. This holy place, as an imperfect advance towards the true presence of

God, and at the same time an obstacle in the way to it, is an emblem of the first covenant period in service and atonement.

A.B. Davidson, *Hebrews* (Edinburgh, 1882), p. 171.

★ ★ ★

This phrase has been used just before (v. 6; comp. v. 2) of the Holy place as the vestibule, so to speak, of the divine presence-chamber; and it is very difficult to suppose that it should be suddenly used in another sense for „the first (the Mosaic) tabernacle“ as opposed to „the heavenly archetypal tabernacle“ (v. 11). „The first, the outer, tabernacle,“ the sanctuary of habitual worship, did in a most impressive way shew the limits which were placed upon the worshipper. While this held a recognised place among divine institutions the people were separated from the object of their devotion. All had not as yet the privilege of priests: all priests had not the right of approach to the divine throne. Thus the outer sanctuary was the representative symbol of the whole Tabernacle as the place of service.

The Levitical system then, represented by „the first Tabernacle,“ is described here as a parable „to serve for“ or perhaps „to last as long as,“ the present season. It conveyed its lessons while the preparatory age continued up to the time of change.

B.F. Westcott, *Hebrews* (London, 1889), pp. 254, 255.

★ ★ ★

The great message of Chapters 9 and 10 is of *a closed way*, and then of *an open way*. God here emphasizes that the first tabernacle constantly said to the nation of Israel, God is here, but you cannot come to Him. That is what the veil meant, and especially, of course, the second veil. That word “not,” NOT yet ... made manifest, should be emphasized constantly.

This way into the Holiest in Heaven, our access thither, ... unto the continual access and worship described in Hebrews as full growth, is the great distinction of the work of Christ. Under the old legal Levitical offerings and gifts the veil was never done away with. There was no access, there was no **coming nigh** to God. The way into the holy place now has been **opened**, as we are to see, and a mighty invitation and exhortation — the great, central exhortation of Hebrews (10:19), sounds out, to enter into it with **boldness**. (See 10:19ff.)

W.R. Newell, *Hebrews* (Chicago, 1947), pp. 280, 281.

★ ★ ★

APPENDIX SEVEN

Quotations Regarding Hebrews 10:20

Quotations Regarding Hebrews 10:20

This verse revives the thought of Chap. VI:20, of Jesus as at once our forerunner preceding us into the presence of God, and our high priest. The way is **new**, not the old road of outward sacrifice, but the devotion of willing hearts. Jesus dedicated it to the use of the redeemed host by first travelling along it himself (for the essence of the dedication consisted in a solemn opening for the first time to public use).

Frederick Randall, *Epistle to the Hebrews* (London, 1888), p. 87.

★ ★ ★

The writer is almost prepared to say that the entry of Christ into the heavenly places consecrated them to be a sanctuary.

C.T. Vaughan, *Epistle to the Hebrews* (London, 1896), p. 121.

★ ★ ★

APPENDIX EIGHT

Quotations Regarding The Significance Of The First Apartment

Quotations Regarding The Significance Of The First Apartment

The parabolic nature of the Holy Place in the Tabernacle of the wilderness is thus fully shown. All the services for which it was designed were not the completeness which the Spirit intended for the conscience. This very incompleteness pointed forward to the time when all would be complete and right according to the Spirit's design. This blessed period had now come since Jesus had shed and offered his blood to God in the divine Sanctuary.

The very fact that the Tabernacle has this anterior chamber shows that this could not be the final Sanctuary that had been designed by the Spirit for the expiation of our sins. As long as the Holy Place stood before the Holy of Holies, the latter was marked as not being the final Sanctuary.

R.C.H. Lenski, *Hebrews* (Columbus, 1946), p. 283.

★ ★ ★

IX. 1-14. The two ministries are now contrasted, in order to show that the Old Testament institutions were imperfect, and pointed beyond themselves to that real access to God which we have obtained through Christ.

6-10. Of the two divisions of the Tabernacle only the first was used for the regular service. The High Priest alone was permitted to enter the holy of holies, and that only once a year, on the Day of Atonement, when he bore into the presence of God the sacrificial blood, which covered his own sins as well as the sins of the people (6f.). The Scripture which lays down these rules was inspired by the Holy Spirit, and was meant to teach, in symbolic fashion, that a way was not yet opened into the immediate presence of God: this is implied in the very existence of a fore-tent, curtained off from the holy of holies.

Arthur S. Peak, *Commentary on the Bible* (London, 1919), p. 895.

★ ★ ★

... it is part of the author's doctrine that by Christ the distinction between holy place and most holy is abolished.

A.B. Bruce, *Hebrews* (Edinburgh, 1899), p. 328.

★ ★ ★

As High-priest He entered the true holiest place, a tabernacle greater and more perfect, even heaven itself. It is greater; that is, larger. The outer sanctuary has ceased to exist, because the veil has been rent in twain, and the holy place has been taken into the holiest place. The tabernacle has now only one chamber, and in that chamber God meets all His worshipping saints, who come to Him through and with Jesus, the High-priest.

M. Dods, "Hebrews," *The Expositor's Bible* (London, 1910), p. 153.

★ ★ ★

Neither is stress laid anywhere on the existence of a holy place in the true Tabernacle on high. Such a division seems contrary to the idea of it. The holy place below existed because of the imperfection of the first covenant and its service, of which it was the emblem (ix. 8, 9); but as perfection comes through the ministry of the true Tabernacle, there seems no place for a division, which is still the type of imperfection.

A.B. Davidson, *Hebrews* (Edinburgh, 1882), p. 174.

★ ★ ★

... the outer sanctuary no longer exists. The larger and more perfect tabernacle is the holiest place itself, when the veil has been removed, and the sanctuary and courts are all included in the expanded holiest.

M. Dods, "Hebrews," *The Expositor's Bible* (London, 1910), p. 158.

★ ★ ★

But what was the point and the significance of that arrangement? Well, the Holy Spirit now tells us that: **the way into the holy place hath not yet been made manifest, while the first tabernacle is yet standing.** Upon our grasping what this sentence means rests our application of the significance of the Old Testament system of worship. We must ask ourselves what we understand by the phrase, "the first tabernacle is yet standing." Some may be inclined to say, that it means simply that as long as the tabernacle that Moses built was still standing, no-one had any access into the Holiest of all.

But that cannot be the meaning, for we must be consistent with the terms as the writer of this chapter is using them. And hitherto when he has talked about the **first** tabernacle, he is referring not to Moses' tabernacle as distinct from later tabernacles, but to the first compartment in that Old Testament tabernacle, as distinct from the second compartment. And the Holy Spirit signifies this, that as long as that first compartment, that first tabernacle, was yet standing, that is, still had separate status, the way into the Holy Place, that is the Holiest of All, was not yet made manifest.

There is no need for us to knit our eyebrows, for the matter is really simple. It means that in that old tabernacle there hung a veil, and it was the veil that kept people out from the Holy Place, the Holiest of all. At the same time it was the veil that divided the building into two parts. It was the veil that gave to the first part its separate status. If you were to take the veil away from the Old Testament tabernacle, you would be left with one general compartment. And of course immediately you take the veil away, the way into the Holiest of all is made manifest; but so long as a veil hung there, and divided the building into two, and thus made that first compartment a separate place distinct from the Holiest of all, the way into the Holiest of all was not yet made manifest.

We shall see later that there is a beautiful contrast nowadays in the true tabernacle in which we are privileged to worship. There are not two compartments now, there is no veil now; our way is open into the holiest of all for the simple reason that there is no veil and there are not any longer two compartments but only one. There is no veil nowadays between God and His people, spiritually speaking (though in the physical sense there is; see the usage in ch. 6:19-20).

David Gooding, *An Unshakeable Kingdom* (Canada, 1976), pp. 109-110.

★ ★ ★

In v. 8 the very fact that in the earthly Tabernacle the Holy Place still has its position before the Holy of Holies is pointed out as evidence that the way into the heavenly Holy of Holies has not yet been made manifest. Are we now to believe that such an anteroom still has its position, an eternal position, in front of the Holy of Holies of heaven, and that despite this fact this anteroom is now **not** the evidence that it is in v. 8 but rather the opposite, evidence that the way into the heavenly Sanctuary has been made manifest? This surely cannot be the case. If there is an anteroom in heaven as there is in Moses' Tabernacle, the two anterooms cannot have an opposite significance, to say nothing of this division of heaven apart from any significance regarding the way to the heavenly Holy of Holies.

R.C.H. Lenski, *Hebrews* (Columbus, 1946), pp. 290-291.

★ ★ ★

The holy place has no existence strictly in the heavenly sanctuary, the veil is torn aside, and the whole is a holy of holies, God's true dwelling-place.

A.B. Davidson, *Hebrews* (Edinburgh, 1882), p. 201.

★ ★ ★

... the exact meaning of our author here, with whom the point is not the contrast between the two **parts** of the sanctuary, but the **division** between them, and the **hiding** of the one from those engaged in worship in the other.

Delitzsch, Vol. 2, (Edinburgh, 1870), p. 67.

★ ★ ★

... there is nothing said in our present passage of a difference or contrast between the *πρώτη* and the *δευτέρα σκηνή*. Inasmuch as this distinction was destined (according to ver. 8) to last only *μέχρι καιροῦ*.

... In the heavenly world there is no longer any veil (*καταπέτασμα*) between the place of God's own immediate presence and that of His manifestation to blessed spirits, and consequently no thought of separation, much less of difference or contrast between them, as of a *πρώτη* and *δευτέρα σκηνή*.

Delitzsch, Vol. 2, (Edinburgh, 1870), p. 80.

★ ★ ★

τα ἅγια is a technical term and = "the Holy Place;" its use is similar to that of *σκηνή* "the Tabernacle," which constitutes "the Sanctuary" where the presence of God dwells. In 9:3, etc., the Tabernacle of Moses is described with its two places, the Holy and the Holy of Holies. In heaven the two are one, and there is no veil between them; and it is of the heavenly "Holy" that our passage speaks. We may accept the translation "Sanctuary" in our versions as being correct in substance.

R.C.H. Lenski, *Hebrews* (Columbus, 1946)^ p. 251.

★ ★ ★

Herein in an especial manner was the whole a type of the flesh of Christ, in that there was no entrance to be laid open into the holy place but by the rending of the veil. The time when the high priest entered into it, it was indeed turned aside; whereon it immediately closed again, and forbade an entrance and a prospect unto others. Wherefore there could be no entrance into that holy place, such as would have been of old upon the rending of the veil.

J. Owen, *Hebrews* (Edinburgh, 1855), p. 506.

★ ★ ★

APPENDIX NINE

Quotations Regarding The Antithetical Nature Of The Sanctuary Type

Quotations Regarding The Antithetical Nature Of The Sanctuary Type

The priesthood is the basis of the economy, vii. 11. And what is important in the priest is his order. The kind of sacrifice he offers, the place where he ministers it, the nature of his approach unto God, and consequently the nature of the covenant relation between God and the People, and the degree to which the redemptive promises of God are realized — all depend upon his order or kind of personality. The first covenant had a priesthood after the order of Aaron, created by the law of a fleshly commandment — mortal men, having infirmity, vii. 16, 28; its sanctuary of this world, ix. 1, the very construction of which intimated that the way into the presence of God was yet barred, ix. 8; its ministry there, ix. 7; and its sacrifices which could not reach the conscience, ix. 9, nor take away sin, x. 2, 3. The new covenant has its priest after the order of Melchisedec, vii. 11, made a priest according to the power of an indissoluble life, vii. 16; a minister of the true Tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, not man, vii. 1, 2, that is, heaven, where God is present in truth, ix. 24 — with his ministry in that sanctuary, vii. 3-6, ix. 11, 12; and its sacrifice truly removing sin, ix. 12, and cleansing the conscience, ix. 14, and perfecting for ever them that are sanctified, x. 14; comp. vii. 11, ix. 13, 14. Each of these two sets of things hangs together in itself, and the two sets are incapable of confusion; no element of the one series can be introduced into the other.

The Melchisedec high priest goes through the same priestly acts as the Levitical or Aaronic, but his order, that is, virtually the nature of his person, alters the character of these acts, and makes them, instead of being fleshen and figurative, spiritual and possessing ideal validity.

... the only high-priestly act of ministry referred to is the entering of the high priest within the veil on the day of atonement, to which Christ's entrance into the sanctuary on high corresponds.

The order of Melchisedec is that He is a priest for ever. This point, which concerns the Priest Himself, does not cause Him to perform other priestly acts from those performed by Aaron, but it implies that His priestly acts are final, and that through them He dedicates an eternal covenant, which He ever liveth to sustain.

In truth, "heaven," the region of realities and things themselves and God's presence, and "Levitical" or Aaronic, the region of the copies of things and "this world," mutually exclude each other. But, further, the reasoning in vii. 11, etc., shows that in the view of the Epistle, the Son's descent from Judah, and not from Levi, threw Him outside of the order of Aaron (see notes). Our Lord, therefore, was never a priest after the order of Aaron, but always, from the moment He was a priest at all, a priest after the order of Melchisedec.

His ministry corresponds to that of the high priest. A ministry consists of three things: a place of ministration or sanctuary; priestly action there and an approach unto God; and an offering or sacrifice. The ministry of the ordinary priests is not here important: the priests go in continually into the first Tabernacle, accomplishing their services (ix. 6). The comparison lies between the ministry of Christ and that of the high priest: into the second goeth the high priest alone, once in the year, not without blood, which he offereth for himself and for the errors of the people (ix. 7). Corresponding to this: Christ, an High Priest of the good things that were to come, through a greater

Tabernacle, and through His own blood, entered in once for all into the holiest, and obtained eternal redemption (ix. 11, 12).

Aaron entering in once in the year into the holiest, for a moment, the veil closing behind him again when he returned, and obtaining no true and permanent access to God (x. 1-4, 11); Christ entering in once for all into the holiest, from which He comes no more out, — for to enter into the true holiest with His offering is to obtain eternal redemption (ix. 12-14, x. 10, 14, 18), and in virtue of the redemption obtained He is enabled to enter in, and there to abide for us, the surety of an eternal covenant (vii. 22, ix. 24, x. 19): Having offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, He sat down on the right hand of God.

This comparison speaks for itself. No mind but one already possessed by preconceptions derived from other sources or suggested by itself could fail to perceive that what is here exhibited is no solemn scenic repetition on a higher stage of the drama of the Atonement already enacted elsewhere, but the culminating scene of that very drama itself.

A.B. Davidson, *Hebrews* (Edinburgh, 1882), pp. 148, 149, 150, 198-199.



Beginning with verse 25 another word, important for the understanding of Christ's high-priestly ministry, is emphasized, namely, the word "once." The one sacrifice of Christ is valid once and for all; it need never be repeated. Its efficacy is so comprehensive, so vast in scope, that it has taken away the sins of "the many." It comprises "the whole history and all of mankind."

The "once" stands over against the "oftentimes." Again and again, year after year, a sacrificial animal had to be slaughtered in the Old Covenant; ever and anon the high priest had to go into the Holy of Holies in order to bring the atoning blood into God's presence. The word "often" betrays the inadequacy of the Old Testament order. The work of Christ is not marked by the word "often" but by the word "once." But "once" means once and for all.

G. Vos, *Hebrews* (Edinburgh, 1855), p. 90.



May we discern a motive which might have influenced the writer of this epistle, though well acquainted with the local position of the incense-altar in the outer sanctuary, to assign it nevertheless to the holy of holies? Such a motive may certainly be discovered, and is indeed recognised by Bleek himself. "*The sacred writer*" so says Bleek, and after him Tholuck, "*regards the holy of holies without its veil as a symbol of the heavenly sanctuary, and had therefore a direct interest in regarding the altar whose incense-oblation symbolized the prayers of saints* (Rev. vii. 3 sq.) *as pertaining to this inner sanctuary.*" This is the exact truth.

F. Delitzsch, *Hebrews* (Edinburgh, 1872), p. 55.



... the writer uses "the Holy Place" and not the Holy of Holies and what the high priest did there when he is bringing out the inadequacy of the Tabernacle and its function. He

is wise in this procedure. The very fact that the Tabernacle has this anterior chamber shows that this could not be the final Sanctuary that had been designed by the Spirit for the expiation of our sins. As long as the Holy Place stood before the Holy of Holies, the latter was marked as not being the final Sanctuary.

R.C.H. Lenski, *Hebrews* (Columbus, 1946), p. 287.

★ ★ ★

Many things ensued on the weakness and imperfection of the types which would not allow that there should be a perfect, complete resemblance in them of the substance itself, that all things between them should exactly answer unto one another. Hence they did at best but obscurely represent the good things to come, and in some things it was not possible but there should be a great discrepancy between them.

J. Owen, *Hebrews* (Edinburgh, 1855), p. 387.

★ ★ ★

What has been said illustrates the freedom with which the writer treats the typical relation between the Levitical ceremonies and the spiritual realities which he sees behind them. The correspondence which he insists on permanently is in general idea, not of detail with detail. The truths imaged are themselves described in figures, figures borrowed generally from the typical “copies;” and the figures change.

E.C. Wickham, *Hebrews* (London, 1910), pp. 83-84.

★ ★ ★

APPENDIX TEN

References In The New Testament To The Day Of Atonement Apart From Those In Hebrews And Revelation

References In The New Testament To The Day Of Atonement Apart From Those In Hebrews And Revelation

Each use of *hilaskomai* in the New Testament employs the basic image of the Day of Atonement.

Let us consider 1 John 2: in its setting:

If we say we have fellowship with him while we walk in darkness, we lie and do not live according to the truth; but if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship with one another, and the blood of Jesus his Son cleanses us from all sin. If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just, and will forgive our sins and cleanse us from all unrighteousness. If we say we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us. My little children, I am writing this to you so that you may not sin; but if any one does sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and he is the expiation for our sins, and not for ours only but also for the sins of the whole world.
(1 John 1:6-2:2 RSV)

We also wish to remind ourselves of the use of *hilaskomai* in Heb. 2:17 in order to rightly understand both passages and their relationship to the Day of Atonement. We will read this also in its context.

But we see Jesus, who for a little while was made lower than the angels, crowned with glory and honour because of the suffering of death, so that by the grace of God he might taste death for every one ... Since therefore the children share in flesh and blood, he himself likewise partook of the same nature, that through death he might destroy him who has the power of death, that is, the devil, and deliver all those who through fear of death were subject to lifelong bondage ... Therefore he had to be made like his brethren in every respect, so that he might become a merciful and faithful high priest in the service of God, to make expiation for the sins of the people. (Heb. 2:9, 14, 15, 17 RSV)

Let it be closely observed that the passages are not speaking primarily about a work being done in the heavenly sanctuary but about a priestly sacrifice for the sins of the world. The death of Christ is the focus of these verses. Christ became our high priest in order to taste death for every man and thus to destroy the devil and his works. The death on the cross is priestly work, for our Lord was high priest before his crucifixion. Not idly have we spoken of John 17 as his high priestly prayer. Jesus entered "within the veil" after having become a high priest. So says Heb. 6:19, 20. Thus Heb. 9:14 speaks of Him as offering Himself in sacrifice.

1 John 2:2 is an integral part of the pattern of 1 John 1:5-2:6. The antithetical nature of the verses should be noted. Cf. with 1:6 the following verse; with 1:8 its following verse; and with 1:10 compare 2:1 ff. Thus 1 John 2:2 is identical in meaning with 1 John 1:7 and 9. It is speaking of the purification and forgiveness of sins. In the Old Testament we have an intimate relationship between *katherizō* and *exilaskomai*, for the plural *hamartiōn* as we have seen is limited by the LXX in its cultic references to the Day of Atonement. Ex. 30:10; Lev. 23:27f; 25:9 use *(ex)ilasmos* for *kapharim*, and Ex. 29:36 and 30:10 use *katharismos*. See the close juxtaposition of forgiveness and

atonement in Lev. 4:31 — a typical cultic verdict. John thus in 2:2 echoes the well-known cultic sequence of *Yom Kippur*. Compare Lev. 16:24, 34.

Why are these passages (1 John 4:10 but echoes 2:2) significant for our study of the Day of Atonement in Hebrews? Because we have been guilty of separating in our thought “the atonement” from the day of the atonement. While many have recognized the former as applying to the cross, we have balked at applying the second the same way. Yet by Day of Atonement is meant precisely the time of the offering up of the atoning sacrifice. Hebrews, as we have seen, shies from speaking of the sprinkling of blood on the mercy seat lest some lessen the significance of the Calvary offering. The context of Heb. 2:17 and similar passages is the **death** of our high priest. This is what accomplished propitiation and expiation. Our Lord indeed is making intercession for us as heavenly priest, but it is done by His presence, for His atoning work is already finished, and He has sat down as a Conqueror ready to claim the trophies of His victory.

Fundamental still to the thinking of some is the error of our pioneers that the atonement only began at the cross. If we intended by such a belief only the fact that not all the consequences of Christ’s perfect redemptive work at Calvary are yet worked out, such a view would not be harmful. But as usually stated the glory of the cross is eclipsed and the testimony of many New Testament scriptures muted. Consider, for example, the following:

For if while we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, now that we are reconciled, shall we be saved by his life. Not only so, but we also rejoice in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received our reconciliation. (Rom. 5:10-11 RSV)

For in him all the fullness of God was pleased to dwell, and through him to reconcile to himself all things, whether on earth or in heaven, making peace by the blood of his cross. And you, who once were estranged and hostile in mind, doing evil deeds, he has now reconciled in his body of flesh by his death, in order to present you holy and blameless and irreproachable before him.

All this is from God, who through Christ reconciled us to himself and gave us the ministry of reconciliation; that is, God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not counting their trespasses against them, and entrusting to us the message of reconciliation. So we are ambassadors for Christ, God making his appeal through us. We beseech you on behalf of Christ, be reconciled to God. For our sake he made him to be sin who knew no sin, so that in him we might become the righteousness of God. (2 Cor. 5:18-21 RSV)

Such statements are in strong contrast to those of Crosier and Uriah Smith. The former wrote:

The atonement was made in the sanctuary, but Calvary was not such a place.

Therefore, He did not begin the work of making the atonement, whatever the nature of that work may be, till after His ascension when by His own blood He entered the heavenly sanctuary for us. (Crosier, *Day Star Extra*, Feb. 7, 1846)

And Uriah Smith:

Christ did not make the atonement when He shed His blood upon the cross.
Let this fact be fixed forever in the mind. (*Looking Unto Jesus*, 237).

Such statements have been echoed for over a hundred years as readers of our sanctuary literature know. They are usually linked with other errors, such as the denial that Christ was a priest on Calvary. Smith also writes:

In this case, as in the type, the offering and the usual priestly work precede the atonement. But when Christ suffered for us, in what capacity was He acting? — Not as our priest, but only as the offering; for He was put to death by wicked hands, even as the victims of old were slain by the sinner. It was as the sacrifice and offering that He bore our sins in His body on the tree. Here the blood was provided with which He was to minister. This was an act preparatory to the priestly work He was to perform in the true sanctuary above; the atonement is the last service He renders as priest. Those who make the offering to be the same as the atonement, confound together events that are more than eighteen hundred years apart. The offering was general. Christ died for all the world. The sacrifice was offered to all who would accept of it. But the atonement at the close is specific; it is made only for those who seek the benefits of His redeeming work, by “repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ.” Acts 20:21. (*Ibid.*, 238-239)

C.H. Watson, president of the General Conference, could write similarly in the 1930’s:

In the work of the atonement two essentials are to be observed, a sacrifice, and a priest... The priest’s work began **after** the sacrifice was slain. (*The Atoning Work of Christ*, 92. See also 157.)

Such statements have been multiplied despite the plain testimony of Scripture in such passages as Heb. 10:1, 12; 9:14; 7:27.

Crosier, Smith, Watson, and others wrote as though the priest worked chiefly within the holy places. But repeatedly the Old Testament says otherwise. See Num. 18:3, 5, 7, which show that the priest’s work was continually by the brazen altar of sacrifice. Ellen White never copied the errors of her associates but spoke plainly of Christ as priest at His death. See *Desire of Ages*, 25, 757.

Dan. 9:24 plainly foretold the atonement (“to make atonement for iniquity”) as falling within the seventy weeks prophecy, being accomplished in the midst of the last week, and thus confirming the eternal covenant, and causing sacrifices and oblations to cease.

The Old Testament chapter which has most to say about atonement is Lev. 16. Compare its 14 usages with the total of 48 in the book of Leviticus. We err if we separate the atonement from the Day of Atonement — the latter symbolized the former. “Cleansing” is never an empirical moral transaction in Leviticus, but a “declaring clean” on the basis of faith in the shed blood of a sacrifice. The case is identical in 1 John 1:7.

Some have criticized the KJV rendering of Rom. 5:11 which speaks of our having received the “atonement.” It is true that the original word here is *katallege* — but this is precisely the term used in the LXX for the Hebrew *kippur*. Atonement in Scripture has three dimensions: towards God it is propitiation; towards sin it is expiation; towards sinners it is reconciliation. Rom. 3:25 speaks of Christ as our mercy seat, i.e. as the place of atonement. The text speaks of expiation which implies propitiation. See RSV

rendering. Rom 5:18 assures us that the righteous act of Christ has brought “acquittal and life for all men.” Could language be stronger than that in expressing a completed atonement?

But the evidence is much stronger still. Scripture asserts that Christ’s resurrection was the evidence of our Lord’s finished work of propitiation. Read Rom. 4:25. Compare also 1 Cor. 15:17. Similarly, Pentecost spoke of the Father’s acceptance of that finished work and was symbolic of the anointing of the heavenly sanctuary made possible by the cross. See Acts 2:33.

Nor is the testimony of Hebrews contrary to that of the other epistles. Chapter 13 assures us that God brought Christ from the dead “by the blood of the eternal covenant.” This agrees with Rom. 4:25.

But the witness of Hebrews to a completed work by Christ on the cross is not left to the closing chapter. It is found in the introductory verses, and then frequently repeated thereafter. It was after Christ “had made purification for sins” that He “sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high” (1:4). Compare 2:9; 10:12, 13; 12:2. These passages assure us that Christ’s heavenly enthronement was the evidence and reward of an accomplished propitiation. In Heb. 9:22 it is the shedding of blood, not its sprinkling, that guarantees remission of sins. The sprinkling is but emblematic of application of the remedy — not the remedy itself.

The emphasis on the Day of Atonement in Hebrews is most significant for the issue under discussion. The services of that day symbolized the finding of a way of access to God’s presence through the complete expiation of sin. The work of sprinkling upon the mercy seat followed the right of access through the shed blood, and the worshippers expected a speedy reappearance of their Representative, not a prolonged work in the second apartment. When Christ left His grave-clothes in the tomb and appeared to His believers with the claim that all power in heaven and earth had been given to Him — He was enacting the work of the High Priest who after making the atonement, changed His garments and reappeared to bless the people.

Thus in Hebrews we find such passages as 2:17. This reconciliation is identical with the “eternal redemption” spoken of in 9:24 as something already obtained in the first century. He entered the presence of God “through His own blood” 9:12. Compare 9:14. These verses are important as they show conclusively that Calvary was the ground of entrance into the heavenly sanctuary. He did not enter to make atonement but to claim the benefits of an already accomplished atonement. After the veil was rent in the Jerusalem temple symbolizing Christ’s completion of the sacrifice which shattered the barrier between sinners and the holy God, He could never again be like the Levitical high priest outside the veil with the work still undone. We do not read of Melchizedek as priest ever sacrificing. Rather, we find him blessing. He communicated the fruits of prior sacrifice. So it is with our great King Priest after the order of Melchizedek. Every Lord’s Supper with its reminder of the blessing of sins forgiven tells the same story of a sealed covenant, sealed by the blood of Christ’s sacrifice.

Apart from an isolated reference in Acts, the didactic treatment in Hebrews, and the allusions in the Apocalypse, we have still another didactic reference to the Day of Atonement in Rom. 3:25 according to many scholars, and further allusions in the gospel record. To these we now turn.

Rom. 3:25 has long been a storm centre. It is in some respects the most important of all passages hailed as a *Crux interpretum*. Part of the Acropolis (so-called) of the New Testament — Rom. 3:25 — its testimony must not be overlooked. As a *locus classicus* this verse is not susceptible of slick ready exegesis and we will not presume to attempt the cutting of all the Gordian knots involved. Rather, we wish to make some suggestions for which there are strong grounds, and which if accepted will contribute towards the purpose of this document, but which if rejected will in no wise be damaging to our central theses.

We refer the reader to F. Buchsel (*TDNT* III, p. 320ff), and to the comments of G. Friedrich, O. Kuss, P. Althaus, O. Michel, K. Barth in their expositions on Romans, particularly Rom. 3:25. These are German scholars who oppose the view popular in Germany since Deissmann. Outside Germany the view that Rom. 3:25 is strongly linked to the Day of Atonement is not only widely recognized but almost taken for granted. A Nygren, T.W. Manson, P.J. Leenhardt, A.M. Hunter, C.K. Barrett, F.F. Bruce, and D.E.H. Whiteley fall into this category. However, we are not engaging in a numbers game to establish a truth of biblical exegesis, and therefore will briefly indicate the evidence for this position.

First, it is impossible to deny that Paul was fully aware of the relationship of *hilasterion* to the ancient tabernacle, and special to *Yom Kippur*. Exclusively in the LXX *hilasterion* signifies the place of sacrificial expiation. (Twenty-one of the twenty-seven occurrences of *hilasterion* in the LXX are translations of כַּפֶּרֶת. Even the five occurrences in Eze. 43 probably are because the altar ledge there referred to paralleled *kapporeth*. See Eze. 43:20. The final instance, that of Amos 9:1, is almost certainly an error from misreading the Hebrew. Thus as Young says, “the likelihood of this LXX usage being the source of Paul’s designation of Christ as a *hilasterion* borders on certainty.” *Op. cit.*, 337.) In the Pauline context the reference to “by his blood” certainly points us to the Day of Atonement when the mercy seat, the *hilasterion*, received the expiating blood. Dr. Young has written:

In a context which has so powerfully expounded a doctrine of universal sin, reaching its climax in Rom. 3:25, it is natural for a Jewish writer to fall back upon the key terms of the only Old Testament institution where such community sin was dissolved. (N.H. Young, *Ibid.*, 295)

He further adds:

The Day of Atonement ritual with the blood sprinkled upon the *hilasterion* by the high priest is the most likely parallel textually, the most informative parallel exegetically, and the closest parallel linguistically. Textually, the Pauline affinities with the LXX are undisputed; exegetically the Day of Atonement gives a mass of suggestive and profound interpretations; and linguistically only the Day of Atonement texts can explain the joining of “by his blood” to “*hilasterion*.” (*Ibid.*, 297)

If Buchsel, Michel, Barth, Nygren, etc. are correct, what significance has their conclusions for us in our present study? According to C.F.D. Moule, the lack of the article before *hilasterion* is due to its being an accusative used predicatively. **Philo** is known to have parallels to such construction. This would imply that it is primarily the function of the mercy seat that Paul alludes to rather than identity. But it is quite certain that the mercy seat was the most important cultic item of the sanctuary. This was where

atonement was made for the sins of the people of God, and it is not possible to think that Paul was unaware of that fact. Our “so-what” inquiry is answered by the evidence that Paul saw in Calvary the antitype of the entrance into the Most Holy where the mercy seat was located.

Nygren, Manson, and others have suggested certain parallels and contrasts in their elucidation of the *hilasterion*. The ancient mercy seat was hidden from view, but now Christ is publicly set forth to the whole world; the blessings of the mercy seat once were claimed by cultic ritual, but now they are received through faith alone; the tabernacle mercy seat was sprinkled with animal blood, but both Hebrews and Romans imply that the redemptive accomplishment is through the applied blood of the Son of God.

The blood sprinkled on the mercy seat was warm. It had to be un-coagulated, or sprinkling would have been impossible. It is just as impossible to separate the antitypical blood-shedding and entrance to the Most Holy. Rom. 3:25 tells us that our Lord entered the Most Holy Place in immediate connection with His death. While Adventists have realized that the slaying of the goat on the Day of Atonement was not fulfilled in 1844, they have endeavoured to separate the aspersion on the mercy seat till that time — something exegetically, theologically, and logically unsound.

The reader should look again at our comment in Chapter 2, section Heb. 13:10-13 regarding the significance of the word “atonement” in this manuscript. See also our comments on Dan. 9:24 in chapter three.

Desmond Ford

★ ★ ★

APPENDIX ELEVEN

The Gospels And The Day Of Atonement

The Gospels And The Day Of Atonement

Even reading the passion narrative superficially suggests Jesus as the antitype of the Passover lamb. But there are less prominent motifs embedded in the same accounts. Consider the words of J.D.M. Derrett:

... they linked Jesus' sufferings with the usual dramatic preparation of the High Priest, on the Even of the Day of Atonement. The latter was taken to an **upper chamber**, where he communed with the 'elders of the Court'. He was **adjured**, and was kept awake all night. The tending of the Altar **fire**, which normally took place about **cock-crow**, was advanced, and before cock-crow the Altar was made ready for the High Priest's personal sacrifice. During the ceremonies the High Priest was robed and disrobed several times and his final vestments were glorious. The gospel texts have retained the coincidences, some of them trifling in themselves, because the role of the High Priest and the outlines of his ritual were perfectly well known, and because a succession of mere hints was enough to make the point that Jesus was the **real** High Priest and was just about to effect the **real** (and everlasting) Atonement. That he was interrogated by the High Priest and elders in the High Priest's dwelling (and we note in passing the gospel's stumbling over the place of the meeting and the exact identity of the chief interrogator) is a perfect piece of New Testament irony. And that the Day of Atonement and Passover have little in common seemed irrelevant, on the theory that Jesus' life summed up and gave meaning to all the *Torah*. (*Law in the New Testament* [London, 1970], 410-411)

When we add to this the little touch in John's resurrection account about the folded clothes left in the tomb and recall Lev. 16:23 the picture becomes clearer still. Even the evangelists concerned apparently with the history of the atonement are not negligent of its theological implications and the typical antecedents.

The Old Testament picture in Leviticus 16 brings to view one who after preliminary ritual was without sin. This one by his solitary labours reconciled the nation to God. He brought the blood of a spotless offering into the presence of God and the whole nation was accepted in his acceptance. Then he returned to the waiting penitents to bless them, and on every fiftieth year the Jubilee trumpets sounded on the Day of Atonement and the people rejoiced as never before in their whole lifetime. The New Testament assures us that the reality has come in Jesus our great High Priest who has made atonement for our transgressions. Therefore are we accepted in the beloved, and gladly rejoice in His imputed righteousness. That has been the good news ever since the resurrection morning in 31 AD. Reconciled by our Representative, in God's reckoning we too have entered within the veil and become seated in heavenly places at God's right hand. Eph. 2:6.

Desmond Ford

APPENDIX TWELVE

Studies In The Book Of Daniel (*R. Cottrell*)

from

Sabbath School Lesson Quarterly Senior Division,
No. 287, First Quarter, 1967

Studies In The Book Of Daniel (Sabbath School Lesson Quarterly)

Page 3

Lessons 5 and 6 present a composite summary of all of the information Gabriel imparted to Daniel, without attempting (in these two lessons) to interpret it. Lessons 7 through 12 turn to the New Testament for the interpretation and application of the prophecies of Daniel given by Christ and the various New Testament writers.

Page 5

As with all of God's promises and warnings, the covenant blessings were conditional upon Israel's cooperation. Again and again we find the word "if" attached to the promised blessings. "It should be remembered that promises and the threatenings of God are alike conditional." — *Evangelism*, p. 695.

Pages 6-7

God purposed, after seventy years of exile, to restore His people to the Land of Promise, to renew His covenant, and to carry out His original plan for them. All that had been promised might yet come to pass if they learned the lesson that bitter experience was designed to teach.

"This promise of blessing should have met fulfilment in large measure during the centuries following the return of the Israelites from the lands of their captivity. It was God's design that the whole earth be prepared for the first advent of Christ, even as today the way is preparing for His second coming." — *Prophets and Kings*, pp. 703, 704.

Page 14

Study Aim: To understand and appreciate God's purpose for the salvation of the world through the Jewish people during the restoration era that followed the Babylonian exile.

Page 15

Introduction: According to Daniel 9:24, RSV, seventy "weeks of years," or 490 years, dating from the restoration decree, were allotted the Jews in which to fulfil their appointed mission as the covenant people. This is known as the restoration era. As the inspired writers make abundantly clear, it was God's purpose that the good news of salvation should go to all the world during this period of time, and that Messiah should come, die for His people, rise again, and establish His eternal kingdom. What God is accomplishing through His church on earth today, He originally purposed to do for the world through Israel, the chosen nation, during the restoration era. See *Prophets and Kings*, pp. 713, 714.

Much additional information about God's purpose for the returned exiles is provided by other Old Testament writers of the captivity-restoration era. Their perspective is helpful in understanding how, in the purpose of God, the prophecies of Daniel could — and would — have been fulfilled to literal Israel had her rulers and people proved faithful to their covenant privileges and responsibilities. This insight into what might have been, provides a firm basis for understanding the way in which Christ and the New Testament writers later interpreted and applied these same prophecies, once the Jewish nation had ceased to be God's chosen instrument for the conversion of the world.

The Hebrew word translated "weeks" is a derived form of the word for "seven," meaning a period of time made up of seven units or subdivisions, whether seven days or seven years — a hebdomad. In chapter 10:2 Daniel relates that he was in mourning for "three full weeks,"

literally, “three full hebdomads [weeks] of days.” Evidently, when Daniel intended a hebdomad of days he considered it necessary to add (according to the Hebrew text) the qualifying phrase “of days” to the word “hebdomad [week],” in order to make clear that these hebdomads were “weeks” of days and not years, as in chapter 9:24. In recognition of this fact, the RSV translates Daniel 9:24, “weeks of years.”

Page 16

4. *What was God’s purpose for the Jews as a nation following the exile? Ezek. 36:11, 24-28. See also Jer. 31:31-34.*

Note. — “This promise of blessing should have met fulfilment in large measure during the centuries following the return of the Israelites from the lands of their captivity. It was God’s design that the whole earth be prepared for the first advent of Christ, even as today the way is preparing for His second coming.” — *Prophets and Kings*, pp. 703, 704.

Taken in their literary and historical context, all of the Old Testament promises looking forward to a future restoration were given with the return from Babylonian exile in view. All that had been promised by Moses and the prophets might yet have come to pass if leaders and people proved loyal to their covenant privileges and responsibilities. Their restoration and prosperity were to be conditional on a transformation of the heart.

Pages 16-17

6. *What witness were the Jews to bear to the nations during the restoration era? Isa. 60:1-3. See also Isa. 49:3, 6; 56:6, 7.*

Note. — The glorious prophecies of Isaiah 40 to 66, which in their original setting applied specifically to this restoration era, provide a picture of what God purposed to accomplish in and through the Jewish nation during that time.

In Isaiah, as in Daniel and Zechariah, Messiah would come and die (ch. 53), the gospel would go to all the world (chs. 54 to 62); at His coming the Lord would destroy those who rejected His mercy (chs. 63 and 64), and establish His universal, eternal reign of righteousness (chs. 65 and 66).

Page 17

7. *By what figure did Ezekiel illustrate Israel’s postexilic mission to the nations following the exile? Ezek. 47:1-12.*

Note. — In a slightly different sequence, Ezekiel presents the same picture of the restoration era as Daniel, Zechariah, and Isaiah. Exile (Ezekiel 1 to 33) is followed by restoration (chs. 34 to 37). The nations will come against Jerusalem, but the Lord will fight for His people (chs. 38 and 39). The sanctuary will be re-established (chs. 40 to 46), Messiah the Prince will come (ch. 44:1-3), the gospel will go to the nations (ch. 47), and the Lord Himself will reign in Jerusalem (ch. 48).

8. *How would the nations respond to Israel’s appeal? Zech. 2:11; 8:20-23.*

Note. — “It was God’s purpose that by the revelation of His character through Israel men should be drawn unto Him. To ail the world the gospel invitation was to be given. Through the teachings of the sacrificial service Christ was to be uplifted before the nations, and all who would look unto Him should live. All who, like Rahab the Canaanite, and Ruth the Moabitess, turned from idolatry to the worship of the true God, were to unite themselves with

His chosen people. As the numbers of Israel increased, they were to enlarge their borders, until their kingdom should embrace the world.” — *Christ’s Object Lessons*, p. 290.

Pages 17-18

12. *What was the ultimate goal of the restoration era following the exile? Dan. 9:24; Micah 4:1, 2, 7-10. See also Jer. 3:17.*

Note. — “If Jerusalem had known what it was her privilege to know, and had heeded the light which Heaven had sent her, she might have stood forth in the pride of prosperity, the queen of kingdoms, free in the strength of her God-given power. She might ... have been ... the mighty metropolis of the earth. From her walls the dove of peace would have gone forth to all nations. She would have been the world’s diadem of glory.” — *The Desire of Ages*, p. 577.

13. *How was the Messianic kingdom to be established? Zech. 14:1-4, 8, 9, 16. See also Mal. 4:1-6.*

Note. — Had Israel been faithful to God and fulfilled her assigned role during the restoration era as God intended, His eternal kingdom would have been established at Jerusalem in the long ago. The conditional prophecies of Isaiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, and Zechariah concerning Israel would have met their fulfilment, and Christ would have inaugurated His righteous reign as “king over all the earth.” But, as a nation, the people of Israel failed to achieve the high destiny marked out for them. They rejected the Messiah when He came, and God in turn rejected them from being His people.

Page 21

The fourth beast of chapter 7 and its little horn exist together to the close of time. They are judged and destroyed together, the fourth beast being punished for the “great words” its little horn speaks.

Page 24

12. *What promise of eventual deliverance from the oppressor’s power is given? Dan. 7:21, 22, 26; 8:25; 9:27; 11:45; 12:1.*

Note. — There is a happy ending to the long reign of terror. When it seems that the great oppressor is on the point of triumph, God intervenes in the course of history to deliver His people, to destroy their wily foe, and to inaugurate His own righteous reign on earth. By the verdict of the supreme court of the Universe, those who have suffered at the hands of the great persecuting power will eventually be awarded eternal justice.

Page 26

Now that the transfer of the covenant promises and responsibilities to the nascent Christian church had been made, further information could be given concerning **when** and **how** Daniel’s prophecy would be fulfilled. It is worthy of special note that, on the very day the Jewish leaders officially rejected Jesus as the Messiah, He directed His disciples’ attention to the book of Daniel and told them that **now** those who read the prophecy should be able to understand (Matt. 24:15) what had previously been “closed up and sealed.” His great discourse on the signs of His coming (Matthew 24, Mark 13 and Luke 21), in answer to the disciples’ questions about when and how Daniel’s prophecy would come to pass, is His interpretation and application of that prophecy to the changed historical situation in which the church has become the new chosen instrument of God’s purpose on earth. Jesus here places

in our hands the master key for unlocking the mysteries of Daniel that had hitherto been “closed up and sealed.”

In this lesson we consider Christ’s interpretation and application of Daniel’s prophecy. In Lessons 8 to 12 we will explore what the various New Testament writers have to say on the matter. By thus letting the New Testament interpret the Old for us, we shall have an inspired authoritative commentary on the book of Daniel as it applies to the Christian church, and thus to our time,

1. *What does Malachi say of Israel’s spiritual state a century after the return from exile, four centuries before the coming of Christ? Mal. 1:6, 7, 12, 13; 2:8, 13, 14, 17; 3:8, 9, 13, 14.*

Note. — “Under the leadership of Zerubbabel, of Ezra, and of Nehemiah they [the returned exiles] repeatedly covenanted to keep all the commandments and ordinances of Jehovah. The seasons of prosperity that followed, gave ample evidence of God’s willingness to accept and forgive; and yet, with fatal short-sightedness, they turned again and again from their glorious destiny, and selfishly appropriated to themselves that which would have brought healing and spiritual life to countless multitudes.

“This failure to fulfil the divine purpose was very apparent in Malachi’s day.” — *Prophets and Kings*, p. 705.

Page 27

Note. — “Not by any temporary failure of Israel, however, was the plan of the ages for the redemption of mankind to be frustrated. Those to whom the prophet was speaking might not heed the message given, but the purposes of Jehovah were nevertheless to move steadily forward to their complete fulfilment.” — *Prophets and Kings*, pp. 705, 706.

God’s ultimate purpose never changes; but when those who have been called refuse persistently to cooperate, He changes the manner in which He will eventually carry His purpose forward to success, the precise time of its culmination, and the human instruments He will use. The Bible record is replete with instances of the reversal of promised blessings and threatened judgments, involving both nations and individuals.

The Christian church became God’s chosen instrument for the salvation of the human race. Though the basic features of God’s plan for the world remained unchanged, this transition from literal Israel to spiritual Israel involved also **a profound change in the manner in which some aspects of the plan would now have to be worked out in history.**

“That which God purposed to do for the world through Israel, the chosen nation, He will finally accomplish through His church on earth today.” — *Prophets and Kings*, p. 713.

Pages 29-30

How the sealed portion of the prophecy of Daniel might have been fulfilled in history, had the Jews remained loyal to their covenant privileges and responsibilities, is beyond our ken. Nor is it important for us to know. With the transition from literal Israel to the Christian church, however, the latter fell heir to the covenant promises, privileges, and the responsibilities that formerly belonged to the literal descendants of Abraham.

Christ and the New Testament writers present a preview of how these aspects of Daniel’s prophecy were yet to work out in history, between the first and second advents of Christ, as

Satan went forth in anger to make war on those who should choose to remain loyal to God. Christ and the apostles often use the very words, expressions, or ideas of Daniel as they draw this picture of coming events. Christ specifically declared His delineation of the future to be an outline of how Daniel's prophecy is to be fulfilled, with His followers as heirs to the covenant promises, privileges, and responsibilities.

Pages 33-34

Bible prophecy is a declaration of God's purpose, and its fulfilment in any particular historical context is contingent upon the cooperation of His church on earth.

Now, instead of a literal nation composed of the literal descendants of Abraham, the chosen people would henceforth be an international body, the church universal, a spiritual "nation" called out of all nations. The world replaced the land of Palestine as the stage for God's efforts in behalf of the human race, and the New Jerusalem in heaven replaced literal Jerusalem as the focal centre of the believer's hope. A new covenant replaced the old, and a new revelation of the divine purpose was given, adapting the former revelation to the new historical situation.

Page 34

The **Old Testament prophecies are still to be fulfilled in principle, though not necessarily in every detail**, owing to the fact that many details were dependent on Israel as a literal nation situated in the land of Palestine. Obviously such details could not in any literal sense apply to a spiritual "nation" scattered all over the world. Thus, only when the New Testament makes a clear application, or reinterpretation, of such an Old Testament passage, to the new situation with the church as God's chosen instrument, do we have infallible guidance as to its import for us.

Consequently, we should first examine such an Old Testament prophecy in terms of its original, historical application to literal Israel before going to the New Testament to discover its application to spiritual Israel.

Page 37

Three basic prophetic time periods are brought to view in the prophetic portion of the book of Daniel — "a time and times and the dividing of time" (ch. 7:25; 12:7), "two thousand and three hundred days" (ch. 8:14), and "seventy weeks" (ch. 9:24). The first marks the tyrant's defiance of God, his persecution of the saints, and his attempt to obliterate a knowledge of God's revealed will and the worship of God. **The second is the period of time during which the little horn of Daniel 8 would desolate the sanctuary, interrupt its services, and substitute in their place his own apostate form of worship.** The third is the period of time allotted the Jews as a nation in which to fulfil their covenant obligations. Each of these three time periods is clarified by comparison with the others, and by Christ and the New Testament writers. A correct understanding of them is basic to a valid interpretation of Daniel.

Page 38

5. *For how long was the sanctuary to suffer under the tyrant's heel? Dan. 8:13, 14.*

Note. — At the end of 1260 "days" God's people were to be delivered from the tyrant's hand; but at the end of 2300 "days" the sanctuary was to be "cleansed." Lesson 11 considers what was to take place at the close of the 2300 "days;" here we are concerned only with the period of time itself, and its correlation with the events of history.

Page 39

In Lesson 9 we found that while the great tyrant of prophecy could not directly influence the sanctuary in heaven, he could, and did, succeed in depriving countless millions of people of a knowledge of the saving ministry of our great High Priest there. For them, the effect was the complete desolation of the sanctuary in heaven. **The context of Daniel 8:14 requires that this cleansing include a restoration of the damage done by the little horn in desolating the sanctuary. At the end of the 2300 prophetic days, or years, a knowledge of the full ministry of Christ there, and access to His ministry, was to be restored.**

Page 41

By “the judgment,” in this lesson, we refer to the entire process by which God intervenes to bring the course of this world’s history to a halt, to separate the righteous from the wicked, and to mete out to each group the reward for which it has qualified. **To be sure, God needs no judicial procedure by which to determine a person’s eligibility for eternal life.** The Bible writers make use of the human judicial process to illustrate the fact that God is not arbitrary in deciding individual destiny, but infinitely fair and just. God’s own people stand before His judgment bar that their right to eternal life may be authenticated — the wicked, that God may demonstrate their characters to be irreformably out of harmony with the principles of heaven.

Note. — In the judgment scene presented in Daniel 7 **the fourth beast and the little horn are arraigned before the bar of divine justice, charged with defiance of God and with the persecution of His people on earth.** The Judge of the universe wrests the kingdom of this world from their power and awards it to the Son of God and to His faithful people. **Seventh-day Adventists have also thought of this scene as a portrayal of the judgment of individuals, as well as of organized human opposition to God and the saints.**

Page 42

5. *In what various ways does Daniel refer to the judgment of the great tyrant of prophecy? Dan. 2:34, 35, 44, 45; 7:11, 26; 8:25; 9:27; 11:45. Compare Dan. 12:1.*

Note. — These descriptions all reflect: (1) an act of judgment that is supernatural, for no human hand is lifted in defence of the guilty, nor is any needed to execute the sentence; (2) an act of judgment that is universal; it eliminates all earthly opposition to God and to His people; (3) an act of judgment that takes place at the close of human history, and inaugurates God’s eternal, righteous reign on earth.

Page 43

10. *What solemn proclamation immediately precedes the day of judgment? Rev. 14:6-11.*

Note. — God has entrusted to His remnant church the responsibility for proclaiming His judgment-hour message. The first angel of the heavenly trio announces that the hour of God’s judgment has come. The second introduces the villain who is to be judged — Babylon the Great. The third issues the indictment of those who are to suffer divine wrath: They have espoused the cause of antichrist, and so must perish with him. For this reason God summons His people still in Babylon to “come out of her” in order to avoid participation in her sins and in the “plagues” meted out to her. Rev. 18:4.

Page 44

Each of the great lines of prophecy presented in the book of Daniel closes with the annihilation of the forces of evil and with the establishment of the universal, righteous kingdom of God on earth. Dan. 2:44; 7:13, 14; 8:25; 9:24, 27; 11:45 to 12:3.

APPENDIX THIRTEEN

Parallels Between Daniel 8 And Daniel 9

Parallels Between Daniel 8 And Daniel 9

Traditionally we have made the seventy weeks the first part of the 2300 years. Undoubtedly, this was in the providence of God for nineteenth century purposes. But the Hebrew term *chathak* means to “cut,” and is used as a metaphor for the making of a decision. Even *Doctrinal Discussions* admits this meaning. The whole passage of 9:26-27 actually covers the identical ground of 8:1-14, and not just the first part.

Consider the linguistic and conceptional parallels suggested in the following list:

1. Both prophecies revolve around the sanctuary.

It is a commonplace with us that the sanctuary is central in Daniel 8, but we have not usually perceived that it is almost as central in Daniel 9. T.R. Birks wrote the following more than a century ago:

There is another feature common to the three later in contrast with the former visions. They all make repeated allusions to the temple of God. In the eighth chapter the term translated, **The pleasant land**, will be found, by a comparison with other scriptures, to denote the temple itself. Twice, again, in that vision the sanctuary is directly named. The prophecy of the Weeks also directly mentions the temple, both in the prayer of Daniel and the message of the angel. In like manner, in chapter xi. 16, 31, 41, we have a similar allusion. Each vision appears thus to divide itself into two portions, the times of the second temple, and a period of renewed and heavier desolation. Their close also looks forward to a third era, more blessed and glorious, when the sanctuary shall be cleansed, and the holy people shall be scattered no longer; but Gentiles shall come to the light of Zion, and kings to the brightness of her rising. (T.R. Birks, *The Two Later Visions of Daniel*, p. 6.)

The theme of Daniel’s prayer is the restoration of the sanctuary, and the starting point of the seventy weeks has to do with the re-establishment of the Jewish sanctuary community. The prophecy, after presenting the blessings associated with Messiah’s coming, including the anointing of the “most holy,” closes with reference to the fate of the sanctuary.

“And the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; ... and unto the end of the war desolations are determined” (Dan. 9:26). Compare Dan. 8:13: “How long shall be the vision concerning ... the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot?”

Knox’s translation gives the following for the close of verse 27:

“In the temple all shall be defilement and desolation, and until all is over, all is fulfilled, that desolation shall continue.” (Compare Dan. 8:13, 17.)

It is certainly significant that Christ in His second advent sermon, which passed without a break from the desolation of literal Israel by literal Rome to the desolation of spiritual Israel by spiritual Rome, should quote both Daniel 8 and 9 regarding the destiny of the sanctuary. Thus:

“When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place” (Matt. 24:15; compare Dan. 9:27).

“And Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled” (Luke 21:24; compare Dan. 8:13).

Christ here quotes phrases, “abomination of desolation” and “trodden under foot” from Daniel 9 and 8 respectively. (For the former see Dan. 12:11 in the Septuagint.)

The Protestant reformers saw in Daniel 8:13 a prediction of the papal desolation of the Christian church (see *The Seventh-day Adventist Commentary*, vol. 4, pp. 61, 62), and many commentators have found the same in Daniel 9:26, 27. Revelation 11:2 confirms this interpretation.

This evidence indicates that Daniel 9 as well as Daniel 8 discusses the fate of the sanctuary and covers the entire Christian era.

2. Both prophecies refer to Christ and the Antichrist as the protagonists in the war over the sanctuary.

In Daniel 8 we read concerning the “prince of the host,” whose sanctuary was cast down by the little horn. He is also referred to as the “Prince of princes,” while the little horn is styled “a king of fierce countenance.”

In Daniel 9 we find the prince of the sanctuary is referred to as “Messiah the Prince,” while His opposite number is described as “the prince that shall come.” “Come” is always used in Daniel in connection with the warlike approach of a hostile power. (See chaps. 1:1; 8:6; 11:10, 13, 15, 16, 40.) Undoubtedly the reference here in Daniel 9:26 particularly refers back to the prediction in the previous chapter concerning the future desolating prince. T.R. Birks wrote as follows on this point:

The “people of the prince that shall come,” it is quite evident, are the Romans, by whom the Jewish temple was destroyed. But since the same angel is the messenger in both visions, (a point, to which the Spirit draws our special attention), the meaning of the phrase is most simply explained by this narrative of the Little Horn. A king of fierce countenance, the angel Gabriel has already taught the prophet, will cast down the place of the sanctuary, and destroy the people of the holy ones. He now declares afresh, when the Messiah shall be cut off, the people of the prince that shall come will destroy the city and the sanctuary. Can any allusion be more distinct and clear? Surely it is plain that the same prince and people are announced in the two visions, and the prophet himself could never have supposed, for a moment, that the desolation of the sanctuary, which had been announced fifteen years before, would be nearly six hundred years later in its fulfilment. The Little Horn, then, must be an emblem of the Roman power. (*Ibid.*, p. 180.)

3. Both prophecies begin with the time of Medo-Persia.

Daniel 8 has for its first symbol a ram having two horns, and the prophet is told that the horns represent the kings of Media and Persia.

Daniel 9 has its starting point in the reference to the going forth of the commandment to restore and-build Jerusalem, which commandment, of course, was issued in the days of Medo-Persia (see Ezra 6:14).

4. Both prophecies culminate with judgment on the Antichrist at the end of time.

The chief aggressive symbol in Daniel 8 is the desolating little horn, but the prophecy closes with the promise that this power will be “broken without hand” (verse 25).

Daniel 9 speaks of the “prince that shall come” against the sanctuary, and after describing the desolations of the holy place, it is pledged that ultimately “that determined shall be poured upon the desolator” (verse 27, margin). The Amplified Bible has: “Until the full determined end is poured out on the desolator.” (From *The Amplified Bible*, Copyright 1965 by the Lockman Foundation.)

Many commentators point out that the language of the last section of Daniel 9:27 is an echo of Isaiah 10:23-25, which foretells the ultimate destruction of Israel’s foes. The concept of “pouring out” reappears in Revelation 15 and 16 with the pouring out of the plagues upon Babylon.

5. Both prophecies point to the bringing in of everlasting righteousness.

Daniel 8, by its portrayal of victorious persecuting powers through the ages, says in effect, “Wickedness shall prosper till the sanctuary is cleansed.” This cleansing, or justifying (margin), of the sanctuary is made the terminus of the prowess of the little horn. Thus in the explanation given by Gabriel it is declared that ultimately the conquering little horn will be “broken without hand,” an obvious reference to the coming of the “everlasting kingdom” of Jehovah referred to in Daniel 2:44, 45, and 7:27.

The word for “cleansed” in chapter 8:14 is the niphil form of the root whose substantive occurs in Daniel 9:24 as “righteousness,” the “everlasting righteousness” to be ushered in by the Messiah when sin and transgression are ended. Thus both Daniel 8 and 9 point to the final setting up of God’s eternal kingdom of justice made sure by Calvary and established in glory at the end of time.

By way of review, parallel expressions (related though not always identical in meaning) in the two prophecies are now placed side by side.

Daniel 8	Daniel 9
“ Gabriel make this man to understand the vision.”	“He [Gabriel] informed me ... and said, ... I am now come forth to give thee skill and understanding ... Therefore understand the matter, and consider the vision.”
“The vision.” An expression used pre-eminently of Daniel 8. So applied at least ten times.	“Consider the vision.” “To seal up the vision.”
“The place of his sanctuary was cast down.”	“Shall destroy ... the sanctuary.”
“By reason of transgression.”	“To finish the transgression”
“Concerning ... the transgression of desolation.”	“Desolations are determined.” “He shall make it desolate.”
“Then shall the sanctuary be cleansed” (made righteous).	“To bring in everlasting righteousness.”
“The prince of the host.”	“Messiah the Prince.”
“King of fierce countenance.”	“The prince that shall come.”
“At the time of the end shall be the vision.”	“Unto the end of the war desolations are determined.”

Daniel 8	Daniel 9
"At the time appointed the end shall be."	"That determined shall be poured upon the desolator [margin]."
"Shall destroy the mighty and the holy people."	"Shall destroy the city and the sanctuary."
"He shall be broken without hand."	"That determined shall be poured upon the desolator."
"Trodden underfoot." "Unto two thousand and three hundred days."	"Desolate, even till the consummation."
"Shall stand up against the Prince of princes."	"Shall the Messiah be cut off."

The significance of these parallels will be rapidly appreciated if the central motifs are compared as follows:

Daniel 8	Daniel 9
"He shall also stand up against the Prince of princes." "And the place of his sanctuary was cast down," giving "both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot." "Unto two thousand three hundred days."	"... shall Messiah be cut off, ... and the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; ... and unto the end ... desolations are determined."

Matthew 24 makes it clear that both prophecies refer to the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, but then continue to be fulfilled in the war against spiritual Israel by Antichrist through the ages. (Compare Matt. 24:1-22 and Rev. 11:2.) This fact alone disqualifies the position of critics who apply Daniel 8 solely to the times of Antiochus Epiphanes.

Desmond Ford, "More Evidence of the Connection Between Daniel 8 and 9," *Ministry*, July, 1968, pp. 30-32. [First paragraph not in original article.]



We have referred to the nineteenth century application of *chathakas* "cut-off." But the original intention of heaven that all things should be consummated by the end of the seventy weeks should not be passed over. R. Cottrell has declared:

The Hebrew word for "cut-off" is *chathak*. As a matter of fact, it does not mean "cut-off." It means determined. Seventy weeks years are determined upon your people. And I think the significance of that in Daniel's time is this: Here they came up to the close of the seventy years of exile and Daniel prayed for the restoration of Jerusalem. He said, "O Lord, delay not (9:19)." And the angel came in reply to his prayer, and said "Daniel, the seventy weeks of years (490 years) are determined for your people." That is, they are allotted to the Jewish people. That is the actual meaning of the Hebrew word and, I believe, true to context also. And the idea that means that seventy weeks were cut-off from another period is a part of the re-interpretation and not of the original meaning. (See cassette tape record of Dr. Cottrell's Loma Linda address on Dan. 8:14, on Feb. 22, 1980.)

APPENDIX FOURTEEN

Should a Question be Answered? A Study of Dan. 8:14

Article by C.L. Price, brother of George McCready Price, in
"New Light on Old Problems," 1973, p. 8.

Should a Question be Answered?

Yes, I suppose so, if the question is proper and timely.

And should an answer be questioned?

No doubt it should be, if it is not considered a true and correct reply to the question.

No, that's not the thought. Should an answer have a question to it at all?

Now you are getting silly; how can it be an answer if there is no question asked?

Well, that's a good question; so further:

Should an answer to a question be considered and treated and expounded without taking into consideration what the question was which induced the answer? Could we trust well to the correctness of an exposition of an answer given in that way?

"After three days;" "at four o'clock;" "for two weeks, then I went over;" "For five years' then we have a new one." Now, could those answers be properly considered without taking into consideration what the questions were which induced the answers? Take e.g. the last one. My friend asks me a question. I reply, "For five years, then we have a new one." A third man hears us talking and catches my answer, but did not hear the question. He goes to his neighbours and tells them confidently: Mr. P. gets a new car every five years. I heard him telling his friend that he made his old car last for five years and then he got a new one." How much confidence could be given to such a comment given to that answer? For the question asked me was: "How long does your Canadian Parliament last?" You will say, "But that's foolish; nobody is so silly as to treat of an answer without considering the question with it." But wait a minute. Would you believe that one of the best known Seventh-day Adventist writers, in one of the popular books put out by the denomination comments at great length on the answer to a question in just that way — comments just thus on a Biblical answer given to a Biblical question — and comments thus at length on that answer without referring at all to the question which induced the answer?

And would you further believe that one of the chiefest, special doctrines of the Adventist faith is based upon those comments by that writer thus given — the answer to a Biblical question being expounded by that writer, and the doctrine based upon those comments, without the question being considered at all, or referred to in any way, or without letting her readers know, that there was any question to which that answer was a reply?

"Well," you say: "Show us the goods; place your cards upon the table."

Open your *Great Controversy* at page 324 (I have the 1888 edition) and you will note that the writer quotes the Bible passage: "Unto 2300 days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." — Dan. 8:14. Now that text is the answer to the question which was asked in v. 13; and the question was provoked by the scenes given, the conditions portrayed, in vv. 9-12. But is the question referred to on that page in *Great Controversy* along with the answer? I don't find it. The writer does not mention the question at all.

After the first giving of that text, on page 324, the writer goes on through the rest of that chapter (18) — on through the next half dozen chapters, of more than 100 pages, largely

in an exposition of that text, mentioning it and referring to it again and again; but, in it all, I have looked in vain for any mention whatever of the question asked in v. 13, which induced the answer of v. 14. Silly, is it? What's silly, my mentioning the matter, or the fact itself?

You will doubtless say that in this particular case it makes no difference, for Sister White gives a true exposition of that text, in v. 14, anyway. Of course, an Adventist must say so. But does she? Does she make verse 14 answer the question asked in v. 13? Just look at the context. The prophet saw a wicked power, the "little horn" in vv. 9-12 defiling the sanctuary, treading it down, taking away the daily sacrifice, setting up its own abomination, treading down the people of God — and working evil generally. Then in v. 13 the question was asked as to how long that evil work of that evil power was to continue — "to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot;" and the answer to that question was: "Unto 2,300 days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed."

Now remember: Sister White does not refer to that question of v. 13 at all, as she expounds the answer given in v. 14; and she makes that answer a reply to something wholly different from the question which is really asked in v. 13, and the context of vv. 9-12; for she makes v. 14 reply to such a question as this: "How long shall the sanctuary be defiled by the sins of God's people, which have been transferred to it by confession and faith in the atoning blood?" In her writings that evil "little horn" had nothing to do with defiling the sanctuary; but that defilement was caused by the confessed sins of the righteous. Just read chapter 23, "What is the Sanctuary?" and you will see most emphatically that this is so. Why, that is the foundation of the doctrine of the Sanctuary as held and taught by SDA's. God's people confess their sins, and by their faith in the atoning blood those sins are, day by day, hour by hour, transferred to the sanctuary, where they accumulated year after year, until at the end of the 2,300 days, in 1844, the atoning blood is again applied in some other way, and the Sanctuary is cleansed from all those sins. You see by Sister White's exposition, the "little horn" had nothing to do with it; nothing whatsoever; it is just as though that evil power had not been brought into the picture at all. The theory doesn't need it; indeed, it gets along far better without it. So, no wonder Sister White doesn't refer to it at all (at least I have not seen it) as she expounds that text of Dan. 8:14.

But certainly, in all that chapter of Daniel 8, there is no mention of the matter contained in Lev. 4 or Lev. 16 at all; no hint of any connection between them; no suggestion that the sins of God's people, or any confessed sins, are referred to whatever. For in that ch. 8 of Daniel, it was the evil machinations of that "little horn" which defiled the sanctuary and made its "cleansing" necessary — not the confessed sins of God's people; those are not referred to at all; that thought is wholly put there by the Adventist writers themselves, just as Sunday is put into Rev. 1:10 by Methodists and Baptists.

Now what shall we do about it? Is a peculiar church doctrine safely based on a sure foundation, based thus as it is on a text separated from its context — on an answer quite divorced from its immediate question and wholly separated from the facts presented in the context which provoked the question? Honestly, what absurd theory could not be worked up by such a method as that?

Permit me to use an illustration. Suppose I am an Universalist. I quote from Rev. 7:14: "These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes and

made them white in the blood of the Lamb.” From this I proceed to argue that “These are they” refers to “the kings of the earth and the great men and the rich men” spoken of in ch. 6:15, which is part of the same vision. All these, no doubt, “come out of great tribulation,” as most men do — and so we prove universal salvation.

You would reply: “Folly! Look at the context. What you quote in verse 14 is an answer to the question asked in verse 13, and the question in verse thirteen was induced by the picture, or vision, given in verses nine to twelve. What hope for finding truth is there, if you divorce an answer from the question asked, and from its entire context in that way?

And you would be right. But what better than that is the treatment given by Adventist writers to the text of Dan. 8:14?

And please remember that this is only one of three or four almost equally heavy counts against the theory or the doctrine of the sanctuary, as at present held by SDA people.

Now I suppose that many of you who read this will just drop it into the waste basket and say: “Oh well, our Adventist leaders are highly educated men, well versed in all the doctrines of the church, and they will have the right of it — not this old question-maker.” And many others will say: “We are the remnant church and we have the truth in its essence, and no error; so why should we spend time on such a problem.” And still others will say: “The Adventist church is doing a mighty work for God; He is blessing them wonderfully, and they are surely His special people. What they teach is good enough for me.” But a few may be “more noble than those in Thessalonica” and really will search the Scriptures whether these things are so. — C.L.P.

APPENDIX FIFTEEN

Importance Of Antiochus Epiphanes

Quotations from book by R.D. Wilson, *Studies in the Book of Daniel*
(New York, 1917), pages 270, 271-276.

Importance Of Antiochus Epiphanes

The time has now arrived to grapple with the most insidious and treacherous attack that has been made upon the Book of Daniel. ... There remains but one important obstacle standing in the way of the Christian who desires to follow Christ and the apostles in their apparent acceptance of the Book of Daniel as being what it purports to be. It is the fact that Antiochus Epiphanes looms so high in the mind of the prophet. It is difficult to account for the prominence given to this "contemptible" monarch in the midst of a narrative that opens with an account of Nebuchadnezzar the king of great Babylon that he had built, that thinks Cyrus the founder of the Persian empire to be worthy of the merest reference, and that alludes to Alexander the Great in the most cursory fashion. Why should Epiphanes be selected from all the successors of Alexander, the Ptolemies, the Seleucids, Perdiccas, Eumenes, Antigonos, Demetrius Poliorcetes, and the rest? Why should he be given forty verses, or more, of a book which barely squints at the Persian kings, and never gives but a glimmering intimation that the Roman fleets and legions were to become in his time the masters of the world? Why should a vision predicting with such accuracy and detail the campaigns of the kings of the North and the South never allude to that unequalled family of heroes who were to begin at Modin the liberation of God's people and scatter like the leaves of Vallombrosa the numerous and frequent hosts of deadly enemies who were to desolate the homes and attempt to suppress the religion of that Jehovah in whose name the prophet spoke? Why above all was his detailed vision to cease with the renovation of the temple and fade off into dim outlines when it passed beyond that time into the more distant vistas but the more glorious hopes of the Messianic kingdom? Why especially should he describe the true course of events in Epiphanes' expedition against Egypt till the year 169 and then picture another campaign which according to the critics never occurred at all?

These and similar questions have vexed the righteous souls of many who would like to believe in the real Daniel and who have no prejudices against the possibility of the kind of predictive prophecy alleged to be found in the book. They can accept the first six chapters which record the striking occurrences in the lives of Daniel and his companions. They can accept the principle of the possibility and the fact of divine revelation of future events. But they hesitate at accepting the whole, at least, of Daniel, because they see no good and sufficient reason why he should have narrated with such length and clearness the history of the Seleucids up to the death of Epiphanes and have given so much emphasis to the deeds of this tyrant while barely mentioning such superlatively and relatively important events as the resurrection, the judgment, and the kingdom of the Messiah.

Now, in order to remove this hesitation, it may seem to some sufficient to affirm our belief that these predictions might have been made by God through Daniel, even though we could perceive no good reason for them. We think, however, that we can perceive a good and sufficient reason for them, one at least that justifies them in our estimation, and we shall proceed to state it, in order that if possible we may make the ways of God appear just to the men of little faith.

It appears to us, then, that the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes was one of the most important events in the history of the church. It can be rivalled only by the call of Abraham, the giving of the Law, the Captivity, and the Incarnation. Among all the crises to which the people of God have been subjected, it can be compared only with the dispersion in the time of Nebuchadnezzar. The return of the exiles had been definitely foretold by Jeremiah, and Jeremiah's prediction was known and pondered by Daniel. He was not needed, nor was it given to him, to supplement the work of his great predecessor. But he performed a greater

and more lasting service for the church. He showed clearly that all the tyrants of the earth were under the control of the God of heaven, that the kingdoms of this world were fore-ordained by Him and should at last be superseded by the Kingdom of the Messiah and His saints, and he encouraged the people not merely of his own time but of all time to be steadfast in the midst of fiery trials and deadly perils of all kinds in view of the certainty that God could and would eventually circumvent or crush the tyrants and deliver the innocent for time and for eternity.

Now, the deadliest peril that the church has ever confronted was the attempt of Antiochus Epiphanes to suppress it utterly. For reasons of state, and perhaps also of religion, he determined to enforce conformity of worship throughout his dominions. His plan of operations was the most astute that has ever been devised. He ordered the cessation of circumcision, the sign of the covenant between the people and their God and that which held them together as a race. He stopped the services in the temple and instituted in their stead the worship of Jupiter. He set up idol altars in every city and demanded that every Jew should sacrifice according to the heathen ritual which he had introduced. He commanded that the holy writings should be destroyed so that the laws and customs and institutions might be gradually but surely forgotten and eliminated. And for all who refused to accept these severe and stringent regulations and requirements he pronounced the penalty of death; whereas he crowned with honours and emoluments all who apostatized and renounced the God of their fathers. The result of his well calculated machinations was almost complete enough to equal the most sanguine expectations. Most of the Jewish people seem to have cast away without any apparent qualm the hereditary claims of race and country and religion, and to have grasped with eagerness the proffered hand of the subtle enemy of their faith. The blood-thirsty tyrant executed his threats of death upon all who opposed his will. Men, women, and children were ruthlessly slaughtered. Whole families were extirpated for the guilt of one of their number. The chosen people were on the point of being annihilated and the promises and the hopes of the covenant of being annulled for ever.

There never was, before or since, such a period of desperation and despondency in the history of the church. Pharaoh's aim had been to destroy the race, but the promise to Abraham had been fulfilled through Moses and Joshua. Nebuchadnezzar had carried the people captive and destroyed Jerusalem and the temple; but the sacred books had been preserved, apostasy was rare, and through God's servants, the kings of Persia, the people and the temple were at length restored to their former worship, as it had been foretold by the prophets. But, now, under Epiphanes, was attempted what had never been proposed by Babylonian conqueror or Persian friends, the entire destruction of people and religion at one fell blow. Prophecy had ceased. The tribes of Israel were scattered over the earth, some foreign cities like Alexandria and Antioch having more Jewish inhabitants than Jerusalem. The Holy Land was largely in possession of the Gentiles. The Jews themselves had become indifferent to the Law. The High Priests were murdering each other and one of them when deposed at Jerusalem built a rival temple in Egypt. The whole polity of the Jews was disintegrated, all their fortresses and cities were in the hands of the enemy, they had no army and no leaders, and all seemed lost.

Then it was that one man stood up and defied the haughty king. His name was Mattathias. He lived at a village named Modin. The heathen had constructed an altar. The priest was ready to sacrifice the victim, when Mattathias slew him and made a fiery appeal to his fellow citizens to take arms against the tyrant. To hearten them, he called to mind the great deeds of their fathers and the faith that had inspired them. In the climax of his speech he referred to the fiery furnace and to Daniel in the den of lions. This recalled to them that their God could and would save those who put their trust in Him. They rallied round Mattathias and his five

noble sons, the most valiant and able of them all. The pious sprang to arms and after many a hard fought fight the Syrians were overcome and the kingdom of the Jews was re-established under the Asmonean rulers. **Had the attempt of Antiochus succeeded, the preparation for the coming of the Messiah could not have been completed. A people waiting for his appearing would not have been existent. A Diaspora eager to receive and disseminate the gospel would not have been ready. In short, the continuity of the church would have been destroyed, the records of the Old Testament might have disappeared as utterly as the archives of Tyre and the memoirs of Hannibal, the New Testament could not have been written, the life of Jesus would have been entirely different, the method of the early propagation of the gospel must have been altered and the whole plan of salvation changed.** But, it will be said, how did the time when these alleged predictions of Daniel were written affect all this? Only in this respect, that it affords sufficient reason for their having been made so many years before. Just as the deliverance of the three children from the fiery furnace and of Daniel from the lions' den on account of their faith in Israel's God gave Mattathias a fitting climax in his speech inciting the people to steadfastness in their trials, so the knowledge that their evil condition had been foretold nearly four hundred years before would strengthen the hearers' confidence that the rest of the prediction would be fulfilled in the overthrow of the oppressor and in the ultimate triumph of the kingdom of God. The stupendous crisis justified the prediction; the prediction justified the expectation of deliverance.

R.D. Wilson, *Studies in the Book of Daniel* (New York, 1917), pp. 270, 271-276.

APPENDIX SIXTEEN

The Connection Between Daniel 8:14 And Daniel 12:13

The Connection Between Daniel 8:14 And Daniel 12:13

Some spiritual hobby-horses begin with doctrinal novelties. The complex Adventist teaching on the „investigative judgment“ is a case in point. The history of the doctrine throws a deep suspicion on it, for it looks like a spur-of-the-moment expedient devised as a face-saving measure. The church had known nothing of the doctrine until the 19th century when William Miller, interpreting some obscure words of Daniel, became convinced that Christ would return on October 22, 1844. The day came and went with no unusual celestial events, and now it is referred to as the “Great Disappointment.” But the next day as disillusioned Hiram Edson was sulking through a cornfield, a novel alternative dawned upon him. Why not say that the scheduled event was not the actual return of Christ to the earth, but simply his entrance into the heavenly sanctuary to make an “investigative judgment?” That explains why no one saw him (except for Edson who reported a vision). The idea appealed to his friends, and it became a doctrinal distinctive of Seventh-day Adventism. (C. Peter Wagner, “Are You Riding a Hobby-Horse?” *Eternity*, July, 1962, p. 9.)

So says a typical critic of Seventh-day Adventists.

An acknowledged exegetical difficulty **does** exist regarding the direct linking of Daniel 8:14 with the concept of judgment. On the face of it there is nothing in the statement “Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be justified” (margin) that suggests the Adventist interpretation. It is the purpose of these remarks to suggest a simple but legitimate approach which demonstrates that Daniel 8:14 does indeed point to the Judgment.

Practically all commentators declare that Daniel 10-12 is an expansion of Daniel 8 (see Lange; Jamieson, Faussett, and Brown; Clark; Bishop Newton; and modern commentaries). The highpoint in the symbolism of the book is reached in the fourteenth verse of the eighth chapter. Thereafter the rest of Daniel is explanation of the symbolism presented in the vision of the ram and he-goat. Daniel 8:15-26, for example, gives a comprehensive initial sweep of interpretation, even naming the early powers pictured in the scenes of the first half of that chapter. Daniel 9:24-27 covers the same ground in part, as it describes the experiences of the restored remnant prior and subsequent to the coming of the Messiah to His temple.

In chapter 10 we read an explanatory statement from Gabriel declaring “**yet** the vision is for many days” v. 14. In effect he says “what I have explained so far to you (9:24-27) does not exhaust the vision of the 2300 days which you by prayer and fasting have been seeking to understand more fully. I will now give you a detailed description of the coming events of those „many days“ especially the latter-day crisis, and thus fulfil my commission (8:16).” The following chapters of eleven and twelve are an expansion of the concise interpretive summary given in 8:19-26, covering not only the five centuries referred to in 9:24-27, but the subsequent experience of spiritual Israel even to the resurrection and the setting up of the kingdom of God. The “many days” of papal persecution, and the final persecution of the Antichrist, are given particular prominence. The climax in this revelation of Gabriel’s concerns “the time of the end,” (11:35, 40; 12:4), thus paralleling the interpretation given first in 8:17 which affirmed that the vision of the 2300 days reached to the same period.

Let it therefore be emphasized that the last four chapters of Daniel are but an expansion and commentary upon the symbolism of the vision in the eighth chapter. Why is this significant for Seventh-day Adventists? Because the closing statement of this divine explanation refers to the final item of the initial pictorial revelation — namely the 2300 days.

“But go thou thy way till the end be; for thou shalt rest, and **stand in thy lot at the end of the days.**” Almost all scholars have recognized that this verse is a reference to the allotting of rewards to the righteous in the Judgment, and this recognition therefore is an unconscious endorsement of the Adventist interpretation that the justifying of the sanctuary involves a work of Judgment.

Many Bibles have in the margin of Daniel 12:13 a reference to Psalm 1:5 which reads: “therefore **the ungodly shall not stand in the judgment**, nor sinners in the congregation of the righteous.” As the Lange commentary says on Daniel 12:13:

The meaning is, “that thou mayest receive thy portion of the inheritance at the judgment of eternal recompense; cf. chap. 7: 18, 27; Rev. 20:6. The thought refers back undeniably to vs. 2, 3, hence to the Messianic recompense, of which Daniel also should partake, and a majority of interpreters recognize that fact ...” (J. P. Lange, *Commentary on the Holy Scriptures*, Vol. 7 [Zondervan Publishing House, Michigan, 1960], pp. 269, 270.)

Even a hurried glance down the passages listed under “lot” in a concordance show that its chief reference is to the allocation of an inheritance. Gesenius says of the Hebrew noun for “lot”:

What falls to any one by lot, especially part of an inheritance, ... Metaphorically used of the lot assigned by God to men, Ps. 16:5; Dan. 12:13 ... (The Tregelles translation.)

The connecting link between this verse at the close of Daniel and the verse at the close of the symbolic part of the book is not merely its parallel position, but the reference to “the days.” These days, according to the context, comprehend the 1260 years of papal persecution and extend to “the time of the end” mentioned in v. 4 and in 8:17. Chapter 12 has at least seven allusions to chapter eight, and there can be no reasonable doubt that 12:13 applies to the many days, even 2300, which Daniel 8 declares would reach to “the time of the end” (8:17). The contexts of 12:13 and 8:14 each refer to the trampling down of the sanctuary, the suspension of the daily, and the treading underfoot of the host. Likewise in verses 5-7 of this final chapter we have a repetition of the setting of 8:14 where angels conversed by the river regarding the length of the oppression of God’s people and the casting down of the truth. Again “seal the book until the time of the end” (12:4) is but an echo of 8:26; “And the vision of the evening and the morning which was told is true: wherefore shut thou up the vision; for it shall be for many days.”

Earlier we have discussed the chief usage of the word “lot” in the Old Testament as applying to “a portion or destiny” (Strong), an inheritance temporal or eternal. There is another significant usage indicated by the first Biblical employment of the term. The first references to “lot” appear in Leviticus 16 where lots were cast to determine which of the two goats should become the symbol of Azazel, and which would be the Lord’s goat. The anxious Jewish worshipper, however, saw more than this as implicit in the procedure. The two goats whose destinies were thus appointed by lot prefigured the two groups into which the race will be divided by the allocations of divine judgment.

Sir Isaac Newton’s comments on the sealing described in Revelation are enlightening for this present discussion. He quotes Revelation 7:1-3, and says:

This sealing alludes to a tradition of the **Jews**, that upon the day of expiation all the people of **Israel** are sealed up in the books of life and death (*Buxtore*, in *Synagoga*

Judaica, c. 18, 21). For the **Jews** in their *Talmud* tell us, that in the beginning of every new year, or first day of the month, *Tishri*, the seventh month of the sacred year, three books are opened in judgment; the book of life, in which the names of those are written who are perfectly just; the book of death, in which the names of those are written who are atheists or very wicked; and a third book, of those whose judgment is suspended until the day of expiation, and whose names are not written in the book of life or death before that day. The first ten days of this month they call the penitential days; and all these days they fast and pray very much, and are very devout, that on the tenth day their sins may be remitted, and their names may be written in the book of life; which day is therefore called the day of expiation. And upon this tenth day, in returning home from the Synagogue, they say to one another, **God the Creator seal you to a good year**. For they conceive that the books are now sealed up, and that the sentence of God remains unchanged henceforward to the end of the year. The same thing is signified by the two Goats, upon whose foreheads the High Priest yearly, on the day of expiation, lays the two lots inscribed, **for God** and **for Azazel**; God's lot signifying the people who are sealed with the name of God in their foreheads; and the lot of **Azazel**, which was sent into the wilderness, representing those who receive the mark and name of the Beast, and go into the wilderness with the great Whore, (emphasis his) (William Whitla, *Sir Isaac Newton's Daniel and the Apocalypse*, [London, 1922], pp. 315-316.)

The same thought is expressed by other writers. For example:

The goat for Azazel sets forth banishment from God's presence with sin still imputed. One is Christ, and all who are His by faith; the other is Antichrist, and all who cleave to him. One is the seed of the woman; the other is the seed of the serpent. To go right back to the fountainhead of human history — one is Abel, slain, but accepted of God; the other is Cain, who goes out from the presence of the Lord, and of whose death — eloquent silence! — we do not read. (Martin and Marshall, *Tabernacle Types and Teachings* (Pickering and Inglis, London), pp. 76, 77.

Is it not significant for Seventh-day Adventists that this closing verse of the book Christ admonished us to understand contains a word indicative of judgment and destiny, a word which is used chiefly in the Old Testament with reference to the casting of lots on the Day of Atonement, and the casting of lots prior to the inheritance of Canaan? These two usages are actually one in meaning, as surely as Daniel 12:13 and 8:14 are one in pointing to the judgment of the antitypical day of atonement which will allocate to the righteous their portion in the eternal Canaan.

Desmond Ford, article studied by Daniel Committee, GC 1964.

★ ★ ★

APPENDIX SEVENTEEN

Summary On Dan. 8:14 And 1844

Summary On Dan. 8:14 And 1844

1. Dan. 8:10-14 had its primary application to the days of Antiochus Epiphanes.
2. Dan. 8:14 parallels 7:9-13; 2:44, 45; 9:24; 12:1 and, in harmony with the apotelesmatic principle, it applies also to the Last Judgment ushering in the kingdom of glory.
3. As the Old Testament “Day of the Lord” prophecies had an initial application to an immediate crisis of judgment, and apply also to the last outpouring of Divine wrath, so it is with Dan. 8:14.
4. But these Day of the Lord prophecies also applied to crises between these first and last applications. Thus E.G. White can say of Matt. 24 that it applied to Christ’s generation, the last generation, but also “through the ages” (*Desire of Ages*, p. 628). The same is true in principle of Dan. 8:14.
5. The element of conditionally must always be taken into account when interpreting prophecy. Matt. 24:34 has been an embarrassment to the Christian church because this factor was not understood. Dan. 8:14 could have had its final application in 1844, if all who had laboured in the Advent movement had remained faithful. There was no necessity for an investigative judgment 140 years long before Christ could return.
6. Just as “the time of trouble” spoken of in Matt. 24 applied to A.D. 70, the Middle Ages, and will apply to the time after probation’s close, so Scripture applies Dan. 7:9-13 (which parallels 8:14) to the first Advent when to Christ the Son of Man was given all dominion in heaven and earth (Matt. 28:18); to the second coming (Rev. 14:14; Matt. 24:30) but also to recurring judgments through the ages (Luke 22:69 “From now on ...”).
7. Similarly, the Reformers applied Dan. 8:10-14 and Rev. 14:6, 7, to their message of restoration and judgment, and had the world responded to the Reformers, the end would have come in their generation. The same is true of 1844.
8. In later applications of apotelesmatic prophecies, some of the original details may either drop out, or apply in a less precise manner. Note the words of the *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* on Deut. 18:15 and Eze. 38. See 1:1019; 4:703. Thus we have no need for embarrassment over the fact that there are chronological problems in our application of the 2300 days.
9. Dan. 9:24 applies to the same crisis as 8:14, and was fulfilled by Christ’s atonement which legally abolished sin and brought in everlasting righteousness. This was the antitype of the Day of Atonement, and the second advent could have merged quickly with the first, if Israel had responded or the early church been faithful. Thus Heb. 9:27, pictures our High Priest in the second apartment waiting (in A.D. 70 or thereabouts) to come out to earth to bless the waiting congregation.
10. Scholars have seen in 9:24 not only an application to the Cross, but also to the eschatological consummation. The prophecy employs not only the Day of Atonement type, and its characteristic technical terms, but also Jubilee imagery. The Jubilee was always ushered in on the Day of Atonement, and ten forty-nines to every Jew indicated ten Jubilees leading to the last and greatest.
11. Our Lord Himself in His Olivet sermon applied Dan. 8:13, 14 and 9:24-27 to the Last

Judgment, and the end of the world. Matt. 24, 25; Mark 13; Luke 21 are actually a pesher on these prophecies. But when our Lord thus interprets the Danielic prophecies, he does so in terms of His passion at the first advent. Thus the evidence is complete that Dan. 8:14 and 9:24-27 apply to both advents, and use the Day of Atonement for each.

12. Dan. 9:24-27 has the same factors as the prophecy of Dan. 8, covering the centuries embraced by the ram, he-goat, four horns, little horn, and the cleansing of the sanctuary. It uses much of the same language and the same concepts. Here also the sanctuary is in focus, Antichrist and Christ, the abomination of desolation, the final outpouring of judgment, and the bringing in of everlasting righteousness through God's tabernacling again with men as transgression is finished and sin ended.
13. Chapters 10-12 of Daniel enlarge 8:1-14, also have Day of Atonement intimations (including the fasting motif of 10, and the casting of lots for the assignment of destiny in 12, and the judgment of 12:1-4), and allude to judgment as coming at the end of the days of 8:14.
14. Dan. 12:1 pictures a pre-advent judgment (as hinted at also in 12:13) whereby Michael "finds" all whose names are written in the book of Life, and delivers and rewards them at His coming. This is an instantaneous "finding," not a protracted process involving more than a century. E. Heppenstall has written:

The use of the term "investigative" needs to be carefully interpreted. The doctrine of an investigative judgment is not to be conceived as God's poring over the record books in order to figure out the accounts. "The Lord knoweth them that are his."

Daniel pictures the books being opened in judgment. He declares in Daniel 12:1 and 2 that "every one that shall be found written in the book" shall be delivered. This takes place when "Michael stands up." The similarities between this passage and the one dealing with the judgment in chapter 7:9 to 14 are striking. The coming of Christ to the Father to receive dominion and the kingdom, and the standing up of Michael appear to be part of the same over-all activity. The result of all this is that dominion is given to Christ. The saints share in the judgment because the kingdom of God is declared to belong to them. Michael stands up and speaks for His saints because their names are found in the book of life. (E. Heppenstall, "The Hour of God's Judgment is Come," *Ministry*, June & July, 1961)

15. But all the instances of judgment in Daniel focus chiefly on eradication of sin and sinners which vindicates both God and His people, rather than a judgment which seems to hold the saints in jeopardy. The cleansing of the sanctuary in 8:14 must be interpreted in the light of its context, and thereby means nothing less than an eradication of sin and its results — the sin brought in by the "little horn" — Antichrist — first Satan himself, and then his representatives through the ages. This is the application of the 8:10-14 prophecy made in Rev. 12, where Satan is pictured as casting down the stars to the ground, but then himself is cast out through the Atonement of Christ. Similarly in Dan. 7, the allusion to books particularly has to do with the record of the wickedness of the great Antichrist, and the Judgment there chronicled has to do with taking away his dominion and consuming it, in order that the saints might have an everlasting reward in the purged dominions of God.

16. SDA's have stood on vantage ground, far ahead of their contemporaries, when they applied Dan. 8:14 eschatologically and in terms of judgment. The fact that they also have entertained some erroneous concepts in connection with their truth no more invalidates their divine commission than the inadequate understanding of John the Baptist, and the disciples concerning the kingdom in their day.
17. Truth is progressive. E.G. White said we have but the first gleamings of the light and that the Bible is but dimly understood. Especially, said she, are we called to be students of prophecy, and particularly the prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation which, when better understood, will bring the last revival. We must, according to the Spirit of Prophecy, remember that age never makes error into truth, and that truth can afford to be fair, and that "we have many things to learn and many to unlearn." "We should never allow ourselves to use an unsound argument." "Error is never harmless and never sanctifies." That which God gives His servant now to proclaim, declared Ellen White in 1888, may not have been present truth years ago, and vice versa. See *CWE*, pp. 33-51; E.G. White's second sermon at Minneapolis, 1888. See Olsen's *Through Crisis to Victory* appendix.

Observe that Ellen White certainly believed that God permitted erroneous positions to be held for a time that should be revised at appropriate opportunities. Consider her comments upon the 1843 publication of J.V. Himes' "*A Chronological Chart of the Visions of Daniel and John*."

I have seen that the 1843 chart was directed by the hand of the Lord, and that it should not be altered; that the figures were as he wanted them; that his hand was over and hid a mistake in some of the figures, so that none could see it, until his hand was removed. (*Early Writings*, p. 74.)

The publisher's footnote declares:

This applies to the chart used during the 1843 movement, and has special reference to the calculation of the prophetic periods as it appeared on that chart. The next sentence explains that there was an inaccuracy which in the providence of God was suffered to exist. But this does not preclude the publication of a chart subsequently which would correct the mistake, after the 1843 movement was past, and the calculation as then made had served its purpose. (*Ibid.*)

This much-valued chart arrived at the year 1843 by using the seven times of Lev. 26:18-34, the 1335 days of Dan. 12:12, as well as the 2300 days of Dan. 8:14. The mistake Ellen White had in mind was the 1843 date rather than 1844. *Great Controversy*, sixth edition says: "The testimony of the Scriptures pointing to the coming of Christ in 1843, awakened widespread interest" (pp. 222-223).

About a dozen times Ellen White refers to "prophetic periods" believed in by those who were in the Miller movement. She says these periods extended till 1844, and that the one which seemed most clearly to reveal the time of the second advent was that of Dan. 8:14. (See *GC*, p. 324.) One is compelled to ask "What other prophetic periods reached to 1844 — these ones, on which the message was based?" These prophetic periods stand "without impeachment." (*GC*, p. 457.) All "repeated efforts to find new dates for the beginning and close of the prophetic periods" (*Ibid.*) are condemned. In the same volume we read that the seventy weeks is a "portion of the same great prophetic period" of the 2300 days (*Ibid.*, p. 351). So, if the seventy weeks is a portion of the 2300 days period, it is not thought of as

another period separate in itself. Besides, the ones referred to all reached to 1844 (see *EW*, pp. 251, 233-234, 236) — thus the 1260 years is not intended.

Now Ellen White herself does not anywhere itemize the “prophetic periods,” but she does tell us that Miller believed in “various chronological periods” which he thought extended to the second coming. (*GC*, p. 324.) “Prophetic periods” is a Miller phrase penned long before Ellen White wrote on the topic. (*Ibid.*) From Froom’s *Prophetic Faith*, Vol. 4:473, and from the Fitch chart published by Himes, we find that these included the seven times of Lev. 26:28-34; the 1335 days of Dan. 12:12; the hour, day, month, and year of Rev. 9:15. Miller also held that 6000 years would be “up” in 1843, as well as forty-nine Jubilees. On pages 524 and 525 of the same volume we learn that “all calculations of prophetic time were then believed by the Millerites to end sometime in or about the Jewish year 1843.” (See Damsteegt’s *FSDAMM*, p. 38, n. 190. Note particularly page 84: “1843 ... was the year of the termination of several time prophecies.”)

On the chart described by Ellen White as directed by the hand of the Lord and not to be altered, we find reference to Lev. 26; Dan. 8 and 12; Rev. 9 and 11, but nothing about the Jubilees, the 6000 years, or the Litch interpretation of Rev. 9:15. So it would seem that the “prophetic periods” referred to again and again by Ellen White (about ten times in *Early Writings* alone) would seem at least to include the 1335 days of Dan. 12. Damsteegt refers to this prophecy as applied by early Adventists. (See *FSDAMM*, pp. 73-75; 85-87; 91; 156; 168-170.)

We would suggest that in view of Ellen White’s endorsement of those sections of the 1843 chart which list prophecies culminating in 1843, that we have in this fact evidence of the principle of progressive development of truth, and the subsidiary principle that recommendation which seems both comprehensive and final may be neither. I doubt if any scholar amongst us today believes that it is possible to prove that Dan. 12:12 points to 1843 or 1844, although E.G. White in 1850 wrote that “the 1335 days were ended.” (See Damsteegt *FSDAMM*, p. 169.) The year 508 has no marked significance. According to Ellen White, God permits certain conclusions for a while which later He may cancel out. Thus even Ellen White endorsements of Oct. 22, 1844, should not be taken as Heaven’s last word. As already seen, it cannot be demonstrated that in 1844 the Day of Atonement fell on Oct. 22, and neither are any of the dates of the 2300 days prophecy absolutely certain.

Further evidence for this may be found in the fact that other dates originally endorsed by Ellen White in *Great Controversy* no longer stand historical investigation. She herself recognized that her own strong statement on Aug. 11, 1840, originally written gave too much credit to the Litch prediction. Thus the revision for the 1911 edition. As for the French Revolution dates, supposedly applying to prohibition of the Scriptures for three and half years — these are quite unreliable. Only for approximately six months did France during the Revolution war against religion and its forms. The years 538 and 1798 for papal supremacy are similarly indemonstrable, but adequate for practical purposes. Litch rightly declared long ago: “The (advent) doctrine does not consist in merely tracing prophetic periods.” (Froom’s *Prophetic Faith*, Vol. 4:527.)

18. Heaven gave symbolic prophecy as a means of sustaining interest in the important truth of Christ’s return, and apparently was little concerned that most interpreters would fall short of absolute precision in their conclusions. This was true at the time of the first disappointment of 1843, again in 1844, and third time in 1845, and similarly for others in 1851. The principle still has relevance today. Adventists moved from an interpretation

affirming the end of the world in 1844 to an ameliorated position that probation had closed; then shifted to another stand that probation had not closed for a small minority; again a later shift that probation for the world had not closed at all.

19. The removal of sin, the sealing, the midnight cry, the shaking, the marriage, and probation's close — all once seen as applying in the vicinity of 1844 are in later years applied by Ellen White to future events well over a century in the (then) future. The last lines of page 358 in *Patriarchs and Prophets* do the same with “the cleansing of the sanctuary.”
20. It is true for movements as for individuals, that those led of God are not expected to be impeccable or inerrant, but loyally advancing in faith, love, and obedience.

★ ★ ★

APPENDIX EIGHTEEN

The Daniel Committee Of 1938-1952 And The
Chronological Problems Of The 2300 Days

The Daniel Committee Of 1938-1952 And The Chronological Problems Of The 2300 Days

The present writer claims no expertise in chronology, but it seems to him important that the church should acknowledge the uncertainties that exist in this area. Is our dogmatism upon all the dates we use in connection with the 2300 days warranted?

The *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* has excellent material on this issue, particularly its article on New Testament chronology in volume 5. But it may be of interest to some to note the concern on these issues in a Daniel Committee of over twenty years precedence to the one which functioned in the sixties.

The dispute between Dr. Thiele and Miss Amadon (and Brother Froom who supported Miss Amadon) should be observed for its bearing on the current issues. Note that the committee of the time was promised that Brother Froom would validate in detail the Oct. 22, 1844 date in his *Prophetic Faith* volumes. The study of these, it seems to the present writer, does not demonstrate fulfilment of that promise. The exact dates for the “going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem,” the termination of the rebuilding, the baptism of Christ, the Crucifixion, the stoning of Stephen, and the Day of Atonement in 1844, remain very much matters of controversy. Perhaps the only thing we can dogmatically assert is that dogmatism on precise dates is unwarranted. *The Chronology of Ezra Seven* by Drs. Horn and Wood is a classic, but does not solve all the issues here raised. It is doubtful that the issues can ever be solved as there is a veil of obscurity over vital points of history in this regard.

The following papers circulated among the earlier Daniel Committee demonstrates the uncertainties involved. The articles by Miss Amadon in the last months of 1943 and the early ones of 1944 should be compared with the conclusions of the *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* on the same issues. See particularly the *Ministry* of March and April 1944, and *SDABC* 5:235-266.

The letter by M.L. Andreasen on page 52f. is still significant for our research today.

The source of all the following material in this Appendix is the GC Archives.

★ ★ ★

SOME ACTIONS REGARDING ADVENT RESEARCH

COUNCIL OF GC OFFICERS WITH J.H. WIERTS

Agreed, To authorize E.D. Dick to confer with M.E. Kern and bring to the officers the suggestion of a committee for a conference with J.H. Wierts regarding the position of the denomination in respect to the date October 22, 1844 and the day of the crucifixion. — OM, Nov. 1, 1938.

DISCUSSION OF ADVENT RESEARCH BY GC OFFICERS AND CERTAIN OTHERS. (J.L. McElhany, A.W. Cormack, H.T. Elliott, H.H. Cobban, I.H. Evans, L.H. Christian, E.E. Andross, W.E. Howell, L.E. Froom, W.H. Teesdale, A.W. Werline, M.L. Andreasen, L.H. Wood, M.E. Kern, F.C. Gilbert.)

Early in November J.H. Wierts talked with E.D. Dick regarding some of his findings on establishing the date October 22, 1844, the true date corresponding to the tenth day of the seventh Jewish month, and Brother Dick arranged for a committee of men to take up the question, not the material alone that Brother Wierts was to present but the general question of

establishing this denominational date. This committee has met several times and now desires counsel.

L.E. Froom stated that as chairman of the committee he wanted to present certain problems they had met on which they desired counsel. The contention has been raised by some of our detractors that the Jews celebrated the Passover on September 23, of the year 1844, and that the denomination therefore had the date wrong. It has been proven, however, that September 23 was celebrated only by the Rabbinical Jews, but that the Orthodox Karaite Jews held to the correct date and had to this day. **We must ascertain the reasons back of the choosing of October 22, 1844, which we have followed all these years. Some of our men also seem not to be sure of the date on which the crucifixion occurred, or the date 457 B.C. and the synchronizing of the beginning of the 70 weeks with that of the 2300 years.** Brother Wierts brought the results of his studies for some 30 years purporting to show that Christ was crucified on the very second that marked the midst of the week in prophecy. In his researches he had found a date which he convinced the editors of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* to be correct against the date they have used and secured their promise to make the correction when the next edition is brought out.

Brother Froom stated that the "Advent Shield" was published quarterly and in January, 1845, printed an article after the disappointment and after some of the men who experienced the disappointment had abandoned the date, then setting forth that a smaller period of time had been discovered in the prophecy whereby the 2300 years would not expire until 1947. At first William Miller had said the period would end somewhere between 1844-1847, but after he started preaching in 1831 and onward he dropped this sliding date and adopted 1844. Among American and English students of prophecy there was a range from 1843-1847 when men thought the period probably ended. Though William Miller fixed the date as 1844 he still put the cross at the end instead of the middle of the prophetic week. We have never gone to the bottom of the matter. Our task now is a major one of showing why we insist on the 70 years and the 2300 years beginning at the same time. Some of the old writers confirm the beginning of 457 B.C. but do not define the "midst of the week."

Brother Froom stated further that we needed astronomical and chronological data to establish these dates beyond question, and the committee needs stenographic help to facilitate their work. They also are united in the judgment that **Miss Grace Amadon** who has studied the astronomical aspects of these dates for a number of years, contacted astronomers and astronomical authorities to considerable extent, could offer the committee some real assistance if she could be present here in person and study the matter through with them under their guidance.

The chairman stated that **Ballenger and Conradi are teaching that the true date did not fall on October 22, 1844**, and inquired if the committee has any data available as yet.

Brother Froom stated not yet, except a bit that he had sent on to C.B. Haynes to meet some emergency he had on in Michigan. The chairman said further that we must give help to the committee on this work and of making available its findings after its work is done. M.E. Kern said that some weeks would be needed to do thorough work, that Miss Amadon reads Greek, Latin and Hebrew, and that we have recently sent her a book from the Congressional Library to assist in her study; that if she could come here for several weeks to study with us, it might prove of real help. Some years ago George MacCready Price suggested that the General Conference establish a research department, but it was felt that the time was not yet ripe for that but it does look as if we need some such provision now, and he hoped the General

Conference would set aside a sum of money to cover the expense of such work. Miss Amadon's help might shorten the time the committee might need to continue its work.

F.C. Gilbert said he had received letters from a number of ministers and editors in regard to what they had received from Ballenger and Conradi, stating that if Seventh-day Adventists did not repudiate October 22, 1844, they would publish their findings to the world. He had called together at one time a group of rabbis, of both the Orthodox and Reformed Jews, to consult about the matter, and that also we have access to a good deal that is published in Jewish books. There is agreement among both Orthodox and Reformed Jews that they do not agree on the calendar. They have admitted a statement by Cyrus Adler that the Jewish Calendar must be harmonized with the Gregorian calendar. The Day of Atonement is not now observed the same day by Rabbinical and Karaite Jews. He has a letter from the chief Rabbi of the Karaite Jews saying that they followed literally the Old Testament in the observance of the Sabbath and of the feast days without any change from the time of Moses and the prophets. Brother Gilbert has written several brethren who are in trouble on this matter and sent some material to the *Review and Herald* before he knew of the appointment of the present committee to study this date. Jews have an inter-calary month every seven years, and every 12 years they have a year of only 354 days, but the two sections of the Jews do not agree on the civil calendar dates.

The chairman stated that we owe a duty to our people to set straight the contentions of our detractors.

Elder Froom stated that S.S. Snow in the "*True Midnight Cry*" was the first to state the exact date, October 22, 1844, but after the passing of the time he went into fanaticism. Our quest is to establish this date with reliable data.

L.H. Christian stated that Conradi has put into a leaflet of his a challenge to Seventh-day Adventists, but disclosed that the only ground for the challenge was the calling up of a Rabbi in Hamburg and hearing him state that our date is wrong and his is right. He believes we should not depend too much on astronomy and thinks that a note in the *Review and Herald* would suffice to quiet many of our people. When men investigate our doctrines they should give us the benefit of their investigations. He referred to the search of 666 that had been started a long time ago and data gathered but never given out, and thinks our work could have more dispatch if this were done.

The chairman stated that the White Trustees had made request that we make available the findings on some of these questions. They had received a letter from a brother making request and stating that many of our people are troubled over these things and we ought to give out what we find. The chairman said further it is reported that one whole union mission has accepted the Fletcher teachings and would be drawing off from the denomination in the future, though this report has not been verified. We should not be too silent on our findings. Very irresponsible persons can start serious trouble, citing the shot that brought on the World War. The influence of irresponsible people is not always commensurate with their standing or importance. We have paid no attention to Ballenger, but not all of our workers can tell what the trouble is that he has not been answered. Some of our workers fear being put down as heretical if they raise a question on our teaching. We should not compel men to take counsel with their fears. We owe it to our workers to give help on these matters. There are workers all through the ranks who are wanting help. Some of our preachers do some hedging by not giving the trumpet a certain sound on some of our doctrines. He had a letter the other day urging that some action on our part is needed to meet wild and foolish ideas that are floating

about. Letters are coming to him every day along this line. One letter wanted the authority or proof that the taking of Ethiopia by Italy was predicted in the Bible and suggested that we might win Italy's favour by acknowledging it so. We cannot close our eyes to these floating views.

L.E. Froom stated that we could easily supply facts on what was done in 1844 but we must get the facts back of what led to the choice of the date October 22, 1844. It is the same with the date of the crucifixion.

The chairman said we talked much of what the nations are doing in the fulfilment of prophecy, but we must not forget that every point of our truth is being attacked. This is in fulfilment of prophecy as really as are things of a national character. A man may say, I know these things, I do not need to investigate, and that may satisfy him, but many will not accept assertions of truth, but desire proof.

M.L. Andreasen stated that he had been asked certain questions in his classes as far back as 1924 and after a little test learned that not half of the students believed in the cleansing of the sanctuary. He thought they had not quite understood and could not believe because of the limit of their understanding. If that represents a cross section of our ministry we do not have a ministry that is profoundly convinced of the truths for which we stand. He feared that our detractors have made more inroads into our ranks than we think and that more research needs to be done to establish our doctrine. When men know they can talk it out they are more easily convinced, but he has been surprised by some saying they did not dare talk out what is in their minds.

The chairman raised the question whether or not we should devote some money to help on research. He had asked for an appropriation from the General Conference Committee sometime ago, without naming the sum, for some special research work. C.H. Watson passed over to him some documents in 1936 to which he suggested that attention be given, especially on 666. Investigations on this latter point show that we had made some unwarranted claims and assertions. We have been troubled somewhat with dogmas being set up by some men and then checking others by these dogmas, as to their belief or unbelief of our doctrines. Unless we give proofs to our workers we shall have a weak ministry giving the trumpet an uncertain sound. **He would like to see this committee prepare matter to answer Conradi and Ballenger on October 22, 1844. Is it not time to meet the situation? Some of our ministers are troubled because we do not make any answer and think that we are not able to answer them.**

M.E. Kern said he was deeply concerned about our losing one-third of our converts by apostasy.

The chairman said we used to preach with power and conviction and brought in people who believed but there has been too much uncertainty in our more recent preaching.

M.E. Kern believes that we should do earnest research work on these things but not talk about it too much. We should have the facts to set forth so that we shall not have to back down.

L.H. Christian said that we must study and find proof, but we have developed a tendency not to use this quotation and that quotation from Catholic writings because they were not authoritative and we cannot be sure of what they say. The effect of this is to undermine faith. We don't want to be so cautious that we shall weaken our cause.

Brother Froom's book is not yet out though the people have heard him give talks and know that he has the facts, yet they cannot receive them and read them for themselves. Why can't some of these things be given out to help our people? We have been silent long enough and should give out something that will bring relief.

L.E. Froom stated that **Grace Amadon has done enough work on the astronomical aspects of October 22, 1844**, to be of value to the committee, that if she comes she would work under supervision to assist the special group of the committee dealing with that particular phase of the study. We might need her for four or five weeks and she might do some things that the members of the committee are not qualified to do.

Agreed, To recommend to the General Conference Committee that a suitable sum be set aside to meet the expense of necessary research work. (Officers' Meeting, Dec. 18, 1938)

AUTHORIZATION OF RESEARCH COMMITTEE BY GC COMMITTEE

A Committee, appointed by the Officers, has been doing certain historical research work. It seems advisable that this committee continue its work.

VOTED, Confirming the appointment of this committee, as follows: L.E. Froom, chairman, L.H. Wood, M.E. Kern, A.W. Weline, M.L. Andreasen, F.C. Gilbert; and that an appropriation of \$250 be made from the Emergency Fund for this work of research. (GC Committee Minutes, Vol. XV, Bk. 3, p. 1004.)

AUTHORIZATION BY THE GC COMMITTEE OF CONTINUATION ADVENT RESEARCH

VOTED, That the treasurer be authorized to make available \$250 for continuing a certain line of research work authorized by the Committee some time ago. (GC Committee Minutes, Mar. 20, 1939.)

MEETING PLANNED TO HEAR REPORT OF RESEARCH COMMITTEE

A committee that was appointed to do certain research work presented a statement concerning their extensive report which is now ready. It was felt that this report should be presented to as representative a group as possible, and it was therefore

VOTED, To set July 9 and 10, beginning at 9 A.M., July 9, as the time for hearing the report, in order that the union conference presidents, who will be in attendance at the General Conference Committee meeting in New York City just preceding this date, may be present; and further, that the officers be asked to invite any others they may think advisable, to be present when the report is given. (GC Committee Minutes, May 31, 1939.)

Note. — The above mentioned meeting was held, but there seems to be no record of it. Probably no action being taken.

F.H. YOST ADDED TO RESEARCH COMMITTEE

(GC Committee Minutes, Aug. 4, 1941.)

F.D. NICHOL ADDED TO RESEARCH COMMITTEE

(GC Committee Minutes, June 25, 1942.)

M.E. KERN APPOINTED CHAIRMAN OF RESEARCH COMMITTEE

(GC Committee Minutes, Sept. 6, 1943.)

★ ★ ★

A STATEMENT ON THE RESEARCH COMMITTEE AND ITS WORK

The Problem

Seventh-day Adventists believe that they are a movement of prophecy — they carry a message that was set forth in Scripture to be preached at a certain time. This conviction is based on their understanding of the sanctuary. The exposition of the sanctuary truth as it relates to history and prophecy revolves around the 2300 days with the key dates of 457 B.C., 31 A.D., and 1844 A.D. Anything which would seem to disturb these dates is of vital interest to the church.

In recent years vast amounts of archaeological data have been unearthed and translated. Also much new information of ancient chronology and calendation has been acquired. In the light of this new knowledge, authorities place the seventh year of Artaxerxes from the spring of 458 to the spring of 457, mostly in 458. The source evidences for arriving at this conclusion are so clear that we can hardly ignore them. To balance the scales on the other side, these same source materials and principles of ancient computation help us to establish certain synchronisms of profane and sacred history that are very useful to us in other areas and periods.

It takes no profound thinking, of course, to see that a change in the dating of the seventh year of Artaxerxes would place us in a most embarrassing dilemma in the presentation of the sanctuary truth.

Somewhat similar is the situation in regard to the date of the crucifixion of Christ. A large section of the Biblical scholarship places this event in the year 30 — not 31 as we have been wont to preach during the past one hundred years.

Related to these two problems is the charge of several of our opponents that the Millerites, and therefore the Seventh-day Adventists, were mistaken in placing the 10th day of the seventh month, Jewish time, on October 22, 1844. The orthodox Jews celebrated the Day of Atonement that year on September 23.

It was to deal with these and related problems that the Research Committee was appointed Dec. 19, 1938.

The Progress Thus Far

No one anticipated in 1938 that nearly fourteen years would elapse before a report could be given. Even the nature of the problems was but dimly understood. Any committee given such an assignment, unless the members had had training and experience in the use of the tools of the chronologist and astronomer, would find it necessary to spend many diligent hours, even days and weeks, simply learning the rudiments of calendation, chronology, and some astronomy. The Research Committee has had to do just that. And as the endeavour has drawn out longer than was expected, and the personnel has changed, some of this groundwork has had to be repeated.

An immense amount of labour has been done since the Committee first addressed itself to the task. Committee members qualified in certain lines have carried on extensive studies in archaeology, astronomy, calendation, and Bible time periods. The results of such work have been presented to the Committee for discussion and evaluation. Hundreds of pages of reports and studies have been written. Some of this material was even acceptable for publication in the archaeological press. And the Committee as a whole has spent long hours in discussion and study.

Immediately on its appointment the Committee occupied several months in most intensive labour. On July 9 and 10, 1939, there was a meeting of the General Conference Committee and the union conference presidents with representative leaders about Washington, to hear the report of this Committee. L.E. Froom had prepared a statement regarding the Millerite computation of the 2300-day prophecy. Miss Grace Amadon had written extensively on the astronomical and historical aspects of the crucifixion date. And L.H. Wood had written a statement on the date 457. Two of these statements were presented. But Dr. Wood was not satisfied with the extent of his investigations, and so his paper was withheld. At the close of the meeting, J.H. Wierls raised some questions on the scientific accuracy of certain features of Miss Amadon's work. It was decided to give Elder Wierls an opportunity to discuss his objections with the Committee. This took a long time, and while the Committee believed they had answered Elder Wierls' specific objections, they also felt that the subject demanded further study. The main features of this discussion have been reduced to writing and are in our files.

In dealing with the date 457 the Committee discovered several difficulties, and so the work was continued for some time. Miss Amadon also pursued her study of the crucifixion date, and additional papers were prepared. Then in September, 1943, the Committee was reconstituted with M.E. Kern as its chairman. Under his leadership it was decided to carefully review the whole subject from the beginning in the light of the criticisms of the Committee's work, and to proceed with further investigation.

Since there were no final conclusions of the date 457, and since it seemed a logical place to start, the Committee concentrated on the beginning date of the 2300-day prophecy. For many months the committee investigated every possible source for clues to the answer for this problem. In fact, the kind of answer that would solve our difficulties was really known in advance. This was possible because of the direction given to our thinking by the Bible itself. We even discussed the kind of archaeological document we would need to clinch our arguments. And there our progress stopped. For months we knew not which way to turn.

And so we began work on the date of the crucifixion, which was the second problem assigned to the committee. The work already done by the committee was reviewed and a thorough investigation of all the available materials was begun. Many different aspects of the problem were discussed and studied. Quite a good deal of material was written by various members of the committee. It will be readily appreciated there is a close connection between the date of Ezra's return and the date of Christ's crucifixion, for both are recorded in the Bible in terms of a Jewish calendar. Therefore we continued to study the extra-Biblical calendrical materials available for the fifth century before Christ, hoping that we might find a clue there to help us solve our first century A.D. problems.

It was just at this point that the additional Aramaic papyri from Egypt came to our attention. These documents have already been mentioned in public at the recent Bible Conference. And I am leaving it to Dr. Horn to tell you the story of their discovery and their significance to our quest. He is also prepared to tell of discoveries which have occurred since the Bible Conference that we hope may help us with the fixing of the crucifixion date. All present have doubtless heard that the new Aramaic papyri gave us exactly the answer we had hoped to find, and now we can be certain about the Jewish dating of the seventh year of Artaxerxes, and the journey of Ezra to Jerusalem in 457 B.C.

Thus one-third of the committee's assignment has been brought to a satisfactory conclusion. Another third of the task was really completed years ago. In fairness to Elder Froom, it

should be said that he found the answer to his part of the assignment in the first year of the committee's work. As has been stated, Adventists had been charged by some of their detractors with being entirely wrong about the date October 22, 1844 — that the day of atonement that year did not fall in October at all, but was celebrated by faithful Jews all over the world in September. Elder Froom's studies have provided us with a satisfactory answer to that charge, and since his conclusions will appear in *Prophetic Faith*, volume 4, the committee has decided not to undertake a separate report on this subject.

This leaves the date of the crucifixion as the only part of our assignment unresolved. Naturally we are not happy to leave the task at this point. We would like to suggest that the committee be continued, even though it seems certain at present that much of our time will have to be spent in watchful waiting. However, the basic study on the problem has been done, and the committee has a clear idea of the kind of evidence that might prove helpful and the various fields where it might be found. With discoveries progressing so rapidly as they are just now, we have reason to believe the Lord may have something in store for us in the not-too-distant future.

We feel deeply grateful to God for so many signal blessings on our work during the past year. It is with a great measure of satisfaction to us that we are able to present this report at this time. The evidences herewith submitted prove once again that "we have not followed cunningly devised fables."

We wish to express our appreciation to the General Conference officers for their kindly and sympathetic understanding of our work, and also for the financial provision which has been so liberally and freely provided from time to time.

Merwin R. Thurber
*Secretary of the Historical
Research Committee*

★ ★ ★

August 6, 1946

TO MEMBERS OF THE ADVENT RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Dear Brethren:

Here is a copy of correspondence from Prof. Thiele regarding the date of the crucifixion
Passover.

It seems to me that we should go into this matter thoroughly, and probably, before finalizing,
have Prof. Thiele meet with us.

While some may feel that "in the midst of the week" is not necessarily in the exact middle of
the week, it certainly will be unfortunate if we find ourselves unable to verify our teachings
through the years regarding the crucifixion date.

Sincerely,
M.E. Kern

MEK:w
Enc.

Octobers, 1943

Elders J.L. McElhany, W.H. Branson, H.T. Elliott, W.A. Spicer, F.M. Wilcox, F.D. Nichol

Dear Brethren:

The enclosed study on the time of the observance of the Passover by the Jewish officials at Jerusalem during crucifixion week has been prompted by the publication of the current series of articles in the *Ministry* on this subject. The conclusion arrived at in this series that, "not only Jesus but the whole Jewish nation kept that last Passover at the only possible *ben ha-arbayim* that could coincide with the date of His death," which in plain English means Thursday night, is a conclusion with which I find myself unable to agree, and this conclusion I believe has a vital bearing upon the validity of the line of argument upon which the committee on sanctuary research in Washington is at present endeavouring to establish the date of the crucifixion and the beginning of the Investigative Judgment.

There is no question about the fact that Jesus and His disciples ate the Passover on Thursday evening of crucifixion week. The question is whether the high priests and the Jews in general also observed the Passover at the same time as did Jesus on Thursday evening, or whether it was observed by them on Friday evening. The one would not necessarily prove the other, no more than the fact that Saturday is the day which should be observed as the Sabbath and which is and has been observed all through the years by a certain group faithful to God constitutes evidence that the Christian world as a whole is today observing the true Sabbath.

My reason for believing in a Friday night Passover observance by the Jewish leaders during crucifixion week is based upon the fact that according to both the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy it was after daybreak Friday morning when Jesus was finally condemned by the Sanhedrin and delivered over to Pilate, and that at that time these Jewish leaders had not yet partaken of the Passover. I fail to see how any type of reasoning, any amount of research, or any display of erudite words can ever change a fact so clear and simple as this.

In addition to the specific evidence for Friday of crucifixion week is the evidence of Josephus that at his time it was the custom of at least a large group of the Palestinian Jews to offer their Passover sacrifices between the hours of three and five of the afternoon of Nisan fourteen, which would agree with the evidence of both the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy in pointing to a Friday night Passover meal during crucifixion week. Again I do not see how any amount of argument can get around evidence so pertinent and cogent as this. **The vital point concerning this discussion is that it appears to involve the validity of the basic premise upon which certain members of the sanctuary committee at Washington are now endeavouring to fix the year of the crucifixion and the year of the opening of the Investigative Judgment. The basic argument seems to be that the Jewish officials established the date of the Passover by means of certain lunar observations, and then the endeavour is made to show by means of astronomical calculations exactly what year such phenomena were observed in Palestine during crucifixion week and thus to arrive at the year of the crucifixion. But the calculations are based on a Thursday night observance of the Passover, not Friday.** If it is a fact that the date of the Passover was annually set by lunar observations of the type postulated, but if it is also a fact that the Jewish officials at the time of the crucifixion observed their Passover on Friday night rather than Thursday, then certainly the lunar observations of a Friday night Passover rather than Thursday should be the ones employed, and **any conclusions basing the year of the crucifixion on postulated observations of a Thursday night Passover would be invalid.**

These points and their significance have been under discussion between both Miss Amadon and Elder Froom and myself for the past eighteen months, but for some reason we have not been able to come to see this matter alike, but it has nevertheless been decided to begin publication of this material at this time. This I regard as unfortunate, for I feel **it is putting this matter of the dating of the crucifixion and the beginning of the Investigative Judgment upon a basis which is open to question** and which I believe will only invite from our opponents further and justifiable criticism of the positions we hold. If there is any subject upon which I feel we should stand upon absolutely solid ground I believe it is the sanctuary question. Certainly we cannot afford to jeopardize our position on this highly important doctrine by going officially on record as holding views which we cannot maintain. I do not believe the validity of our fundamental position is at all bound up with the validity of the articles in question, but some of our opponents may endeavour to indicate that it is. It is hardly the course of wisdom to unnecessarily put into the hands of our opponents material which may prove to be a most potent weapon against us. Our ministry should in our official church organ be supplied only with such material as is altogether solid and firm, and which cannot be undermined. I do not believe that this present series of articles is of such a nature. Even if this material should prove to be sound, I do not believe any great harm would have resulted if its publication had been deferred till the matter had been more thoroughly thrashed out.

If my point of view in this matter can be shown to be faulty, I will be glad to have this pointed out and I shall be happy to change my views. Such an invitation I have a number of times extended to Elder Froom in connection with this discussion but thus far without any response from him other than to refer me to the arguments of Miss Amadon. These arguments I have gone over carefully but I must confess that I cannot find in them anything that I consider to be valid evidence for a Thursday rather than a Friday night Passover observance on the part of the Jewish authorities during crucifixion week. The line of reasoning employed in reaching these conclusions I believe to be faulty and the treatment of the evidence from the Bible, the Spirit of Prophecy, and Josephus which points to a Friday night Passover I cannot but regard as hardly more than mere evasion. It would be easy enough to just let this matter drop, but I do not feel that, holding the views I do, I would thus be giving my best service to the cause of the Lord, and for this reason I am at this time presenting this matter to you.

With others I am highly interested in the early finalization of the work of the sanctuary committee. But while there are items that might have been finalized upon and published years ago, I do not believe that it is the source of wisdom to engage in premature publication of items on which we are not yet altogether sure. Much of the material that Elder Froom has gathered at great expense to this denomination I feel might with profit have been published either in the MINISTRY or in book form years ago. But in this phase of the work in which Miss Amadon is engaged I am wondering whether it would not be the course of wisdom to wait a bit longer till we are more certain of the ground upon which we stand.

Very truly yours,
(Signed) Edwin R. Thiele

★ ★ ★

December 12, 1943

Elder H.T. Elliott
General Conference of SDA
Takoma Park, Washington, DC

Dear Brother Elliott:

It has occurred to me that the following quotation from the Book of Jubilees might be of interest to our brethren in Washington in connection with the question of the chronology of the New Testament Passover:

Remember the commandment which the Lord commanded thee concerning the Passover, that thou shouldst celebrate it in its season on the fourteenth of the first month, that thou shouldst kill it before it is evening, and that they should eat it by night on the evening of the fifteenth from the time of the setting of the sun ... Let the children of Israel come and observe the Passover on the day of its fixed time, on the fourteenth day of the first month, between the evenings, from the third part of the day to the third part of the night, for two portions of the day are given to the light, and a third to the evening. This is that which the Lord commanded thee that thou shouldst observe it between the evenings. And it is not permissible to slay it during any period of the light, but during the period bordering on the evening, and let them eat it at the time of the evening until the third part of the night, and whatever is left over of all its flesh from the third part of the night and onwards, let them burn it with fire. Jub. 49:1, 2, 10-12.

The importance of this reference coming from the second century B.C. and reflecting the customs of at least the Pharisees at that time will be immediately recognized. The above quotation leaves no question but that in the second century before Christ it was already a widespread custom among the Jews to slay the Passover sacrifice on the afternoon of the fourteenth, just before evening, and to eat the Passover meal after sunset, during the opening hours of the fifteenth. You will recall that this is in perfect agreement with the evidence already given you from Josephus as to the Jewish custom in the latter part of the first century A.D. Likewise is the evidence from both of these authorities in complete agreement with the testimony of the gospels and also the Spirit of Prophecy concerning the time of Passover observance at the crucifixion.

You will also recall that the conclusion expressed in the recent series of articles in the *MINISTRY* on the New Testament Passover was that the Passover was both slain and eaten in the early evening hours of the fourteenth, i.e. Thursday evening of crucifixion week. The vital point concerning this subject is that on the basis of such a theory the endeavour is made to fix the year of the crucifixion, whereas if the Jewish authorities who fixed the times by various lunar observations actually observed the Passover feast on Friday evening, then Friday and not Thursday should be the time employed.

In view of the fact that in the December issue of the *Ministry* another item appeared in which the main stress was on the point of "chronology," and in which a quotation from Philo was used in the endeavour to bolster the theory of a Thursday night Passover meal, I felt it only proper that our leaders in Washington should give careful attention to the full evidence available concerning this question. It is my studied conviction that the continued presentation of material along the present line will only result in future embarrassments and disappointments for us. I have just written to Miss Amadon at length expressing my

convictions to her and I have written to Elder Froom calling his attention to the evidence from Jubilees.

I can well understand the position taken by Miss Amadon and the grounds on which she bases her views, and I have endeavoured carefully to point out to her just where she is making her mistakes.

The first mistake made by Miss Amadon is that she did not make a careful study of the time of the final trial of Jesus before the Sanhedrin and Pilate. It was her conclusion that these trials were held during the night, before morning, whereas the definite evidence of both the gospels and *Desire of Ages* is to the effect that this trial was not held till after daybreak, Friday morning. The difference is of vital importance to the question of the time of the New Testament Passover, for if this final trial of Jesus had occurred during the night as Miss Amadon maintains, then according to her the Jewish leaders could have partaken of the Passover feast that same night, following the trial and before morning broke. But if the final trials did not come until after daybreak, then the Passover meal could not have come till Friday night. For this reason the question of the exact time of this final trial and condemnation of Jesus before the Sanhedrin and before Pilate is of fundamental importance, and the mistake made by Miss Amadon on this point is fatal to all her theories concerning New Testament Passover chronology. She has started with the foundation awry and for this reason the great structure she is endeavouring to build on this foundation is likewise awry.

The second mistake made by Miss Amadon is her endeavour to allow a partial picture given by Josephus to stand for a complete picture. It is true, for instance, that Josephus repeatedly mentions the 14th as the day on which the Passover was observed, and it is also true that a careless and superficial reading of some of these references might seem to convey the impression that all of the events connected with Passover observance — the slaying of the lamb and the eating of the feast — were both observed on the 14th. But such a conclusion is hasty and dangerous. Before any such a conclusion can be drawn much more evidence than that presented is required. One needs to know just on what hour of the 14th, for instance, the Passover sacrifices were offered. If the authority in question presents such evidence, well and good. If he does not, then must other authorities be consulted. In the case of Josephus we fortunately possess his evidence on this point, namely that the Passover sacrifices were offered between the 9th and the 11th hours, which would be between three and five o'clock on Friday afternoon of crucifixion week. But Miss Amadon will have none of this latter evidence, for it does not agree with her theories. For two years in her correspondence with me she has been doing her utmost to discredit this evidence. In her latest letter to me she simply brands it, "unworthy of notice." But it is evidence of the utmost importance to this inquiry, the very type of evidence that is essential before any sound conclusion can be arrived at.

The third mistake is almost identical in nature with the second. In the December issue of the *Ministry* appears a quotation from Philo in which again the fourteenth is mentioned in connection with Passover observance. But again this quotation makes no mention of hours at all, and until we have this last evidence from Philo the citation from him cannot be used as evidence for the exact time of Passover observance in New Testament times, as between Thursday or Friday night.

The fourth mistake of Miss Amadon is the failure to take into consideration such evidence as that above given from Jubilees, and other early Jewish writers. In such a letter as this I cannot go exhaustively into this question, but let me simply mention that the Jewish evidence for a

very early observance of the Passover feast on the 13th instead of the 14th is altogether conclusive. Jubilees alone settles that question for a date as early as the second century B.C.

In brief, the first and most important point concerning New Testament Passover chronology is the fact that the final condemnation of Jesus did not take place until after the break of day Friday morning and that at that time the Jewish leaders had not yet partaken of the Passover but were looking forward to the observance of this rite. This alone would prove the incorrectness of Miss Amadon's contention that the Jewish nation as well as Jesus observed the Passover on Thursday night.

If both the Bible and *Desire of Ages* are correct in the evidence which they provide on the above point then should we expect to find corroborative evidence in contemporary sources pointing to an observance of the Passover feast on Nisan fifteen. Jubilees provides such evidence for the second century B.C. and Josephus for the first century A.D.

But an examination of the testimony of both Jubilees and Josephus shows that while the Passover was eaten in the early evening of the fifteenth, the Jewish writers of that period went to great lengths in the endeavour to place stress on the fourteenth, and thus to make it appear as if their current practice in Passover observance was in accord with the regulation originally given by Moses calling for the observance of these rites in Nisan fourteen.

Only the slaying of the Passover took place in the later afternoon of the fourteenth, but this was put forth in such a form as to indicate this was the main feature of Passover observance and thus in accord with the provisions of the Mosaic law. The Jewish writers at the beginning of the Christian era thus use the term "fourteenth" in rather a loose sense when applied to Passover observance, as is witnessed in both Jubilees and Josephus, and it is in this same sense that it is evidently also used by Philo. While a superficial survey of some of the statements of these writers might thus make it seem as if the Passover was both slain and eaten on the fourteenth, a careful study of the full evidence reveals the fact that the custom was to slay the Passover on the late afternoon of the fourteenth and eat the Passover feast in the early evening hours of the fifteenth.

In no field of endeavour is it every proper to take some isolated statement and to build upon it any weighty conclusions which are out of harmony with the complete evidence in that field. For instance, a superficial reading of Phil. 1:23 and of Mark 9:43-48 might seem to provide evidence for the entrance to heaven immediately at death and for an ever burning hell. But we recognize the fact that the true picture in these fields can be obtained only from a careful study of the full evidence in the case. This is true in every field, including New Testament Passover chronology. Miss Amadon's mistake has been to take an isolated statement and to build upon it a general conclusion which was not warranted by the full evidence in the case.

Others who have not had the opportunity of going over all the evidence in this field have considered Miss Amadon's conclusions as plausible, and the result is that there is at present a growing confusion among us on this point of New Testament Passover chronology. Miss Amadon considers herself an authority in this field, but the simple fact is that she is badly confused. While she might have some items in this field which are sound, I know that her chronology simply is not sound, and it is on this point where her chief interest lies. The very heart of her item in the December *Ministry*, for instance, consists of five sentences in which this word "chronology" is used five times. The item closes with the solicitation of further correspondence on this subject and points to further articles to follow: "We are pleased to receive letters of inquiry from those who are studying together. The next study will be on „The Passover Peace Offering.“" I wish with all of my heart that this material were sound and

that our people could be edified and established thereby, but I am afraid that as long as Miss Amadon clings to her present theories, her presentation of this material will lead us to the place where embarrassment and disappointment will certainly come, and where a great deal of explaining will be necessary to try to clear up wrong conceptions. If the material already published is any correct guide to that still to come, then does it appear that it cannot but lead to erroneous conclusions. And if this thing has not yet been finalized upon, then why proceed with it now?

Very sincerely your brother,
(Signed) Edwin R. Thiele

★ ★ ★

December 17, 1943

Elder M.E. Kern
1502 E Brill St.
Phoenix, AZ

Dear Brother Kern:

You are now the chairman, I believe, of the sub-committee on the Advent Source Material that is dealing with Miss Amadon's argument and the arguments that have been offered contrary to it.

You may have all the information which I am herewith giving you, but just to make sure I am sending on letters that have come to me in recent months from Brother E.R. Thiele. These are his letters to me of October 6 and December 12.

It seems to me, as I have expressed it to Brother Thiele and Froom, that it is unfortunate to have this argument going on in the *Ministry* magazine when it is in such an unsettled state and when even the facts on which the argument is based are in question ...

Very sincerely yours,
(Signed) H.T. Elliott

★ ★ ★

February 7, 1944

Elder H.T. Elliott
General Conference of SDA
Takoma Park, Washington, DC

Dear Brother Elliott:

In the February issue of the *Ministry* I noticed the article on the "Date and Hour of the Crucifixion Passover." My first reaction to this article was to simply ignore it and just to let things take their own course be the outcome whatever it might. But after thinking things over more carefully I feel that if this article is as unsound as I believe it to be and if its ultimate outcome will be what I expect it to be, then, if I truly love this work and am concerned over its welfare, I would not be doing my full duty either to God or this cause by remaining silent. I will not discuss the many points in this article which I believe to be unsound, but will

mention only one item which I believe to be vital and which will carry with it the key to everything else.

After giving a citation from Philo which is used as evidence for both the slaying of the Passover and the Passover feast itself on the fourteenth of Nisan, the article declares: “**Only an after-sunset** sacrifice and supper could agree with Philo’s description. If the lamb were slain in the **afternoon**, it would then have to be roasted and eaten on the subsequent evening. Hence two Jewish dates would be involved — not one date only.” Let us put against this statement Philo’s own words, taken from the same section of Philo mentioned in the above citation: “After the New Moon comes the fourth feast, called the Crossing-feast, which the Hebrews in their native tongue called Pasoha. In this festival many myriads of victims from **noon till eventide** are offered by the whole people, old and young alike.” Philo, *Special Laws*, II, sec. 145, tr. by Colson, Loeb Classical Library, Vol. VII, p. 395. Notice that Miss Amadon declares that “only an **after-sunset** sacrifice and supper could agree with Philo’s description,” but that Philo himself declares that it was from “**noon till eventide**” when the Passover sacrifices were offered! If there had been merely a casual reading of Philo’s presentation of this matter, his statement that the hour when the sacrifices were offered was the period between noon and sunset, would have made any speculation concerning this time entirely out of place. And if the testimony of Jubilees had been noted and accepted, that the Passover was slain on the 14th before evening and eaten on the evening of the fifteenth, immediately after the setting of the sun, it would have been clear as to just what Philo had in mind, and the above completely erroneous deduction would not have been drawn. Yet again, if Josephus’ very clear statement that the Passover sacrifices were slain on the 14th, and that the hour was from the 9th to the 11th, three to five in the afternoon, then again would the meaning of Philo’s statement have been entirely clear. In other words, the testimony of any one of these three witnesses would have been entirely sufficient in itself to show just when it was customary in New Testament times to slay the Passover sacrifices and when the Passover feast occurred, and the baselessness of the position taken in these four recent articles in the *Ministry* would have been apparent. But for Philo himself to give the very hour of day of the offering of the Passover sacrifices, and to have that statement entirely passed by, and to endeavour to argue that the time which Philo says was the time, was an impossible time, is hardly in line with sound and careful research. I must say that I cannot understand how it was possible for a presentation so strikingly and so demonstrably erroneous as this to appear in the *Ministry*, and that, after the errors were pointed out.

When an argument is proceeding along sound lines it is possible to accept valid evidence at its full value and it does not become necessary to endeavour to try to circumvent the force of such evidence by any equivocation or specious reasoning. Thus when Josephus said that the Jews offered their Passover sacrifices between the 9th and the 11th hours — three to five o’clock in the afternoon — (Wars VI.IX.3) it does not become necessary to endeavour to dismiss such weighty evidence with a puerile, “But the text has no date!” (*Ministry*, Feb. 1944, p. 38), or with the declaration that “a critical examination of B.VI.IX.3 is unworthy of notice” (Personal letter to me by Miss Amadon of Nov. 2, 1943). And when Jubilees bears witness to the fact that already in the second century before Christ the time of offering the Passover sacrifices among the Jews was considered to be in the later afternoon of the fourteenth, before sunset, and that the Passover feast itself was held in the early evening of the fifteenth, after sunset (Jubilees 49:1, 2, 10-12), we need make no attempt at all to discard such valuable testimony. And when John declares that the hour when Jesus and His disciples observed the Passover was “before the feast of the Passover” (John 13:1), it does not become necessary to try to evade a statement so plain as this. And when John says further that when the Jews on Friday morning refused to enter into the judgment hall “lest they should be

defiled; but that they might eat the Passover;" (John 18:28), it does not become necessary to endeavour to substitute one's own "Talmudic supper" (Letter to me of Nov. 2, 1943), for "Passover." And again, when the Spirit of Prophecy corroborates this witness of John and says that the Jewish officials would not enter into the judgment hall lest they become defiled thereby and "thus prevented from taking part in the feast of the Passover" (*DA*, 723), we do not need to substitute "Talmudic supper" for an unequivocal "Feast of the Passover." Yet again when the time of the last trial of Jesus is described by the Spirit of Prophecy as "as soon as it was day" (*DA*, 714), by Matthew as the time "when the morning was come" (Matt. 27:1), by Mark as "straightway in the morning," (Mark 15:1), and by Luke as, "as soon as it was day" (Luke 22:66), it will not be necessary to be forced to endeavour to place the time of this trial during the night, before the break of morning (Letter to me of Oct. 10, 1943). And when *Desire of Ages*, and Klausner declare that the final legal trial of Jesus could come only in the light of day (*DA*, 710; Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth*, p. 340: Sanh. IV.ii), it will not be necessary to maintain that Jesus' last trial was held "at night" and in the "darkness" (Letter of Oct. 10, 1943). Nor when Mrs. White expressly declares that "The Passover was observed as it had been for centuries, while He to whom it pointed had been slain by wicked hands, and lay in Joseph's tomb," (*DA*, 774), will it be necessary to try to argue that the observance of the Passover does not here mean the observance of the Passover at all, for the Jews had observed their Passover on Thursday night, at the same time as did Jesus, and not on Friday night while Jesus lay in the tomb.

I could carry the above to much greater lengths, but I simply give the above examples to show the shifts and evasions it is necessary to resort to when the position one is endeavouring to maintain is contrary to fact. Yet the pity of it is that this position, totally devoid of any sound foundation, is now apparently receiving official sanction among our leaders in Washington, and that **we are opening up the pages of the official church organ for our ministers throughout the world, for the promulgation of such error, and that, in support of one of our most cherished doctrines — the sanctuary truth!** And the double pity is that this should come just one hundred years after the stirring times of 1844 — a time when God's people should be receiving the most positive and unshakable confirmation of the truth of the positions they hold.

Our position on the sanctuary question is already under serious fire by our enemies. Why should we now play into their hands by providing them with the ammunition they so much desire — an evidence of faulty history, unsound logic, erroneous use of ancient testimony? In God's work and in the realm of truth no position will ever be in need of the unsound support that it is now being proposed to lend to our views on the sanctuary question.

Why must we publish before our workers and before the world such a statement, for instance, as the following in the February *Ministry*: „The Second Temple sources have clearly shown that the ancient Passover date had not changed — even as late as Josephus." The facts are that the complete testimony for the time of Christ shows that at that period a change had been introduced,* that the Passover was no longer observed on the evening of the fourteenth, and the Passover feast was held on the evening of the fifteenth. The testimony of John is proof of the fact that on Friday morning of crucifixion week the Jewish leaders had not yet partaken of the Passover and thus were planning to partake of it on Friday evening, which would be the fifteenth. Jubilees is proof of the fact that that is the view maintained in the second century before Christ. Philo is witness to the fact that the slaying of the Passover sacrifices took place in the afternoon, the fourteenth, and that the Passover feast must therefore have been held on

* but that the sacrifices were slain on the afternoon of the fourteenth.

the evening of the fifteenth. Josephus is witness for the slaying of the Passover sacrifices between three and five of the afternoon of the fourteenth at the close of the first century A.D., and thus again the Passover feast must have been held on the evening of the fifteenth. All this testimony of these contemporary witnesses is in complete agreement on the one point that the time of Passover observance had definitely changed and that the above statement is therefore not true to fact.

The original Passover law, however, had of course not changed, and that law was still well known among the Jews. It was remembered that Moses had commanded that the Passover be observed on the fourteenth, and even though it was no longer customary to obey that law, an attempt was still made to indicate that their customs were still in line with the original directions given by Moses. This fact is well known by all outstanding Jewish writers of our age that I am acquainted with.

Christ and His followers, however, still continued to observe the Passover at the time appointed by Moses, the evening of the fourteenth, which was Thursday evening of crucifixion week. And there were no doubt scattered remnants of people who were still faithful to God in complying with the original regulations concerning the time of Passover observance, but the Jewish leaders at Jerusalem at the time of Christ and the majority of Jews at that time most certainly observed the Passover just twenty-four hours too late.

With each new presentation of this subject in the *Ministry* we are getting ourselves ever more deeply involved. Where will all this end? Many of our workers will think this material reliable and will weave it into their oral and written presentation of the sanctuary truth, and ultimately the time will come when our mistakes on this point will come before those who are informed on this matter, and that will most certainly result in embarrassment for us.

But what are we now going to do? Are we going to allow the present erroneous views which have gone out to remain uncorrected? We can hardly allow error to stand and lead us into the embarrassment which will surely come, but to set forth the correct point of view on this matter will likewise result in embarrassment, for we will have to show that the views on which so much labour and argument were spent were not sound. I cannot but feel that the publication of this material was hasty and unwise, and that it would have been far better to have waited until we were more certain of the ground we were building upon.

Might I now request some information from you as to just how this matter now stands in Washington? Has the committee appointed to investigate the subject finalized upon it, and has the signal been given to go ahead with the matter? It does seem as if this must be so, or publication would not now be continuing. And might I ask who were the members of the committee appointed to investigate this matter? Are all of our brethren there and elsewhere clear on this matter, and am I the only one who seems to see the thing in a different light? Thus far none of the men to whom I have addressed myself in Washington concerning this thing some months ago, has given me any intimation that they felt I might be in error, nor has any attempt been made by any of them to point out in any wise where my reasoning might not be sound or my evidence reliable. If I am wrong I would really appreciate having this pointed out to me.

It must, of course, be understood that the views I hold on this matter are views which I am teaching to the young people in my charge at Emmanuel Missionary College. I am particularly anxious that our young men receive a solid foundation for the truths which they will go forth to proclaim. And I am anxious that when they come in contact with error, however subtle, cunning, or insidious it may be, that they be able to discern this. It is my

conviction that the type of reasoning employed in arriving at the conclusions expressed in this series of articles in the *Ministry* is just as erroneous as the reasoning often used to prove the position of an ever-burning hell, of the immortality of the soul, and of the keeping of a spurious Sabbath. Our young people are constantly being brought in contact with error that is more and more subtle, and they just must be trained to be able to detect falsehood from truth. What will I now do in regard to this presentation of this subject? I believe it to be wrong, I certainly do not wish the young people in my charge to go out teaching something so demonstrably and yet so subtly in error, and yet to point out the falsity of this matter cannot help but result in embarrassments. I must repeat that I believe with all my heart that the publication of this material at this time to be untimely and unwise, and that it is performing a distinct disservice to the cause of present truth.

And what is to happen next? Will this thing go on and on? The further we go, the more difficult will it be ultimately to retrace our steps. Would it not be well to wait until we first know that we are going forward upon solid ground? And if this material is wrong, how will we now inform our ministry of this fact so that the errors may not continue to be given an ever wider circulation?

Finally, I am wondering, Brother Elliott, whether it might not be well to secure a copy of Philo and then invite Miss Amadon over and have her read the statement referred to in the early part of this letter concerning the offering of the myriads of paschal sacrificial victims "from noon till eventide." It is found in section XXVII.145, p. 395, Vol. VII of Philo. The citation upon which Miss Amadon has placed such stress as proving that Philo could not possibly refer to an afternoon sacrifice but that it must come after sunset is on page 397, same section, 149. The title is *Philo*, F.H. Colson trs., Loeb Classical Library, VII. The American publisher is Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass. The Seminary will of course have a copy. If after seeing the above statement by Philo and noticing that it is the exact opposite of what she has been endeavouring to prove, Miss Amadon will, if the real truth of this matter is the thing of first importance to her, accept the full force of this testimony and acknowledge the erroneousness of her position. And with that will fall this whole position she has so laboriously been endeavouring to build up in this present series. That will of course not be easy. But if Miss Amadon's chief interest is to prove that her position has been and still is correct, her endeavour will be to parley and do away with the force of this testimony.

With kindest Christian greetings, believe me to be,

Very sincerely your brother,
(Signed) Edwin R. Thiele

★ ★ ★

CORRESPONDENCE WITH NAVAL OBSERVATORY REGARDING WORK OF GRACE AMADON

February 26, 1946

Dr. Glen H. Draper
Naval Observatory
Massachusetts at 34th NW
Washington, DC

Dear Dr. Draper:

One of our teachers is in receipt of a letter which concerns a statement made by Miss Grace Amadon to the committee on chronology, of which she was a member. She stated that she had your endorsement on some of her computations, but did not specify. The question is: assuming that you gave an endorsement, did this concern or include her position that the Jewish Passover in the year 31 A.D. fell on a Friday? As she is now deceased, we would appreciate a word from you.

Respectfully yours,
(Signed) D.E. Rebok

DER:y

★ ★ ★

US Naval Observatory
Feb. 27, 1946

Mr. D.E. Rebok
SDA Theological Seminary
Takoma Park 21, DC

Dear Mr. Rebok:

Your letter of 26 February has been received. I did check over the work of Miss Grace Amadon and found it to be an interesting and accurate research following the premises she accepted. Her conclusion that the Jewish Passover in the year 31 A.D. fell on a Friday is correct and consistent with her premises.

But as I told her so frequently there may be some question in accepting the premises as real. They are interesting and furnish as consistent a set of conclusions as any I have seen on the subject, although **they seem to contain several precepts of almost hearsay. They are novel to say the least.**

I am enclosing a mathematical paper of mine own which should sufficiently demonstrate the roll of traditional premises in most discussions. The truth is had, only when the last exception has been clearly understood and defined.

Sincerely,
(Signed) Glen H. Draper

★ ★ ★

March 1, 1946

Dr. Glen H. Draper
Naval Observatory
Massachusetts at 34th N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Dear Dr. Draper:

I wish to acknowledge your letter of February 27 and to thank you for the answer which you have given to my question. I wonder if you would be willing to offer your comments or counsel regarding the premises upon which Miss Grace Amadon based her work, or if you would feel free to give us the facts so far as science and mathematics know them concerning the Passover day in the year 31, as well as the other years which are now considered by various groups studying this problem. We are looking for facts and truth. If you can help us in any way, it will be greatly appreciated.

Again thanking you for your very prompt and careful reply to my question, I am

Respectfully yours,
(Signed) D.E. Rebok, President

DER:y

★ ★ ★

US Naval Observatory
Washington 25, DC
March 5, 1946

Dear President Rebok:

Your letter of March 1 has been received. I am answering it immediately as I am so pressed for time that I shall never get to answer it if I set it aside for proper considerations.

I am a little perturbed to know exactly what you desire as Miss Amadon's work must certainly be in your possession and states for itself what it is. Briefly though **it assumes that the Paschal moon is the important moon and not the new moon. Her calendar is refreshing in its (at present) novel premise that the Jews knew enough of the motions of the moon to predict the time at which the moon would be full.** The Paschal feast should *never* arrive before the full moon is her major premise. I have never heard of any other modern who claims this, but it was indeed interesting to me to see how she was able to make a consistent chronology on that premise. It appears in many respects to be the most consistent chronology I have seen, *although it requires the difficult assumption that the priests knew a great deal more of the laws of motion of the moon than they recorded as such.* Miss Amadon insisted, with evidences of record that they did have this knowledge as a divine secret. **She had faith that the priests were able to regulate the entire year by observations of the new moons of a previous year. It is difficult to understand now how they were able to do this as we have only in the last three hundred years been able to reproduce this feat.**

I do not have the time to go into all the details of her problem, as you request but she has it fairly well outlined.

Very truly yours,
(Signed) Glen H. Draper

★ ★ ★

March 7, 1946

Dr. Glen H. Draper
Naval Observatory
Massachusetts at 34th NW
Washington, DC

Dear Dr. Draper:

I fully realize you are a very busy man and I even hesitated to approach you with my original question, but you have answered my question satisfactorily and I thank you for your frankness and for your opinion. These are interesting problems, but without doubt there are others which are certainly more pressing and I would not encroach upon your time to discuss them further.

Appreciating your two letters and your viewpoint in the matter, I remain,

Respectfully yours,
(Signed) D.E. Rebok, President

DER:y

★ ★ ★

San Francisco
Oct. 2, 1948

Dear Brother Kern:

The following points seem to me essential to an understanding of the committee problem of the 2300 days.

1. The beginning of the 2300 days. Which command?
2. The meaning of "how long," "Until," "Going forth"?
3. Proof of the connection of the 70 weeks and 2300 days.
4. Is "unto Messiah, the Prince" a chronological statement?
5. When are we to reckon that the Messiah came? Birth? Baptism?
6. He "began to be about 30 years," When? "Began," "About" are indefinite.
7. When did God reject Israel? At crucifixion, Stephen's death, destruction of Jerusalem?
8. What reason is there for an attempt to fix the absolute beginning of the 7th of Artaxerxes apart from an attempt to arrive at the tenth day of the seventh month in 1844? If we are not compelled to arrive at Oct. 22 is there any point in spending years to establish the exact moment of Artaxerxes accession?

9. (a) If Christ was born in B.C. 4, how do we account for Herod's death also in B.C. 4, when Christ must have been born some considerable time before Herod's death?
10. If Christ was born in B.C. 4; the crucifixion in A.D. 31; if Christ in 26-7 began to be about 30 years old, if there was a 3½ year's ministry; how do these dates harmonize?

If Dr. Wood arrived at an undisputed date for Artaxerxes' 7th year; if Dr. Lindsjo arrives at another date; where are we after all these years? There would seem to be no point to continue these discussions unless some of the above questions are settled; and that will take years.

(Signed) M.L. Andreassen

★ ★ ★

THE DATE OF CHRIST'S CRUCIFIXION

Biblical scholars have not been able to reach unanimous conclusions in regard to the crucifixion date of Christ. The reason for the disagreement lies in the fact that **data on which the crucifixion date must be based are still uncertain.**

Let us first list points on which there is general agreement. We know that the crucifixion took place (1) at the time of the Jewish Passover (Matt. 26:17-30; Mark 14:12-26; Luke 22:1-23; John 13:1-30; 18:28), and (2) that it was the preparation day for the weekly Sabbath (Mark 15:42-47; Luke 23: 50-56; John 19:31, 41, 42). It is also evident that Christ rested in the tomb on the Sabbath (Matt. 27:62-66), and that He rose from the dead early Sunday morning, the first day of the week (Matt. 28:1-6; Mark 16:1-6; Luke 24:1-6; John 20:1-18). It is, furthermore, certain that the crucifixion took place between the years A.D. 26 and 35, during which time Pontius Pilate was governor of Judea. We know, moreover, from Scripture that the law of the Passover required (1) the lamb to be slain before sunset on the fourteenth day of Nisan and eaten before the following midnight (Ex. 12:6ff; Lev. 23:5), and that ripened barley had to be available for the wave sheaf on the second day of the feast of unleavened bread (Lev. 23:6, 7, 10, 11).

It is also generally agreed that the Jews, in common with the Babylonians, Persians and other Eastern nations based their calendar on the movements of the moon, and that their ordinary years had 12 months, each month having a length of either 29 or 30 days. In order to keep the year in step with the seasons, an intercalary month was inserted every two or three years — 7 times in 19 years.

With this evidence in hand, the establishment of the 14th of Nisan in any year of Christ's time may seem to be a simple matter. Assuming that the 14th of Nisan was the day of the full moon, it may appear to be comparatively easy to establish the crucifixion date by finding astronomically the date at a Passover season when the moon was full on a Friday during the years of Pilate's reign.

A crucifixion date arrived at by this procedure, however, is based on a number of unproven assumptions, since the exact nature of the Jewish calendar used during the time of Christ is unknown. Uncertain factors are the following: (1) Was the Jewish calendar in the time of Christ based on observation or computation — did the beginning of each month depend on an observation of the new moon crescent, or was the month's beginning calculated in advance? (2) Was the moon always full on the 14th of the month, or sometimes one or two days earlier? (3) Which years during Christ's life consisted of thirteen months, i.e., were embolismic?

(4) Did the Jews at the time of Christ follow the Babylonian calendar in toto, as some scholars think, or did they follow their own scheme?

Although the present-day Jewish calendar is basically still lunar, it cannot help to clarify the uncertainties listed above, because it was introduced not earlier than the fourth century and varies considerably with the one previously used. It is fixed by computations made before the beginning of the year, and is arranged in a way that the festival days will not fall on certain days of the week. For example, the Day of Atonement, which comes on the 10th day of the 7th month, is according to Jewish regulations not supposed to fall on a Tuesday, Wednesday, or Friday, hence the calendar is adjusted in a way to avoid this.

The only other Jewish calendar concerning which we are reasonably well informed is that of the 5th century B.C. Our knowledge about this calendar is derived from a number of Jewish documents found in recent years in Egypt. See on this calendar S.H. Horn and L.H. Wood, *The Chronology of Ezra 7* (Washington, D.C.: Review & Herald Publishing Assoc., 1953), pp. 66-88 and 118-145.

For a reconstruction of the Jewish calendar for the period lying between the 5th century B.C. and the 4th century A.D. no reliable source materials is as yet available. Rabbinical statements concerning the earlier Jewish calendar found in the Talmud from A.D. 200 on and other Jewish writings are late, ambiguous, and not always reliable. They can be interpreted in different ways, and it is unknown whether these statements are based on good information or tradition. In view of these uncertainties regarding the calendar used in the time of Christ every attempt to fix the crucifixion date scientifically, can only be based on a number of hypotheses and unproven assumptions.

Scholars who have arrived at A.D. 30 as the year in which the crucifixion took place, believe that the Jewish calendar in the time of Christ was identical with the Babylonian calendar of earlier centuries. They also believe that this calendar was based on observation of the moon, in which the first day of each month began at sunset the evening on which the new crescent of the moon was seen for the first time after its conjunction, that is the appearance of the new moon.

A calendar based on observation, however, is dependent on the weather. If on the evening after the 29th of the month the crescent was invisible because of an overcast sky, the first of the month was postponed one day. This weather problem would not be a matter of concern in those lunar months which naturally would be thirty days in length. If the first day of the month was delayed by one day because of bad weather, the 14th also would have fallen one day later. Since we have no source material from the time of Christ on which to construct with certainty a calendar for the year A.D. 30, it is obvious **that in view of the factors involved we cannot set an exact date for the crucifixion.**

Further, it is not known whether the Jews regulated their calendar at that time so that the full moon coincided with the 14th of Nisan or with the 12th or 13th, as some think, in order that those who were travelling to Jerusalem during the Passover season might have lighted nights for travelling. Such a calendar would be based on computations and not on observations. Those working on the assumption that the Jews computed their calendar instead of basing it on observation, and fixed it in a way that the full moon came on the 12th or 13th of Nisan, reach entirely different conclusions with regard to the crucifixion date. **Using this hypothesis as the basis for her astronomical computations, Miss Grace Amadon arrived at A.D. 31** for the crucifixion date (See "Ancient Jewish Calendation," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 61, part 4 [1942], pp. 227-280). It should be noted that **her conclusions are likewise**

based on an interpretation of certain Jewish statements which are ambiguous, and that her conclusions will stand or fall on the correctness of several still unproven hypotheses.

Years of investigation carried on by a number of members of a committee appointed by the General Conference to investigate this and other related dates, have led to the conclusions that **our present source material is insufficient to arrive at a scientifically unassailable date for the crucifixion.**

For the reconstruction of the Jewish calendar used in the time of Christ, the discovery of contemporary source material of an unambiguous nature must be awaited. **Without such material the crucifixion date cannot scientifically be established.** It might not be superfluous to mention in this connection that in the present state of our knowledge it is also impossible to establish accurate dates for a number of events of Christ's ministry for which chronological statements are made in the Gospels, like Luke 3:1 and John 2:20. The reason for this uncertainty is once more the present scarcity of historically reliable extra-Biblical source material of the first century of the Christian era.

While admitting that the crucifixion date cannot scientifically be established, fortunately we have other means by which we are able to arrive at a correct date for the crucifixion of Christ. The prophecy of the 70 weeks of Daniel 9:25-27 provides the answer to this problem, since it contains the prediction that the Messiah would "cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease" in the midst of the last of the 70 weeks, which means after 60 ½ prophetic weeks or 486 ½ prophetic days — 486 ½ actual years.

Furthermore, this prophecy provides not only the length of the period involved, but pins its beginning down to the time when "the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem" should occur (Dan. 9:25), a decree which was issued in the 7th year of Artaxerxes 1 as recorded in Ezra 7. Since events described in that chapter can be dated in the year 457 B.C., a date whose accuracy can be demonstrated (see S.H. Horn and L.H. Wood, *The Chronology of Ezra 7*, pp. 107-117), it is merely a matter of simple reckoning to find the end of the 70 prophetic weeks or 490 years in the fall of A.D. 34. **If the 70th week ended in the fall of A.D. 34** the event which took place in the midst of that prophetic week — the cessation of the sacrificial service through Christ's death — must have taken place in the spring of A.D. 31. In this the Spirit of Prophecy concurs (*GC*, 410, *DA*, 233).

Siegfried H. Horn

★ ★ ★

APPENDIX NINETEEN

Extracts From Dr. R. Cottrell's Presentation Loma
Linda, February, 1980

Extracts From Dr. R. Cottrell's Presentation Loma Linda, February, 1980

Twenty-five years ago I became acquainted with Des Ford when he was a student at the theological seminary which was located in Washington, D.C., at that time, and I was working on the *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*. He requested an opportunity to dialogue with me about the sanctuary and the subjects that he has been interested in here recently and which we will be discussing here tonight. We spent many hours talking about these things together. My comments tonight are a severely condensed version of three addresses that I gave at Andrews University on October 20, the weekend of October 20, just one weekend before Des Ford made his address at PUC.

The slides that I will use during the second half of the program tonight are ones that I made a little bit more than 10 years ago for a small study group that we had in Washington, D.C., composed mostly of editors at the Review and the GC, and a few other friends as well. I might add that Des Ford has seen these slides and we have talked together about the things we will talk about tonight. A few weeks ago, Dr. Hammill and a number of the chairmen of the advisory committee that the GC set up to work with Des Ford, and several of the members of his committee, have seen these slides and have heard this presentation also. I have presented them to the combined religion faculties of Loma Linda and La Sierra. I might say that heretofore, I have limited my personal discussion of this subject to scholarly circles which I have felt for a number of years has been appropriate, but in view of the fact that these problems have entered the public domain, I think it would not be responsible on my part to continue to be silent.

Interestingly, on the very same day that I received the tapes of Des Ford's address at PUC, I received a letter from Harry Lowe, who was chairman of the committee on problems in the book of Daniel. I will quote just one sentence from that letter — a very short one. "Ford's presentation dealt with nothing we did not discuss on the problems in the Daniel Committee twenty years ago." So it is nothing new in scholarly circles.

I would like to say again that nearly all of our Bible scholars in the church — perhaps all of them — recognize the reality of the problems we will be presenting tonight, but there is no consensus on the solutions to these problems. It has been the policy of certain persons to prevent a discussion of this for the past 10 years or so, and to think of some, even in scholarly circles who commented on the subject as sort of dangerous liberals who were a threat to the church. But I would like to submit that this attitude of no discussion, of silence, has really been responsible for escalating the problems to the state that it is in today, because it has prevented our Bible scholars from sitting down together and working on the problems and coming up with a satisfactory solution. The tree of silence never bears the fruit of peace. It is best to face things directly and to work with them honestly. And only fair-minded, responsible discussion can accomplish that objective. It is more than a little that the last ten years or so that it has not been possible to do that. [Sentence on tape not clear.]

Seventh-day Adventists have always thought of themselves, appropriately, as people of the Book, meaning the Bible, of course. And it has ever been our intention to believe the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth as set forth in the Bible. In telling about the Sabbath conference at Volney, New York, Ellen White relates that of the 35 people present at the conference, hardly two agreed. Some were holding serious errors, and each strenuously urged his own views, declaring that they were according to the Scripture (*Life Sketches*, p. 110). I would like to ask why such a situation prevailed when these were all honest people? I

think: They all loved the Lord. They loved the truth. They studied the truth as best they could in the Scriptures. But when they came together hardly two of them, as Ellen White said, agreed. Why was there this disunity?

I would like to submit that the answer was that they were using what we refer today as the proof-text method of Bible study. And inasmuch it was the proof-text method of Bible study that created the problem that we encounter in our interpretation of Daniel 8:14, it is important that we understand what this method is and how it operates. I will briefly mention 5 points. We might mention more.

The proof-text method thinks of the Bible correctly as God's message to us today, but it forgets that the Bible was also originally God's message to people in the time in which it was written. 1 Cor. 10:11 for instance.

Second, the proof-text method pays minor, if any attention, to the historical setting to which the messages of the Bible were originally addressed, or to the intentions of the inspired writers. It construes the words and statements of the Bible often in the sense that only the modern reader would be inclined to place upon them. As a matter of fact, in the proof-text method of Bible study each person's presuppositions and biases — mine, if I am engaging in proof-text theology — these presuppositions and biases tend to determine what a person concludes when he reads a passage of Scripture, setting out with an idea his study of the Bible consists essentially in a search for statements that seem to support his idea. And interestingly as it may seem, as the recent spate of conferences in righteousness by faith have indicated, all sides can quote Ellen White and both sides can quote the Bible. Of course, we might not agree on the use that each person makes of that; but it is a fact that in the proof-text method a person's personal pre-suppositions and biases in large measure determine the conclusions that he arrives at.

Third, the proof-text method usually accepts an English translation of the Bible as its ultimate authority of what the Bible means. No special training is necessary to engage in the proof-text method of Bible study. It is a sort of do-it-yourself method in which anyone can engage, depending upon his own level of ability. Reasonable ability to read the King's English in the King James Version of the Bible, to make use of the marginal references, the English concordance, and to define Bible words by looking them up in a modern dictionary, and sometimes with referring to other English translations are the principal requisites that a person engaging in proof-text Bible study at its best will need.

Fourth, the proof-text method makes indiscriminate use of the analogy of Scripture. That is, comparing Scripture with Scripture, find a certain word like sanctuary in Dan. 8:14, the same word in Lev. 16, the same word in Heb. 7, 8, 9 and so on, finding the same word, the person using the proof-text method concludes that they are all talking about the same thing, approximately. But there is an effect that comes in here in this rather indiscriminate use of the analogy of Scripture, the result being that a text is often out of context to mean something quite different than the original writer intended. And it tends to be unaware that many Bible words, expressions and statements conveyed entirely different concepts to the writer, to his original audience, than they do to us today.

Fifth, anyone can use the proof-text method. One person's opinion is just about as important and as valuable as another person's opinion. And there is no real way to determine which interpretation is right. The proof-text method offers no certain way to do that, and as a result there is a very considerable diversity of opinion on the part of the Christian world today, and

in fact, most of the differences of opinion amongst the churches and most of the differences of opinion that occur even in our own church are the result of using this method.

Well, let us make no mistake. There is nothing whatever wrong in E.G. White's use of the Bible when we understand how and why she uses it as she does. That is a considered conclusion after many years of study. But there is something grievously wrong about us, the church, when we begin to make use of her writings in the interpretation of the Bible, and the way some of us continue to use her writings in the exegesis of Scripture. I would like to suggest that this egregious error on our part coupled with the continuous use of the proof-text method by many has been the root of practically every theological problem that has confronted the church over the past 65 years since the death of E.G. White. For example, the problems posed by Conradi, Fletcher, Snide, Grieve, Houteff, and the Shepherds Rod, Robert Brinsmead, Ron Numbers, Walter Rae, and others. The problem is basically the relationship of E.G. White's writing to the Bible.

This lethal combination of the proof-text method and the way in which we have used E.G. White is at the root of our theological problems.

As long ago as 1871 Ellen White herself wrote, "If you had made God's Word your study with a desire to reach the Bible standard and reach Christian perfection, you would not have needed the testimonies." That is an interesting thing from E.G. White. "You would not have needed the testimonies." That is Volume 2, page 605.

Also, at various times E.G. White reproved the brethren — told them not to use her writings in settling doctrinal matters. So with this group of Bible teachers, and later others, learning how to go to the Bible directly for the first time, there were some who could carry out E.G. White's instruction and go to the Bible and find out what it said.

In sharp contrast with the proof-text method of Bible study, this method which is commonly known as the historical-linguistic-contextual method, or more simply the historical method came into increasing use in the church. Its aim is to ascertain as accurately as possible what the Bible writers really meant by what they wrote under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and how they intended their readers to understand what they wrote. This method of Bible study takes each passage of Scripture in its historical setting, each word in the original language in order to determine its meaning in a particular context, and each statement in its own context and perhaps also the author's purpose in writing.

Now under the proof-text method the living presence of E.G. White had been essential in order to confirm the true meaning of Scripture from the study of the Bible. But with the historical method it became possible to go to the Bible directly. Likewise under the guidance of the Holy Spirit to be sure and listen to God's voice speaking to us today. Clear consensus was not possible with the proof-text method without the living presence of E.G. White, but it is possible with the historical method of interpretation. A high degree of accuracy and reasonable consensus can be attained.

In bringing this part of our study to a close, I would like to suggest that the Bible scholars of the church have been well aware of these problems of interpretation in Daniel 8:14 and Hebrews 9 for many years. Individuals have attempted to correlate Adventist teachings on the sanctuary, the investigative judgment, and 1844 with these passages of Scripture on the basis of recognized principles of interpretation. Several solutions to these problems have been proposed but over the past 10 years this obscurantist policy has prevented them from working effectively together and from reaching a consensus. And that is why there are differences of

opinion on the solution just as Des Ford is demonstrating at the present time. Had it not been for this moratorium on study by our Bible scholars during the past 10 years particularly, the church would probably, by now, have reached clear consensus on these matters and the present rather critical situation might have been avoided.

So that the context in our historic interpretation or application of these verses leaves us in very considerable trouble because it isolates verse 14 from its context and makes it refer to an entirely different set of things.

The Adventist interpretation is based upon certain assumptions.

1. That the 2300 evenings-mornings stand for 2300 24-hour days.
2. That the day-for-year principle is inherent in symbolic prophecy. That is, that the 2300 days represents 2300 literal years that began in 457 B.C. and ended in A.D. 1844.
3. That because the temple was permanently destroyed in A.D. 70 the sanctuary to be cleansed in 1844 for that very reason must be the one in heaven. That is reasonable.
4. That the KJV “cleansed” is the correct rendering of the Hebrew word *nitsdaq*. You are going to hear this word again, *nitsdaq* simply means cleansed, or in the RSV, restored to its rightful state. That the cleansing referred to is an antitypical cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary on an antitypical Day of Atonement from the confessed sins of God’s contrary people of all ages, and that this cleansing constitutes an investigative judgment of their fitness for heaven.

When I found it impossible to reconcile the Adventist interpretation with the context of verse 14, I went to Elder Nichol, who had been our editor-in-chief on the *Commentary* of course, and rather shepherding Don and me as we did our work on revising *Bible Readings* so that it would correspond with the *Commentary*. In the early spring back there in Washington, we had seen so little sunshine and so much snow that I often worked out on the roof for hours at a time, and Elder Nichol came out for a few minutes to talk some things over. Well, I went to him with this problem in Daniel 8 and asked his counsel. He asked me, “What do the Bible teachers have to say?” I said, “We have been working on the *Commentary* for several years, 14 hours a day.” (By the way, we began work at 4:30 each morning, six days a week, except for Sabbath, and worked all day long. There wasn’t much time for anything else.) I said, “I don’t know because I haven’t had an opportunity to talk with them for a number of years.” He said, “Well write them a letter.” So I wrote a letter with six questions in it:

1. What linguistic basis is there for translating *nitsdaq* as cleansed?
2. Why did the translators of the Septuagint render *nitsdaq* as *katharizo*, which does mean cleansed in Greek?
3. What is the relation of *nitsdaq* to its context in verses 9 to 13?
4. How would you render *nitsdaq* in terms of its context?
5. What linguistic or contextual reasons can you suggest for applying *nitsdaq* to the services of the Day of Atonement, and thus to the Investigative Judgment beginning in 1844?

6. What reasons other than language and context would you suggest for applying *nitsdaq* to the services of the Day of Atonement and thus to the Investigative Judgment beginning in 1844?

This questionnaire was sent out to eight teachers of Hebrew — all of the people in all of our colleges who were teaching Hebrew at that time, to every head of a college Bible department, to several other experienced Bible teachers with whom I was personally acquainted, to four former Bible teachers who were in administrative or editorial work. Here are their names, the ones at the Seminary. Some of these, of course, were teaching Hebrew. In addition to these, Otto Christiansen, Graham Maxwell, Richard Litke, Sakai Kubo, the department heads listed here — some of those were teaching Hebrew also — and Dr. Hammill, who at that time was in the GC Dept. of Education, but he was and is a Bible scholar; Elder Jemison, who was working on a textbook on Bible doctrines; and Don Neufeld and myself, who had been working on the *Commentary*. I thought that it was appropriate that I should reply and enter my considered judgment on the subject, along with the others. In due time all of these responded to the questionnaire and here are their responses tabulated.

1. The linguistic basis for translating *nitsdaq* as cleansed. 21 of the 27 said that there is none or they didn't offer any. Five said that it is meagre evidence. And one had a very interesting reply that I thought was worthy including: The possibility of an incorrect Hebrew translation from an unknown Aramaic original. I thought that was some basis on which to base an important teaching such as 1844.
2. Why did the Septuagint translators render *nitsdaq* as *Katharizetai*? Fourteen said that they had no suggestion to offer. Eight said, well, they applied Daniel 8:14 to Antiochus. Two, they followed a putative, that is an imaginary Hebrew text, that did read cleanse. Two said that the translators of the Septuagint understood the heavenly sanctuary. (That is giving them quite a bit of credit.) One said that they had some pre-conceived theological opinion. (Well, maybe they did.) And one said it was a fortunate accident. (How do you like to have an important point of faith based upon a fortunate accident? Is that the way God works? I don't think so.)
3. The relation of *nitsdaq* to its context in verses 9 to 13. Nineteen of the 27 said that it has no relation to its context or offered no suggestion. Four said it refers to a restoration to damage done from the little horn. That is correct, of course. Four said it refers to the re-discovery of the sanctuary truth obscured by the papacy as the little horn.
4. The proposed translation of *nitsdaq* in terms of its context.
5. What linguistic or contextual reasons for applying Daniel 8:14 to the antitypical Day of Atonement, the Investigative Judgment, can you suggest? And notice that every one of them gave no linguistic or contextual reasons for the Adventist interpretations.
6. Do you have any other reasons for so applying Daniel 8:14? Thirteen said that there is no other basis or they didn't offer any basis. Seven said it is by analogy between the earthly and heavenly sanctuaries. (That is correct, of course.) Five said that the Spirit of Prophecy so applied it. Two said that it is a fortunate accident in translation. (And I shiver at thinking of my faith being based upon a fortunate accident.)

Well, as a result of this I went back to Elder Nichol with the results of the poll and didn't get any help. He took the results of the questionnaire, without the names attached to any particular responses, to Elder Figuhr, who was GC President. As a result Elder Figuhr and the

officers of the GC set up the Committee on Problems in the Book of Daniel. Here are the members of the committee, with Elder Harry Lowe as chairman. In addition to the regularly appointed members, the committee invited several people to sit with us and they were with us most of the time. It was appointed in the autumn of 1960, met first on January 4, 1962. There is quite a long interim there, but anyway that is the case. Here are the other times that we met, for a total of 16 days, in Takoma Park and Berrien Springs. I don't expect to read this through. Here is a list of the 45 papers that were presented by various members of the committee. Interestingly, Des Ford submitted some papers, although he was in Australia, and the committee considered them. Here are three of them. Then on the next page I think you will find his name occurring again at that point.

Now I would like to examine and summarize the committee's work from 1961 to 1966, when it finally adjourned *sine die*. TH stands for traditional hermeneutic. That is the historic Adventist interpretation. RH stands for re-interpretation hermeneutic. (I will explain that a little later.)

But basically, even though there was a variety of opinion on this committee, there were two fundamental points of view that came to stand out finally.

1. The majority held to the traditional hermeneutic.
2. The minority held to the re-interpretation hermeneutic.

One, the majority said Daniel 8:14 is a contextual island, that is, it has no connection with its context and is not to be interpreted in terms of its context, but by the analogy of Scripture, that is, in terms of Lev. 16, Hebrews 9, and so on. The minority said that the verse is an integral part of its context and is to be interpreted in harmony with its context, both literary and historical, with application beyond its own historical context to be made by later inspired writers.

Two, some on the committee suggested that Daniel 8:14 is apocalyptic. Well, we all agreed that Daniel 8:14 is apocalyptic, but there was a difference between the majority and minority as to the effect of apocalyptic on interpretation. The majority said that apocalyptic is not susceptible to interpretation by the usual linguistic, grammatical, contextual, historical norms. The minority of us said that these norms are as valid and necessary in dealing with apocalyptic as with other literary forms, but of course, we didn't stop there.

Three, that Daniel 8:14 is eschatological. I can hear that word ringing through the committee again and again. Well, we all agreed that Daniel 8:14 is eschatological but differed as to the nature of eschatological prophecy and its interpretation. The majority said that Old Testament eschatological prophecy was not relevant to the people or historical situation of Old Testament times, but was addressed across the centuries to God's remnant people in our times and is to be understood exclusively from our historical perspective. The minority said that Old Testament eschatological prophecy, including that of Daniel, was originally addressed to ancient Israel as the covenant people and was to have been fulfilled to them, but was later transferred, in principle, though not necessarily in every detail, to the Christian church along with the other covenant privileges, responsibilities and promises.

Four, the 2300 evening-mornings and the sanctuary in heaven. The majority finds the heavenly sanctuary in Daniel 8:14, so it seemed to me, and this is my opinion, by a process of circular reasoning that anticipates its conclusion by postulating the key factor in its conclusion, *a priori*, as its basic assumption. The minority of us accepted the heavenly

sanctuary as set forth in Hebrews and Daniel 8:14 as applicable to that sanctuary on the authority of a later inspired writer. In other words, we all came to the same conclusion, but we differed as to how we thought we could get there.

Five, as to the meaning of *nitsdaq* — cleansed or restored to its rightful state — the majority defends the KJV rendering “cleansed” as the true meaning of *nitsdaq*, despite the fact that the word is never used in that sense in all Hebrew literature, Bible or anything else. The minority accepted the meaning of *nitsdaq* as reflected throughout the Old Testament would concede perhaps “cleansed” for point of argument, but point out that this still leaves us in as much trouble as ever with the context.

Six, some on the committee emphasized what they referred to as the larger view, that is, interpretation by analogy, bringing in sanctuary in various other places in Scripture. The majority assumed that the sanctuary in Daniel 8:14 is the same described in the book of Hebrews. Defines its cleansing by analogy with the Day of Atonement ritual in the ancient sanctuary in Lev. 16. The minority recognizes the validity of analogy, but affirms that the analogous character of another passage of Scripture must first be established on the basis that the context in both instances justifies that analogy.

Seven, predictive prophecy and the divine purpose. The majority assumed divine foreknowledge and/or foreordination as the basic elements of predictive prophecy and reasoned that such predictions are therefore absolute, unconditional and not subject to modification under changed historical circumstances. We suggested that we assume that predictive prophecy is a function of the divine purpose. It is not a categorical prediction of the future, but it is a statement, a declaration of the divine purpose, that God's ultimate purpose is unconditional, but that His intermediate purpose with respect to the people through whom, the means by which the time when His ultimate purpose will be accomplished are always conditional upon the response and cooperation of those whom He calls into covenant relationship with Himself.

Last of all, How did the committee summing up its discussions relate to the exegetical problems? The majority said that the Adventist interpretation can be established satisfactorily on the basis of the assumptions mentioned and that problems, if any, should be forgotten and that the committee should prepare a report that will strengthen the faith of our people in the traditional interpretation. Now I am not putting words in anybody's mouth, but several on the committee expressed that and I am simply quoting the majority of the committee here. The minority said that to ignore the problems would be a tacit admission that we had no answers for them. Remember that the name of the committee was the Committee on Problems in the Book of Daniel, and the majority was suggesting that we forget the problems and not say anything about them, and make the committee appear naive and foolish to knowledgeable SDAs and biblically literate non-SDAs.

We made four different suggestions as to a report that we would feel clear about. The majority wanted us to sign our names to a report that wouldn't even mention the problems in the book of Daniel and we couldn't conscientiously do that.

Well, our first suggestion was that we deal fairly with the problems and set forth both points of view. Well, the majority didn't want that.

So we came up with a second suggestion that the report of the committee be published without the names of the committee members attached to it. Well, they didn't want that. They wanted our names attached to it.

Three, we suggested that members submit their papers for publication under their own names only. OK.

Four, the minority should be permitted to withdraw from the committee in order that the majority may issue a unanimous report in keeping with its wishes. We offered to step outside the door while they took a vote so that it could be unanimous. Or, if they insisted, we were ready to withdraw from the committee completely.

Well, none of these suggestions were acceptable to the majority so the committee adjourned *sine die* and made no report after working for five full years on the subject.

Let's look at the problem in Daniel 8:14 and bring it into sharp focus.

1. Contextually, the evenings and mornings are the evening and morning continual burnt offerings or regular daily ritual services of the sanctuary, not the light and dark parts of the day. With two such services conducted each day, one in the morning and one in the evening, the 2300 of them would span 1150 twenty-four hour days. Not 2300!
2. Nowhere in Scripture is the day for a year concept either stated or implied as a norm for interpreting prophetic time periods. The two texts that we usually refer to are in no way analogous to Daniel 8:14. I will explain on the slide why. In numerous time prophecies the context specifies literal time. There is no indication in Scripture of the day-year principle. In fact, the first time that we come to it in all literature, so far as I know, is the Jewish scholar Maimonides about the 13th century who comes up with that idea. In chapter 9 the angel tells Daniel that the decree initiating the 70 weeks went forth when he began to pray, verse 23. Chapter 9:23. Furthermore, chapter 9 assigns the little horn to the 70th of the 70 weeks of years and locates the omission of the 2300 evening and morning sacrifices within the 1260 days of the last half of the 70th week.
3. The key assumption that the 2300 days reached far beyond the destruction of the temple in A.D. 70, thus justifying a transition from the earthly to the heavenly sanctuary is without Biblical validity. Inspiration placed the prophetic messages of Daniel within the context of the historical portion of the book with ancient Israel as the chosen people. If indeed, inspiration intended a different application in verse 14, why is there no clear positive statement to this effect anywhere in the Bible? To have given Daniel this prediction within the historical context to which it did not apply, with no warning that it was to meet its fulfilment far beyond that historical context would inevitably mislead and confuse the Jewish reader. The Old Testament knows nothing of a sanctuary in heaven. And it is not valid exegesis to read the New Testament concept of a heavenly sanctuary back into the Old Testament historical context with its earthly sanctuary.
4. *Nitsdaq* does not mean cleansed and never occurs in this sense in all Hebrew literature. Furthermore, it is never used in connection with the daily ritual service, the Day of Atonement ritual service or the remission of sins. The concept that the ancient Day of Atonement ritual has a counterpart in the heavenly sanctuary — that Daniel 8:14 envisions the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary, and an antitypical Day of Atonement by removal of the confessed sins of God's contrite people, the final act in an Investigative Judgment is based upon an analogy the inspired Bible writers themselves never draw, either explicitly or implicitly.

The context of Daniel 8:14 attributes the defiling of the sanctuary to the little horn. SDA's interpretation attributes it to the transfer of confessed sins to the heavenly sanctuary by the

priestly ministry of Christ. To pretend to ourselves that the SDA interpretation reads Daniel 8:14 in context then would thus be to identify the little horn as Christ. In other words, we can't have both context and the Adventist interpretation in so far as the Bible itself is concerned. Similarly in chapter 9:27 we attribute the cessation of sacrifice in offering to Christ's death on the cross. Whereas context equates it with the little horn taking away the continual burnt offering in chapter 8:11-13.

By this time you are wondering if I am a Seventh-day Adventist? I would like to affirm right now that I am a fourth generation SDA. I believe in the Adventist interpretation of Daniel 8:14, so we are not through quite yet.

5. Christ and the New Testament writers re-interpret Daniel. And we could take a study of Daniel 24 and show that Christ is not simply applying what Daniel wrote. He is re-interpreting in a new historical situation.
6. Ellen White re-interprets Daniel for our time. And because I fully believe and am convinced that God spoke to and through Ellen White, and I accept her writings 100%. I accept her re-interpretation, her approval of the Adventist interpretation of the heavenly sanctuary, the Investigative Judgment, 1844, because I accept her as an inspired writer. And so Daniel is very closely related to the Advent message and we can have full confidence both in the contextual facts in the book of Daniel and their application to the Jewish people in ancient times as God's purpose would have been worked out had they been faithful. But because Christ didn't come and His kingdom has not been set up and we believe that it will yet be set up at the coming of Christ, obviously there must be some fulfilment in the future, and Ellen White points out to us what that fulfilment will be, and so we recognize both the contextual interpretation and the re-interpretation by New Testament writers and Ellen White bringing to us what God would have us understand in our time.

★ ★ ★

It should not be assumed that Dr. Cottrell agrees with everything Desmond Ford has said or written on Dan. 8:14. He does not. In general, he probably agrees with most of what Ford has set forth regarding the problem, but chooses a different solution. Similarly, it must not be assumed that Ford interprets the Scriptural passages identically to Dr. Cottrell. — (D. Ford.)

★ ★ ★

APPENDIX TWENTY

The Conditional Nature Of The Time Of The Advent

The Conditional Nature Of The Time Of The Advent

Fairburn says: “Thus, to refer to the predictions ... respecting the second advent of the Lord — there can be no doubt, that (however definitely fixed in the counsels of Heaven) certain things among men are represented as tending, on the one side to hinder, on the other to forward its approach. Our Lord, in one of his parables (Luke xviii.1-8), speaks as if it hung on the steadfast faith and persevering prayer of his elect people. St. Peter uses still stronger language; he exhorts believers to a hopeful, godly and consistent life, that they might hasten on the day of the Lord’s coming, (for such is the plain import of his words, ... 2 Pet. iii.12). And St. Paul not only speaks of a grand development of apostacy (sic) necessarily preceding the arrival of that day, but of certain things, which he does not further characterize, hindering this development, and by implication retarding the personal appearance of the Lord, which in the chain of providences was to be subsequent to the other.” *The Interpretation of Prophecy* (Edinburgh, 1956), pp. 64-65. Fairbairn then spells out his belief for the reason of the delay of the Parousia. “... for the church being then in the full springtide of its life and blessing, burning with holy zeal for the proper fulfilment of its mission, it might well seem, as if that mission were hastening to its accomplishment, and all things were becoming ready for the final harvest of the world. Yet, it must have been impossible for any one to read with care some of the parables of our Lord, or even what was written by St. Paul of the great apostacy (sic) ... without coming to the conviction, that there was still an implied alternative; namely, that if the church of Christ should degenerate in her course, if she should begin to slumber in the work given her to do, still more, if she should become adulterated by the carnal spirit, and the corrupt practices of the world, then the shadows of the evening should need to be lengthened out, and ... the Lord should have to protract the day of His appearing.” *Ibid.*, p. 65. Fairbairn gives several examples from Scripture in support of his thesis. He reminds us, for example, that Christ promised the Twelve (including Judas!) that they would one day sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel — a statement apparently as absolute as Mark 13:30.

APPENDIX TWENTY-ONE

The Year-Day Principle



Desmond Ford

Bible Teacher
Australasian
Missionary College
Avondale

The Year-Day Principle

(Part 1)

The Seventh-day Adventist claim to divine sponsorship largely rests upon the significance of the date 1844. This date, in turn, for its location as the terminus of the 2300 days, depends upon the reliability of the year-day principle. While most Adventists accept this principle of prophetic exegesis without question, our critics are neither so naive nor as accommodating. They ask of us, “What have the historical records — that is, Numbers 34 and Ezekiel 4 — to do with the apocalyptic symbolism of Daniel and Revelation?” Furthermore, they point out that neither Daniel nor Revelation make any statement regarding a day being the chosen symbol in prophecy for a year. Typical of our critics is Norman F. Douty who says:

Based upon the fallacious year-day theory and interpreting literal periods of time symbolically, it involves, among many others, two major errors: the ascription of prophetic significance to the year 1844 and the claim that the Adventist movement fulfils the symbolism of the flying angels of Rev. 14 ... Its exponents speak with a tone of finality that few will think justified.¹

In answer to such accusations, let us glance afresh at the evidence that supports the historical mode of interpreting the time periods of Daniel and Revelation.

The time-honoured formula for the year-day principle is that set out by T.R. Birks in his book *First Elements of Sacred*

Prophecy and quoted by our own *Source Book for Bible Students*, pp. 585, 586 (1919 edition). It reads as follows:

A recent book by Norman F. Doty, *Another Look at Seventh-day Adventism*, attacks what he calls “the fallacious year-day theory,” which is basic in Seventh-day Adventist prophetic chronology. Desmond Ford, head of our Australasian Missionary College Bible department, here answers Douty on this important year-day principle of interpretation. We are sure our ministers will find this a timely and helpful article. — Editors.

Year-Day Principle, General Nature of. — It may be summed up in these maxims:

1. That the church, after the ascension of Christ, was intended of God to be kept in the lively expectation of His speedy return in glory.
2. That, in the divine counsels, a long period of nearly two thousand years was to intervene between the first and the second advent, and to be marked by a dispensation of grace to the Gentiles.
3. That, in order to strengthen the faith and hope of the church under the long delay, a large part of the whole interval was prophetically announced, but in such a manner that its true length might not be understood, till its own close seemed to be drawing near.
4. That, in the symbolical prophecies of Daniel and St. John, other times were revealed along with this, and included under one common maxim of interpretation.
5. That the periods thus figuratively revealed are exclusively those in Daniel and St. John, which relate to the general history of the church between the time of the prophet and the second advent.
6. That, in these predictions, each day represents a natural year, as in the vision of Ezekiel; that a month denotes thirty, and a time three hundred and sixty years. — Rev. T.R. Birks, *First Elements of Sacred Prophecy* (London: William Edward Painter, 1843), p. 311.

This statement recommends itself to a candid mind, but some may be led to inquire, “Is this all that can be said?” The purpose of this article is to make some additional observations on the matter, and these will now be set forth in point fashion.²

1. *The time prophecies are essential parts of two Bible books that God Himself has urged us to understand.* Daniel, for example, is the only Old Testament book concerning which we have record of Christ Himself urging its specific study (Matt. 24:15), and the Apocalypse opens with a divine blessing upon both “he that readeth” and “they that hear.” We are assured by the Sacred Record that all the “sealed” portions of Daniel’s prophecy would be understood by the wise “in the time of the end,” and the situation would need to be similar regarding those prophecies in the Revelation that are so closely allied to Daniel’s. Understanding of both, including the time periods, would of necessity eventuate together, and it is *the time periods particularly* that are referred to in Scripture as being sealed until the latter days. Compare Dan. 8:26; 12:4; Acts 1:7.) That God should require His church to gain an understanding of the eschatological portions of His Word with the exception of the time periods is not likely. They too were written “for our learning” (Rom. 15:4).

2. *The time periods in more than one place are announced amid settings of particular solemnity.* In three instances we find Christ Himself as the Revelator of the time messages. (Compare Dan. 8:11-14, Dan. 10:5,6, and Dan. 12:6, 7 with Rev. 1:13-16.) The theme in each instance is likewise impressive. The context of the 2300 days, the 1290, and the 1335 days stresses the cataclysmic events associated with the close of the great controversy between Christ and Satan. (See Dan. 8:17, 25, 26; 12:3, 4, 9-13.) Therefore Bible students have ample encouragement for regarding these prophetic periods as significant and important aspects of revelation rather than as mere imagery or “drapery.”

3. *The preceding point regarding the divinely indicated importance of the prophetic times finds support in the abundant evidence for the fact that ordinary “days” cannot be here intended by these prophecies.* As the visions themselves embrace comprehensive rather than trifling themes, so the time periods emphasized are symbolic of extensive rather than limited eras. Points *a, b, c*, which follow, support this conclusion.

a. The visions, including the time periods, are obviously symbolic, but *the basic symbolism employed in each instance has definite ascertainable significance.* In Daniel 2, for example, the four metals of the image are identified as signifying four kingdoms. Likewise the four beasts of Daniel 7 are interpreted as representing four kingdoms. Thus the time periods incorporated in such prophecies must, as with the other features, be of necessity symbolic rather than literal, and capable of elucidation.

b. *The peculiar way in which the time periods in Daniel and Revelation are expressed also indicates that they must apply symbolically.* Consider, for example, the “time and times and the dividing of time” of Daniel 7:25. Why is it phrased this peculiar way if it refers but to three and one-half years? In two other places this interval occurs in Scripture, and in both these cases it is expressed by its natural phrase “three years and six months.” (See Luke 4:25 and James 5:17.) This is true in every similar case. Paul remained at Corinth “a year and six months” (Acts 18:11). David reigned in Hebron “seven years and six months” (2 Sam. 2:11). He is described as being in the Philistine camp “a full year and four months” (1 Sam. 27:7). How different from these cases is the expression “a time and times and the dividing of time”! The year-day theory would require that the symbol be expressed in such a way as to indicate that it is not to be taken literally. Does not Daniel 7:25 do this admirably?

The different expressions used to denote the same period are an added proof that the time, times, and a half of Dan. 7:25 cannot represent three natural years and a half. Twice it is mentioned as a time, times, and a dividing of time: once as a time, times, and a half; twice as forty-two months; and twice as 1260 days. By comparing the context in each case, the evidence is that all these apply to the same period. But the natural expression of “three years and six months” is not once used. Obviously, God is indicating the symbolic nature of the expressions.

The Holy Spirit seems, in a manner, to exhaust all the phrases by which the interval could be expressed, excluding always that one form, which would be used of course in ordinary writing, and is used invariably in Scripture on other occasions, to denote the literal period. This variation is most significant, if we accept the year-day system, but quite inexplicable on the other view.³

The case is similar with the next great time period — the 2300 days. Is this expressed in the normal way for an ordinary literal period of time? Quite the reverse. To use a marginal reading of Daniel 8:14, “Unto two thousand and three hundred evening morning; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.” This is certainly not the usual and literal expression for a period of between six and seven years. *There are only three instances in all Bible history where a period beyond forty days is expressed in days only, and it is absolutely without precedent in Scripture that periods of more than one year should be thus described* (Gen. 7:4; Neh. 6:15; Esther 1:4).

c. *The context of both Daniel 7 and 8 forbid the idea that the periods mentioned could be literal.* In the first case the little horn emerges from the fourth world empire and endures till the time of the judgment and the Advent; and Dan. 7:25 declares that the period of “a time and times and the dividing of time” extends over most of this period. How impossible this would be if three and one half years only were intended! Similarly in Daniel 8:17, the prophet is told that the 2300 days would extend from the restoration of the sanctuary until “the time of the end.” This means that a period of approximately 2300 years is involved. The treading down of the sanctuary brought to view in Daniel 8:11-13 could not begin before the restoration spoken of in Daniel 9:25, in the fifth century B.C. And besides this, its terminus is expressly stated as belonging to the latter days, just prior to the final proclamation of the gospel by the “wise.” (See Daniel 12:3, 4.) *It has been largely overlooked by our critics that Daniel 8:17, when linked with Daniel 12:3, 9, 10, 13, makes it conclusive that the 2300 days covers many centuries.* Likewise, in Revelation 12 the 42 months cover the greater part of the time between the first and second advents when the church would be in the wilderness of persecution during the Dark Ages. This is granted by almost all expositors.

4. *Inasmuch as short-lived beasts are employed as symbols of long-existent empires, it is most likely that the times mentioned are also presented to scale, with a small time unit representing a larger one.*

5. *The one measure of time commonly used by man which is not employed in the time symbolisms of Daniel and Revelation is that of a year.* Days, weeks, and months are referred to 1260 days, 70 weeks, 42 months), but the ordinary word for year is not found.⁴ Instead, the Hebrew word *meced* is the basic term employed (Dan. 12:7). This term, translated “a time,” does not have for its usual meaning “a year.” The word occurs often in the Old Testament and is used to designate periods of different lengths. The first occasion it is used is in Genesis 1:14: “Let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days, and years.” The word is often

used to state the appointed time of all the feasts of the law. (See Lev. 23:2, 4, 37, 44; Num. 9:2, 3, 7, 13; et cetera.) The Greek *kaipous* of Revelation 12:14 is likewise indefinite. The most obvious explanation of this omission of the usual word for year in the symbolism of time duration in Daniel and in Revelation, while the other calendar terms **are** found, is that the year is the measure typified throughout these prophecies and that the day, the smallest of the symbolic calendar times, is employed to represent it. There is a natural appropriateness in the year-day principle being chosen by the Creator when we remember that there are two great revolutions of the earth, one on its axis occupying twenty-four hours, which gives rise to the “day,” and the other the earth in its orbit occupying 365 days, which gives rise to the “year.” It is appropriate indeed that the lesser should be used as symbolic of the greater.

¹ Norman F. Douty, *Another Look at Seventh-day Adventism* (Michigan: Baker Book House, 1962), pp. 102, 103.

² The writer *acknowledges* his indebtedness to T.R. Birks and to H.G. Guinness for several of these points. Because such works as *First Elements of Sacred Prophecy* and *The Approaching End of the Age* are now difficult to procure, this emphasis on some matters set forth therein may not be amiss.

³ T.R. Birks, *First Elements of Sacred Prophecy* (London: William Edward Painter, 1843), p. 352.

⁴ The Hebrew preposition *lamed*, translated “at” in this verse, would be better translated as it is elsewhere in this chapter, namely “unto.” The sense “at” or “it” fits *lamed* nowhere in this vision: e.g. “toward, or unto, the four winds of heaven” (v. 8: “unto that certain saint which spake” the *lamed* associated with “the vision” in v. 26 as “at,” for it would be senseless. Its meaning is “unto,” and the same can be said of v. 17. Compare also Dan. 4:11 and Deut. 16:4. In harmony with this is the promise that Daniel shall stand in his lot for judgment and reward at “the end of the days” under discussion. This fact alone makes it certain that the prophetic times of Daniel extend until the latter times.

⁵ The Greek of Rev. 9:15 suggests that a point of time rather than a period is here referred to. See modern translations and *The SDA Bible Commentary*, vol. 7, pp. 793, 796, 856, 857.

(To be continued)

June, 1964

THE MINISTRY

The Year-Day Principle*

(Concluded)

Next we are led to inquire whether there are any indications in the rest of the Scriptures that God has ever chosen such symbolism. In Numbers 14:35 and Ezekiel 4:6 we find evidence that such is the case. *On the other occasions God has chosen to use precisely this symbolism, and one of these occasions was during the time of Daniel’s captivity and its use was in connection with a contemporary prophet.* Therefore, that God should use the same symbolism in apocalyptic prophecy is not surprising.

6. *The pragmatic test should now be applied, and the question asked, “Have any of Daniel’s prophecies already met with a precise fulfilment that accords with the principle we are studying?”* Daniel 9: 24-27, the prophecy of the 70 weeks, seems to offer just such a fulfilment. While the Hebrew word here for weeks, *shabua*, simply means a hebdomad, nevertheless the scriptural usage of this term is ever for a week of days. (It is not used, for example, in Leviticus 25:1-10 for this seven-year period.) See Gen. 29:27, 28; Dan. 10:2; Eze. 45:21, et cetera. Inasmuch as other evidence shows that this period of 490 years reaching to the Messiah is cut off from the longer period of the 2300, it is obvious that the latter must consist of years also. Thus here in Daniel 9 we have the pragmatic test met and the year-day principle justified, despite the fact that the word *day* is nowhere used in this passage.⁶

7. *Another testimony that should not be omitted is that found in Revelation 10:5-7.* Here we read: “And the angel which I saw stand upon the sea and upon the earth lifted up his hand to

heaven, and swear by him that liveth for ever and ever, ... that there should be time no longer: but in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound, the mystery of

*The first part of this challenging presentation appeared in the last issue. In order to get the full impact of this author's thesis it would be wise to study these two sections together. We are assured our readers will appreciate the research Dr. Ford has made in this important area of prophetic truth. — Editor.

God should be finished.” Every Bible margin refers the reader from this passage to Daniel 12:6, 7. It is obvious that the first quotation refers to the second one, and in so doing it shows clearly that *the time periods alluded to in the passage quoted from Daniel still had their fulfilment centuries ahead from John the Revelator's prophecy, and that they would reach to the time of the end when “there should be time no longer” and “the mystery of God should be finished.”* Similarly, Revelation 11:2 quotes from Daniel 8:14, indicating that the fulfilment of the 2300 days was projected well into the Christian Age. Only the year-day principle applied to Daniel's period could make these New Testament fulfilments possible, provided that these periods were meant to be as specific as other Bible periods, such as the 120 years before the Flood, or the 450 years concerning Abraham's seed, or the 40 years of wandering in the wilderness.

8. *The principle of repetition and enlargement that characterizes the prophecies of Daniel and Revelation also casts light on the time periods employed in these books.* It is obvious to any unbiased reader of Daniel that the seventh chapter covers the same ground as the second. Similarly, chapter eight again traverses the world empires. Even naming two of those first mentioned in the first outline of Daniel 2. Daniel 8 finishes with the destruction of the wicked by the stone cut out “without hands” as does Daniel 2. As certainly as the fourth empire is pictured as remaining in its fragmentary state till the Second Advent, so it is with the little horn of Daniel 8.

Furthermore, the fourth outline in Daniel, that of chapters eleven and twelve, again covers the identical ground of chapters two, seven, and eight. The description found in Daniel 11:31-45 clearly accords with Daniel 8:11-13, 23-25. The final chapter of Daniel gives in greater detail what is found in verses 44 and 45 of chapter two. *Thus in order to interpret the period mentioned in Daniel 8:41 it is essential that we take into consideration the fact that the chief power prominent for the 2300 days is represented in Daniel 11 as enduring until the kingdom of God is set up.* The inadequacy of interpreting, therefore, the 2300 evening-mornings as days only during the Maccabeus era is apparent.

Let us now consider one or two specific objections to the year-day principle. Evangelical scholars for whom we have respect, such as Edward J. Young, assert that prophetic periods are symbolic only. In answer we would quote Nathanael West:

Even granting that prophetic numbers are symbolic and schematic, IT DOES NOT FOLLOW that they have no temporal value. The fact that they represent an “IDEA” — and no one denies this — does not prove that they do not represent “time” also.

And in another place this writer says:

The prophetic numbers are symbolical only because, first of all, they are literal. The four hundred years DID begin and end. The seventy years DID begin and end. The one thousand years SHALL begin and end. All are spoken of in the same way. The seven weeks, and sixty-two weeks, DID begin and end ... Messiah DID come “after threescore and two weeks,” and “seven weeks.” “After” “until,” “unto” in answer to the question, “How long?” and “O my Lord, When?” ARE chronological.

Another objection to the year-day prophecy should here be considered. This is that there have been so many different dates set for the conclusion of the time periods, and thus obviously, the majority of them wrong, that therefore such a hazy method of conveying truth could not come from God. Notice the well-worded objection of Thomas Maitland regarding the 1260 days:

If such an event as this [the delivery of the saints into the hands of the blasphemous and persecuting power] has taken place, is it possible that the Church of God can be at a loss to decide *when* and *how* it happened? Can there be a difference of opinion among pious, and learned, and laborious inquirers into the Word of God and the history of the Church? Nay, further we ask — “Is the Church at this moment in the hands of the blasphemous little horn, or is it not?” Mr. Faber, and many more, assert that it is. Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Frere, and others, are as fully convinced that it is not. And 9/10ths of the Christian world stand silent, avowedly unable to give an opinion on the subject.⁷ ... When did the saints find out that they had been delivered over, not for ages. Is this credible? But, in fact, when did it happen? ... On this point, too, there is a great difference of opinion ...⁸

What shall we say about this objection? Birks, in his day, affirmed that we should say that the objection is a plausible one, but that it assumes that which it sets out to prove — namely that the prophecy was of no help to the church unless all its members accurately located its application. However, if the prophecy was given for the church throughout many generations, to reveal a dangerous opposer and to give light in regard to the moral features of divine providences through many centuries of time, then it is clear that all these purposes could be fulfilled even if the exact application was not seen for several generations. And, likewise, if mistakes of even a century or more were made at first in the date of the event. All the main features and practical lessons would still be substantially the same, just as surely as the features and character of a person could be well known even though we were a few years in error as to the date of his birth.

A parallel case pointed out by Birks is the revelation made to Abraham regarding his seed sojourning for 400 years and enduring persecution. It cannot be proved that the seed of Abraham did actually serve and were afflicted by a strange nation during the whole of the 400 years. Similarly, during the 1260 years, while a precise period was intended, the recognition of that time by the church could be more definitely recognized by the people of God during part of that time rather than during the whole. And, lastly, it should be remembered that the maxims already declared to be the foundation of the year-day system actually demanded the situation that the critic presents. We would expect successive anticipation, for example, as to the dates involved. Only by such gradual approach to the correct view could the two main purposes have been fulfilled — growing understanding of the prophecy, and a constant and unbroken anticipation of the Lord’s coming. Maitland’s objection assumes that the church must either be in total ignorance of the times, or come at once into full possession of perfect knowledge. All analogies of the church’s past, and even of individual Christian experiences, declare such an objection false.

As the author of *First Elements of Sacred Prophecy* has well said, there are only three alternatives God could have adopted with reference to revelation of the times and seasons to His church. He could keep the church in total ignorance till the end; or translate it suddenly from complete ignorance to complete knowledge, or, third, give gradually increasing light, till at length the sun of righteousness actually arose. Suppose God had adopted the first alternative and had given the church nothing but the most general statements for her guide

through the centuries? As century after century passed, would not believers have been lulled into slumber, believing that the return of the Master was a vague, indefinite possibility, infinitely afar off? After ten centuries of waiting could not the church rationally assume that there could quite easily be ten centuries more of waiting, and therefore relax? Each generation would have had a still weaker expectation of the Advent.

Consider the next possibility — that the light be given suddenly in its completeness. How then could the church fulfil the instruction, “Watch and pray; for ye know not what the time is”? The testimony of the ages is that always, and on every subject, the increase of knowledge has been gradual. “Many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased.” The gradual unfolding of the light of prophecy, the third possibility of revelation, is in exact accord with God’s purpose of sustaining His church in anticipation of His return.

The believer in the year-day principle has just as much evidence of truth of this belief as he could expect. He will admit that objections can be raised to the theory but realizes that these are few compared with the objections that can be raised to the rejection of the principle. Truth here, as in every other philosophical matter, is determined by the weight of evidence. Undoubtedly the scales are well down on the side of the historical interpreters of the ages who represent more of the church invisible than any other interpretative group. Thus Seventh-day Adventists find themselves in good company in their application to years of prophecies of the 1260 and the 2300 days. Among evangelicals, those who literalize the time periods are for the most part dispensationalists, and their attitude in this matter is part and parcel of their erroneous literalistic and futuristic exegesis of the Old Testament and the book of Revelation.⁹

It should be noted that the prophetic times are the most certain identifiers of the nearness of Christ’s coming that the Scripture affords. It is doubtful that any of the other signs customarily quoted are nearly as conclusive. Without the time prophecies we would be left to wonder whether the world had yet another weary millennium or two to endure before Christ appears to banish sin and sorrow.

To quote Birks once more:

That entire rejection of all prophetic chronology, which follows, of course, on the denial of the year-day, is most of all to be deplored, from its deadly and paralysing influence on the great hope of the church ... The prophetic times, indeed, when separated from the context, and viewed in themselves only, are a dry and worthless skeleton; but when taken in connection with the related events, clothed with historical facts, and joined with those spiritual affections which should attend the study of God’s Providences; like the bones in the human frame, they give strength to what was feeble, and union to what was disjointed, and form, and beauty, and order, to the whole outline and substance of these sacred and divine prophecies.¹⁰

⁶ It is a fact that the Hebrew term here employed for “weeks” does not of itself necessarily mean seven days. But neither does it *of itself* mean seven years. Furthermore, in every other case of scriptural usage it is associated with the former and not the latter. This being the case, how very appropriate is its employment in Daniel 9 where part of the symbolism of Daniel 8 is being interpreted. A word is chosen that harmonizes both with the symbolic “evening-mornings” of Daniel 8:14, and with its literal application of years. Daniel 9 supports the year-day principle, not just as it stands by the evidence of the chapter alone, but by virtue of its connection with Daniel 8. It is not proposed here to review the well-known evidences of this connection but we would point out one feature of linkage between the two that is often overlooked. Both chapters are vitally concerned with the future of the sanctuary. Daniel 8 by its references to the daily, the “evening-mornings” (burnt offerings), the sacrificial animals — ram and the he-goat (in contrast to the animals of Daniel 7) and the naming of the sanctuary itself as well as a technical term for the Temple service (*tzaba*, Num. 4:23) — clearly evidences its theme. But Daniel 9 does similarly: (1) it includes a prayer concerning the restoration of the sanctuary, (2) it specifically names the time of this prayer as being an hour of particular importance in the sanctuary ritual, (3) it points to the anointing of the sanctuary’s high priest and of the Most Holy itself (that is, the antitypical priest and sanctuary in each instance), (4) it predicts the end of the typical

sanctuary services when the offering and the oblation would be made to cease by meeting their fulfilment, (5) the sanctuary key term “atonement” is employed (verse 25), (6) the destruction of the typical sanctuary is foretold.

Thus it is no arbitrary exegesis which asserts that Daniel 9 is a logical continuation and explanation of Daniel 8, and which makes the seventy weeks a part of the 2300 days.

⁷ Nathanael West, *The Thousand Years in Both Testaments*, pp. 94, 98, 99.

⁸ T. Maitland, *Inquiry Into the Nature of the Prophetic Times*, pp. 53, 76.

⁹ See *Prophecy and the Church*, Oswald Allis (Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reform Pub. Co., 1945), p. 19.

¹⁰ T.R. Birks, *First Elements of Sacred Prophecy* (London: “William Edward Painter, 1843), pp. 415, 416.

July, 1964

THE MINISTRY

APPENDIX TWENTY-TWO

Daniel 8 — Its Relationship To The Kingdom Of God

Daniel 8 — Its Relationship to the Kingdom of God

DESMOND FORD

Bible Department, Australasian Missionary College

[In many parts of the world our men are digging deeply into the prophetic word, in harmony with God's purpose. In the book *Evangelism*, page 198, we read: "Increased light will shine upon all the grand truths of prophecy, and they will be seen in freshness and brilliancy, because the bright beams of the Sun of Righteousness will illuminate the whole."

With this thrilling promise in mind we present this article as a stimulus to deeper study of some familiar prophecies. — Editors.]

SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS stand almost alone today in affirming that the prophecy of Daniel 8 has special significance for the church in this generation. More than a century ago expositors of many countries and creeds affirmed a similar position, but undoubtedly the majority of commentators throughout the Christian Era have applied the little-horn symbol to the times of the Maccabees, or to Antiochus Epiphanes, as a type of antichrist. If Seventh-day Adventists are to maintain their traditional position regarding the latter-day application of this prophecy, every possible clue to interpretation must be studied and used.

It is the suggestion of this article that a primary key to the interpretation of Daniel 8 has been neglected, and now requires recovery and application. This key consists of the dominant theme of the whole book as suggested not only by its contents but by its historical context.

Daniel 8:14 has too often been considered virtually on its own, and its setting in the whole book, and as regards the times of the book, has been almost universally overlooked. The taking away of the daily ministration and the treading down of the sanctuary as well as its promised vindication is not just the theme of this eighth chapter, it is the theme of the entire book. This prophetic volume was written at a time when it seemed that God's kingdom on earth had crumbled. The sanctuary at Jerusalem, the earthly centre of the theocratic kingdom, had been trodden underfoot by the Babylonians. The daily sacrifice had been suspended and the host of worshipers carried away into bondage. At this time the heathen were in evident supremacy, while the people who were the possessors of God's truth seemed but the offscouring of the earth. From all earthly appearances, prospects of restoration for God's kingdom in Israel, as symbolized by the sanctuary services, seemed slight indeed. At such a time God inspired the captive Daniel (whose name means "God is the Judge") to foretell His final judgments and the restoration of His kingdom to the saints. To the sorrowing prophet, who had ever before him the vision of the desecrated sanctuary site at Jerusalem, God gave other visions promising the vindication of all that was symbolized by the sacred Temple. Thus the history of Israel's earthly sanctuary is used as a microcosm in which the agelong controversy between good and evil is illustrated. It represents God's kingdom on earth apparently overshadowed by evil but finally to be vindicated.

It is not by chance that the book of Daniel begins and ends with reference to the attacks of wicked powers upon the church and sanctuary of God (Dan. 1:1, 2; 11:31, 45). These references to the apparent success of wicked powers in the great conflict between good and evil give point to the dominant motif of the whole book, which is the eventual vindication of God's truth and people, as manifested in the setting up of the eternal kingdom of heaven and the preceding destruction of its opposers. No prophecy of Daniel can be fully interpreted without recognizing this emphasis on the establishment of the kingdom of God. Any interpretation that would limit the fulfilment of any of these visions to Maccabean times

rather than to the “time of the end” is entirely out of harmony with the context and theme of the prophecy. Each and every vision given to the exiled prophet climaxed in a view of God’s kingdom or the events that would usher it in. Therefore, let us consider some key verses of Daniel that make it very plain that Daniel 8:14 is but one facet of a theme traceable through the whole book.

“In the third year of the reign of Jehoiakim king of Judah came Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon into Jerusalem, and besieged it. And the Lord gave Jehoiakim king of Judah into his hand, with part of the vessels of the house of God” (Dan. 1:1, 2).

Here is Daniel’s introductory picture of history relating to the suspension of the sanctuary services due to the invasion of Babylon. Daniel mentions only the first capture of Jerusalem by Babylon, but this event was the beginning of the end. At this time the smaller golden vessels of the sanctuary were removed to Nebuchadnezzar’s temple as trophies of his victory. Probably these included the golden candlesticks and the ark, and thus the sanctuary of Jerusalem remained but a shell. The final dissolution of its services eighteen years later occurred when the glorious Temple of Solomon was burned to the ground. It is hardly possible to conceive of the stunning nature of this blow to Israel. To the devout Israelite the triumph of evil seemed complete. The sanctuary of God, the dwelling place of the Shekinah, had been desecrated, and the daily sacrifices pointing to the coming Messiah had been taken away. In addition to this, the guardians of the oracles of God were in chains. Truth, therefore, had been cast down to the ground, and the host was being trodden underfoot.

Thus in the opening verses of Daniel we have the historical embryo of the prophecy concerning the work of the little horn described in Daniel 8:9-14. It cannot be affirmed too strongly that we also have here the key to the whole book. Many Bible students have remarked on the frequency with which the introductions to various Bible books provide the clue for the interpretation of the subsequent matter. It is certainly so in this case. In view of the apparent crumbling of God’s visible kingdom on earth, epitomized by the mysteries of the sanctuary, the captive prophet is now given visions that foretell the vindication of truth and its believers and the final establishment of God’s eternal kingdom. An integral part of this theme is the destruction of wicked powers and thus their prominence in each vision, which is climaxed by the victory of the kingdom of truth and righteousness.

Consider now the various chapters of Daniel in the light of this theme, paying special attention to the verses relative to the vindication of God’s people, judgments upon the wicked, and the setting up of God’s kingdom.

Chapter 2 climaxes in verse 44: “And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever.”

In Daniel 3 the same theme is discernible although it is not quite so obvious. Here is a vignette of Israel’s experience — oppression of the saints by a heathen power, apparent supremacy of false worship, impending destruction of the true worshipers of Jehovah, but finally their vindication and deliverance accompanied by judgment of the wicked (verses 25-30).

In chapter 4 “a watcher and an holy one ... from heaven” (verse 13) is described as decreeing judgment upon “those that walk in pride” (verse 37). The purpose of these events is described in verse 17 — “to the intent that the living may know that the most High ruleth.”

Chapter 5 is similar, with its description of Heaven's decree of judgment upon the heathen who polluted the sacred vessels of the Temple. Note the emphasis given to the sanctuary in verse 3. "Then they brought the golden vessels that were taken out of the temple of the house of God." Then verse 5 declares, "In the same hour came forth fingers of a man's hand, and wrote over against the candlestick upon the plaister of the wall of the king's palace." Some commentators — for example, Barnes — believe the candlestick here mentioned to be the one taken from the sanctuary and that the reference to the writing being inscribed nearby was to denote that the coming judgment was because of the sacrilege connected with the profaning of the sacred Temple vessels.

In chapter 6 we have a repetition of the theme of chapter 3. Here again we have war upon the saints, false worship exalted, and then God's intervention to save His own, accompanied by the destruction of the wicked. The God of Daniel is acknowledged by the heathen King as "the living God, and stedfast for ever, and his kingdom that which shall be destroyed, and his dominion shall be even unto the end" (verse 26).

In Daniel 7 we have projected into the future a large-scale enactment of the persecutions Daniel witnessed during Babylon's opposition to Israel and Israel's God. The climax is reached in verses 25-28, where the 1260 years of papal supremacy is brought to view: "And he shall speak great words against the most High, and shall wear out the saints of the most High, and think to change times and laws: and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time. But the judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion, to consume and to destroy it unto the end. And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him." Once more the stress is upon the vindication of the saints, the destruction of the wicked, and the setting up of God's kingdom.

Leaving chapter 8 until last, let us consider chapter 9. Apparently the prophet felt that the previous vision intimated a prolonging of Jerusalem's desolation, and the prospect of delay in restoring the sanctuary and its services moves him to earnest intercessory prayer. Note especially verses 17-19: "Now therefore, O our God, hear the prayer of thy servant, and his supplications, and cause thy face to shine upon thy sanctuary that is desolate, for the Lord's sake. ... Behold our desolations, and the city which is called by thy name ... O Lord, hear; O Lord, forgive; O Lord, hearken and do; defer not, for thine own sake, O my God." Daniel pleaded not for material blessings upon his people but for the progress of the kingdom of God. Thus his words "defer not, for thine own sake." Undeniably, to Daniel the sanctuary stands for the kingdom of God on the earth.

In the prophecy of the seventy weeks we read of that which must have pierced the heart of the aged seer. "The people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined" (verse 26). The same prophecy that foretells the restoration of the city and the sanctuary also foretells their destruction because of the unfaithfulness of the people of the covenant. There is yet another reference to the sanctuary in this chapter — "to anoint the most Holy." Every Adventist minister is aware that this expression is almost always applied to things rather than to persons and that it has particular application to inauguration of services in the heavenly sanctuary. (See Exodus 30:25-29.) We would not pretend that Daniel understood the full significance of this revelation. Undoubtedly the words of Peter apply specifically to this captive prophet when he wrote, "Of which salvation the prophets have enquired and searched diligently ... ; searching what, or what manner of time the spirit

of Christ which was in them did signify” (1 Peter 1:10,11). The point to be stressed with reference to this chapter is that once more the sanctuary is prominent as the centre of the great controversy between good and evil, and that the progress of the kingdom of God is vitally associated with the history of the sanctuary.

Chapters 10 to 12 are the record of Daniel’s final vision and should always be studied as a unit. According to chapter 10:14 the focal point of the vision is “the latter days.” As the actions of the opposer of God’s church is described, the sanctuary is brought to view once more. “And arms shall stand on his part, and they shall pollute the sanctuary of strength, and shall take away the daily sacrifice, and they shall place the abomination that maketh desolate” (Dan. 11:31). In the last verse of Daniel 11 is described the assault of an invading power upon the “glorious holy mountain.” However we may interpret this verse, undoubtedly to the prophet it enshrined allusions to the assaults of Babylon on the mountain city of Jerusalem, called glorious and holy because of its possession of the sanctuary and the Shekinah. Some Adventist scholars believe that this portrays the final assault on the church of God by the antichrist and that the following verse (chapter 12:1) describes Christ’s intervention and deliverance. One thing is quite clear — that in this climactic prophecy of the book, again the sanctuary is in focus in connection with the latter days and the setting up of the kingdom of God as described in chapter 12:1-3.

What then shall we say regarding the prophecy of chapter 8? As chapter 7 amplified chapter 2, we find chapter 8 amplifies chapter 7. Daniel 7:25 describes the oppression of the saints and warfare upon the sacred things of God, including His times and laws. In chapter 8:9-13 a similar work is discussed. Again is pictured the wearing out of the saints (the host), and again is described how the truth of the most High would be handled insolently. Under the symbolism of the desolating of the sanctuary is pictured how false worship would apparently displace the true “for many days” even unto “the time of the end.” “The place of his [the prince of the worshiping host] sanctuary was cast down.”

When viewed in its relationship to the whole book and to the historical context of Daniel it is evident that Daniel 8:11-14 is not discussing only an isolated incident of persecution in the days of the Maccabees. Rather, it is portraying, in the symbolism characteristic of the whole book, the issues of the great controversy between good and evil; the issue of false worship as opposed to true worship, the issue of the apparent success of wicked powers, et cetera. The prophecy can be rightly interpreted only when placed alongside the other visions of Daniel, which culminate in the ultimate resurgence of right and truth. As the prophetic chains of chapters 2, 7, and 10 to 12 describe the prelude to the establishment of the kingdom of God upon the earth, so it is with the vision of chapter 8.

Daniel 8:14 declares: “Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed” (“vindicated” or “justified”). This is a promise that the hour will dawn in “the time of the end” when the worshiping saints who have been made as the refuse of the earth will be vindicated before men and angels. The truth that has been cast down to the ground will be uplifted. The dominion of wicked powers over the hearts and minds of men will be taken away and the kingdom of darkness gradually displaced by the kingdom of light. Revelation 18:1 reveals that the earth is to be lighted by the spiritual glory of the final message to the world before the return of Christ in literal glory, and Daniel 8:14 promises that prior to the restoration of God’s visible kingdom there shall be a restoration of truth among men. The 2300 days began with literal Israel coming out of literal Babylon to rebuild and restore literal Jerusalem, and they will end with spiritual Israel coming out of spiritual Babylon to be “the repairer of the breach, the restorer of paths to dwell in.” Two of the historical books of the

Old Testament — Ezra and Nehemiah — described the exodus from Babylon and the restoration of Jerusalem and the sanctuary. Isaiah 58:12, 13 and Revelation 18:1-4, and other passages, apply this movement as prefiguring the final work of God in the earth. The people who turn away their foot from the Sabbath have it said of them, “And they that shall be of thee shall build the old waste places: thou shalt raise up the foundations of many generations.” In God’s final work upon the earth the closing chapters of Isaiah will be fulfilled. The glory of the Lord will rise upon His church and the Gentiles will be the light and brightness of its rising.

The prophecy of the cleansing of the sanctuary thus parallels the prophecies of the restoration from Babylon given in the Old Testament. Both point to the ushering in of Christ’s kingdom as the beauty of holiness and truth become enshrined in the latter-day church.

Such an interpretation of the prophecy of Daniel 8 is in harmony with the theme of the whole book, the vindication of God’s truth and His worshipers, and the victory of His kingdom over opposition and counterfeits of wicked powers. Such an interpretation is in agreement with the last book of the New Testament, which by its repeated references to Babylon and the prophecies of Daniel teaches that the events of that day were typical of latter-day events in connection with spiritual Israel.

The references in Daniel to the sanctuary (chapters 1:3 5:2-5; 8:11-14; 9:17, 24, 26; 11:42, 56) are thus seen to form a complete pattern portraying the agelong controversy between good and evil in the microcosm of Israel’s sanctuary. To restrict the meaning of Daniel 8:9-14 to Maccabean times only is to ignore the over-all theme of this part of the sacred canon.

It was not by chance that almost in the same breath in which Christ spoke of the gospel of the kingdom going to all the world, He commanded His church to understand Daniel the prophet. There is a vital relationship between the two. When we as a people understand this precious book and permit Christ to reign in the sanctuary of our hearts, then the kingdom of God will be hastened and we will see our Lord.

January, 1960

THE MINISTRY

APPENDIX TWENTY-THREE

**Daniel 9:24-27 Recognized As Containing Jubilee And
Day Of Atonement Allusions**

Daniel 9:24-27 Recognized As Containing Jubilee And Day Of Atonement Allusions

These quotations deal with a Qumran text cited by Fitzmeyer.

The thread which apparently runs through the whole text and ties together its various elements is Lev. 25. Parts of three verses of that chapter are quoted: v. 9 in line 26, v. 10 in line 6, and v. 13 in line 2. **The fragmentary text begins *in medias res* with a reference to a jubilee year;** it is part of a quotation of Lev. 25:13, the first part of the thread running through the text. **Into this context of a jubilee year and the regulations prescribed for it in Lev. 25 the figure of Melchizedek is introduced. He is apparently being given a special role in the execution of divine judgment which is related to a jubilee year. In the course of the midrashic development the year of jubilee mentioned first in line 2 becomes ‘the last jubilee’ (line 7) or ‘the tenth jubilee’ (line 7, at the end). In other words, it seems to refer to the end of the 490 years, or ‘the seventy weeks of years’ of Dan. 9:24-27. It is called the year of ‘release’ (*smth*) proclaimed for the Lord (lines 3-4) and of ‘liberation’ (*drr*), such as was announced to the captives of Is. 61:1. It is a year which involves atonement for iniquity, and the Day of Atonement is somehow related to it.**

The characteristics of this year of ‘release’ and ‘liberation’ are ‘peace, welfare (literally, good), and salvation’ (see lines 16, 19). These are ensured because of a judgment in which a figure is involved who is either Melchizedek himself, or someone who enjoys ‘the heritage of Melchizedek’ (lines 5-6).

The day of judgment to be executed by Melchizedek (or whoever shares his heritage) is apparently further identified with the salvation proclaimed by the herald of Is. 52:7 (see lines 15-16). **It is not surprising that the year of jubilee, the ‘year of good favour’, the ‘releases’, and the ‘liberation’ are somehow identified in this text with ‘salvation,’ even the salvation of Is. 52:7.** But what is striking is that the *mebaššer*, or ‘herald’, of the Isaian text is said to be ‘anointed with the Spirit’. In line 18 van der Woude restored the article before *[m]syh*, thus identifying the ‘herald’ explicitly with ‘the Messiah.’

Yadin’s reading is, nevertheless, interesting in that it makes of the herald of Is. 52:7 a messianic figure, i.e., one anointed. This reading is probably a further allusion to Is. 61:1, a passage to which we have already referred in the general comments above (p. 246). **The connection of these Isaian passages with Dan. 9** receives a further support, if my restoration of the end of line 18 is correct, ‘and the herald is the one anointed with the Spirit (about) whom Daniel said ...’ I proposed to read *Daniyel* and referred it to the *masiah nagid* of Dan. 9:36.

Joseph A. Fitzmeyer, *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (London, 1977), pp. 251-253.



APPENDIX TWENTY-FOUR

The Historical Development Of The Doctrine Of The Investigative Judgment

The Historical Development Of The Doctrine Of The Investigative Judgment

How Adventists adopted the sanctuary doctrine — 7

The Investigative judgment — 2

In our last editorial (Feb. 7) we investigated early documents dealing with the subject of the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary and discovered that, except for a few vague references to a breastplate of judgment that the High Priest wore, **as late as 1850 writers we consulted on the sanctuary and the 2300 days say nothing about an investigative judgment.** (Emphasis ours).

However, in one of her early statements Ellen White gives a hint of a judgment. She says, “I saw that Jesus would not leave the Most Holy Place, until every case was decided either for salvation or destruction.” — *The Present Truth*, vol. 1, no. 3 (August, 1849).

This hint was not immediately picked up by other writers. As late as 1853, in a series of articles J.N. Andrews wrote in the *Review and Herald*, he explained the cleansing of the sanctuary only as the blotting out of sin and the transfer of sins to the scapegoat. — Feb. 3, 1853.

However, the next year J.N. Loughborough connected the cleansing of the sanctuary with the declaration, in the first angel’s message, “The hour of his judgment is come” (Rev. 14:7):

“What was that work of cleansing? Is the work of cleansing the Sanctuary fitly heralded by the first angel’s message? In other words, Is it a work of judgment? For light on this subject, we shall be obliged to go to the type. Let us look at the type. See the high priest preparing himself to cleanse the Sanctuary; almost the first thing he did was to gird upon him the breast plate of judgment. For what does he put that on? It certainly looks as though he was going to do a judgment work. ...

“Now I read 1 Pet. iv. Verse 5 declares that Christ is ready to judge the quick and the dead. Verse 7. „But the end of all things is at hand.” Verse 11. „If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God.” (Oracles — ten commandments. See Acts vii, 38.) Why speak as the oracles of God? Because the oracles are the duty brought out by the third angel’s message. Verse 17. The time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God: and if it first begin at us, what shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel of God?” Verse 19. Commit the keeping of your souls to God. 1 Tim. v. 24. „Some men’s sins are open beforehand, going before to judgment.” We see by this what the judgment is that the first angel of Rev. xiv, refers to.” — *Ibid.*, Feb. 14, 1854.

The next year, Uriah Smith enlarged on the idea of judgment. He stated plainly, “The work of cleansing the earthly sanctuary was a work of judgment.” — *Ibid.*, Oct. 2, 1855. Citing Daniel 7:10 and Revelation 20:12, he called attention to the books that would be used in the judgment. Then mentioning 1 Peter 4:17 and 1 Timothy 5:24, he observed:

“This must be a judgment of the same nature and can refer to no other work than the closing up of the ministration of the heavenly Sanctuary, hence that work must embrace the examination of individual character; and we conclude that the lives of the children of God, not only those who are living, but all who have ever lived, whose names are written in the Lamb’s book of life, will during this time pass in final review before that

great tribunal. We see, therefore, how in this respect, the work of the type, is infinitely surpassed by that of the antitype ...

„The first angel proclaimed, Fear God and give glory to him; for the hour of his Judgment is come. At the end of the 2300 days, when that message closed, had that time come? If the judgment scene which takes place in the second apartment of the Sanctuary, to which this proclamation doubtless refers, did not then commence, it had not come; and the first angel with his message, was too fast. But we believe that work did there commence; that there was the time when judgment began at the house of God, and the time came when Daniel, and all the righteous in the person of their Advocate should stand in their lot.” — *Ibid.*

Finally, in an article entitled, „The Judgment,” James White introduced the phrase “investigative judgment.” He said:

“The investigative judgment of the house, or church, of God will take place before the first resurrection; so will the judgment of the wicked take place during the 1000 years of Rev. xx, and they will be raised at the close of that period.” — *Ibid.* Jan. 29, 1857.

The term *investigative* calls attention to the fact that in the judgment conducted in the Holy of Holies, the records of the lives of all those who have at one time or another entered the service of Christ will be investigated. “Every name [of those who have believed on Jesus] is mentioned, every case closely investigated.” — *The Great Controversy*, p. 483. The scrutiny will be thorough, and sentences will be rendered on the basis of the records.

The fully developed doctrine of the investigative judgment has been dealt with in various Seventh-day Adventist publications and will not be discussed in detail here. A readily available source is Ellen White’s *The Great Controversy*, which devotes a chapter to this topic (pp. 479-491).

Thus it required some 13 years **after the passing of the time in the autumn of 1844 before the subject of the investigative judgment was fully developed.** (Emphasis ours).

We now come back to the question - How is the investigative judgment related to the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary? We have already stated that the two are not identical. The cleansing that began in 1844 was the antitype of the Day of Atonement services described in Leviticus 16. The emphasis in that chapter is on the removal once each year of sins accumulated in the sanctuary throughout the year. The pioneers of the Seventh-day Adventist Church understood the antitype to refer to the once-and-for-all removal of sins from the heavenly sanctuary at the end of the age. They also spoke of this removal of sin as a blotting out of sin.

The investigative judgment enters into this work of blotting out of sin at the point of deciding whose sins will be blotted out. Ellen White explained it this way: “As anciently the sins of the people were by faith placed upon the sin offering and through its blood transferred, in figure, to the earthly sanctuary, so in the new covenant the sins of the repentant are by faith placed upon Christ and transferred, in fact, to the heavenly sanctuary. And as the typical cleansing of the earthly was accomplished by the removal of the sins by which it had been polluted, so the actual cleansing of the heavenly is to be accomplished by the removal, or blotting out, of the sins which are there recorded. But before this can be accomplished, there must be an examination of the books of record to determine who, through repentance of sin and faith in Christ, are entitled to the benefits of His atonement. The cleansing of the

sanctuary therefore involves a work of investigation — a work of judgment.” — *Ibid.*, pp. 421,422.

One should not, therefore, equate the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary with the investigative judgment.* One should instead say, as did Ellen White, that “the cleansing of the sanctuary therefore involves a work of investigation — a work of judgment.”

Some have not borne this distinction in mind and have made the judgment the major significance of 1844.* The judgment is an important event, but the final atonement and the blotting out of sin were the items upon which the ritual on the Day of Atonement focused. D.F.N.

Adventist Review, February 14,1980 pages 13, 14, 15

* Emphasis ours.

APPENDIX TWENTY-FIVE

A. Farrer on the Day of Atonement and Dan. 8:14 in Revelation

A. Farrer on the Day of Atonement and Dan. 8:14 in Revelation

The breaking of the seventh seal carries us back to the point at which the hurricanes restrained in vii. 1 are to be released, the danger against which the saints have been sealed is actualized, and the penitential season preliminary to Tabernacles is introduced. The Feast of Tabernacles is at the full moon of the seventh month. The first ten days of the month are penitential, from the ceremony of trumpet-blowing on the first, to the Day of Atonement on the tenth. The trumpet of 1 Tishri announces a new year. (It is confusing to our minds that the Jewish New Year begins with the seventh month, at Michaelmas, and not the first at Lady Day. Similarly the Jewish day began not with the first hour at dawn, but with sundown on the eve before.) A yearly trumpet which both announces a new era and prepares for the Great Day (Atonement) is an obvious symbol for the trumpet of Michael (Isa. xxvii. 13, 1 Thess. iv. 16-17, Matt. xxiv. 31). Michael's trumpet is basically a trumpet of assembly and of release (Num. x 2, Lev. xxv. 9). Since most of those it summons are in the grave, it becomes a trumpet of resurrection.

~~~ A. Farrer, *Revelation* (Oxford, 1964), p. 112.

★ ★ ★

The seventh trumpet sounds at last. Since the trumpet-blowing is the actual ceremony of New Year, there can be no half-hour's silence, as at the seventh seal; this is New Year itself. The trumpet sounds the New Year and the trumpet receives its proper greeting, voices in heaven hailing the establishment of the divine kingdom. For every New Year was kept as a regnant year of the Kingdom of God, and the New Year of Apocalypse initiates a fresh stage of the coming of that Kingdom into its own on earth. No sooner have the shoutings died away, than Atonement Day receives its proper symbol too, the unveiling of the sacred ark: in the ritual, only to the eyes of the High Priest, but here in the apocalypse, an unveiling simply, for Christ our High Priest opens to us the Holy of Holies.

~~~ A. Farrer, *A Rebirth of Images* (Gloucester, 1970), p. 135.

★ ★ ★

Among the scriptural types of St. John's trumpets we should probably reckon the trumpets blown against Jericho, and the more so, because they actually have the pattern of a seven-day week. For six days Israel compassed Jericho in silence, blowing trumpets; on the seventh they went round seven times and, at the last circuit, backed the trumpet-blast with shouting; and down came the walls. The trumpets were followed round by the Ark of the Covenant, which duly follows them here (in verse 19).

So, when the last trumpet blast is sounded, there are shouts in heaven, declaring the victory. But though the Jericho type may suggest shouting, the substance of the cries belongs most to the proclamation of the New Year of the world (see above, p. 112). First comes the theme of the initiation of God's kingdom (15-17) and second the dawn of judgment day (18). We have good evidence to show that in the beginning of our era the Day of Trumpets was observed as the renewal of God's enthronement over Israel, but also as a day of judgment when the moral accounts of all the living were brought up to date in the heavenly books, and a provisional balance struck.

~~~ A. Farrer, *Revelation*, p. 137.

★ ★ ★

The central mystery of the heavenly temple in the Atonement-vision here is the Ark of the Covenant, and when in the Dedication-vision of xv God's glory enters the shrine, this is an exceptional marvel, as at the dedication of Moses' Tabernacle or Solomon's Temple; the

visible presence does not take the primary form of the Enthroned Glory, but the secondary form of the terrible shekinah-cloud by which God manifested his presence on earth; and the service of the temple is disturbed and suspended by the portent. And when we come to the final visions of the book, we find that this temple, this vessel which will hardly contain the Glory of God, is superseded. In the New Jerusalem no temple is seen, for the whole city is the Holy of Holies which God indwells.

~~~ A. Farrer, *A Rebirth of Images*, p. 136.

★ ★ ★

‘The length and the breadth and the height are equal.’ A cubic city is not so much impossible as meaningless: one can have a cubic structure, even a structure measuring fifteen hundred miles each way where the miles are paced out in angel’s paces, but it will not be a city. No: it will be a sanctuary, and that is exactly what St. John means, for the Holy of Holies had the dimensions of a cube. The city is all a sacred precinct: the sacred precinct is all a Holy of Holies, and therefore the length, the breadth, and the height are equal. Like the Holy of Holies, it is lined, even paved, with gold: but the gold is transparent as glass, like the sky. It is walled about with precious stones: of Solomon’s temple we read that it was built wholly of ‘squared precious stones,’ and though ‘precious’ here has not the technical sense, and simply means ‘costly,’ it is still the same word.

~~~ *Ibid.*, p. 253.

★ ★ ★

The Beast-visions (xii-xv) cover the third quarter. The quarter begins on the day of the New Year trumpet, passes through Tabernacles and runs on to Dedication.

~~~ *Ibid.*, p. 137.

★ ★ ★

St. John’s seven angels come out of the temple, as from the incense-offering, and receive the libation-bowls. There should be one bowl and one pourer: St. John has multiplied the High Priest sevenfold as he multiplied the trumpet sevenfold. The seven angels, however multiplied, retain the distinctive High Priestly ornaments: they are, if we may trust the usually preferred reading, ‘vested in stone bright and pure,’ i.e. the High Priestly jewels.

The drink-offering was poured once: St. John makes it fall sevenfold on the burnt-offering of wrath. When it has been fully poured, the action of liturgy is completed and a voice from the temple pronounces that it is done.

~~~ *Ibid.*, p. 182.

★ ★ ★

We may deduce from Philo’s writings and elsewhere that there was a tendency to interpret the daily offering in accordance with the ritual of Atonement Day. On Atonement Day the High Priest carried the sacrificial blood into the temple with the incense, right to the Holy of Holies. It was natural, then, to think of the blood-offering as the price at which the entry of the holiest place was made, even on the days when no blood was carried in with the incense, and when the priest went no further than past the first veil. Every incense-offering was a symbol of Atonement Day.

~~~ *Ibid.*, p. 178.

★ ★ ★

It is this detail of the pulling down of the stars which offers the best point of connexion between the birth of the Man Child and the war in heaven. For one thing, it demands exposition. What does it mean? It means that Satan, by temptation to sin and by the irrefutable accusation based on its success, obtains the condemnation of souls in the court of heaven. Here, then, is the court, here is the contest between Michael and the Dragon. The image is appropriate to the season: it is a Rabbinic doctrine that in the days from New Year to Atonement, the world is judged. The accuser has ruined all the souls he can: as for the elect, they have now a sure support: their merits are grounded in, and upheld by, the prevailing sacrifice of the atoning Lamb. When the Man Child reached the Throne, Satan's battle was already lost. Having no more standing-ground in the court where he had indicted Job, Lucifer himself follows the downward ruin of the falling stars.

~~~ *Ibid.*, p. 141.



The feast of New Year, the first of the seventh month, is the beginning of a ten-day period of which Atonement Day is the tenth. This period is a sort of Lent in preparation for the Easter (as it were) of Tabernacles. Lent finds its climax on Good Friday, and so did the ten days on Atonement. There is one day's gap between Good Friday and Easter: there are four days between Atonement and Tabernacles. Though Atonement is nearer to Tabernacles than to New Year, yet it forms one with New Year, not with Tabernacles. New Year is a feast, Atonement is a fast. Thus in a catalogue of Feasts we may count New Year and Tabernacles each as one, annexing the Atonement Fast to New Year. Again, to a more cursory view, all three solemnities form a single holy season.

The peculiar liturgy of New Year is the blowing of trumpets, an obvious ceremony to mark a period of time. The liturgy of Atonement is the purification or re-hallowing of the temple, the purging of the channel of grace which the holy place represents, from the accumulated defilements of another year. This purging is carried out by the High Priest, with atonement blood taken from the altar of slaughter and smeared on all the parts of the sanctuary, including the mercy-seat in the Holy of Holies, the veiled shrine never beheld by human eyes on any other day, nor then without enveloping fumes of incense-smoke.

St. John stretches back the distinctive symbols of New Year, the trumpets, over the whole period from midsummer to New Year, just as he stretches the Pentecostal symbol of unsealing back over the weeks from Firstfruits to Pentecost. Once midsummer is over, every week that passes is a milestone on the road to the Feast of Trumpets. This means that the seventh trumpet, and it alone, marks the New Year feast.

~~~ *Ibid.*, p. 117.



We may now turn to the visions in xii. They contain the manifestation of Antichrist. That this is a Dedication-theme is evident. The Dedication was instituted to celebrate the Maccabean restoration of the temple, after its desecration by Antiochus Epiphanes: and Antiochus is the Antichrist-beast of those Daniel-visions which St. John principally uses here. The day of Dedication, Chislev 25, not only commemorated the restoration after the desecration: it commemorated the desecration itself, for, as 1 Maccabees tells us with solemn emphasis, Judas was careful to reconsecrate the temple on the same day of the year as had seen the inauguration of the pagan cult there. When the theme of Antichrist's attack on the temple appeared previously in xi, 1-13, we saw that it appeared as part and parcel of a Dedication-oracle, the Temple-measuring.

The synagogue-liturgy made the link between the themes of dedication and profanation especially in relation to the Name of God. Antiochus blasphemed the Name, the Maccabean martyrs hallowed it by their deaths. God had said that he would put his Name in the temple. The principal Dedication-lesson, as we say above, was Numbers vii, which directly follows the Aaronic Blessing and the imposition of the Name, and itself contains the dedication of Moses' Tabernacle. Another Torah-lesson belonging to the feast was the stoning of the Israelite who blasphemed the Name (Levit. xxiv: the chapter begins with a law about the great Dedication emblem, the golden candlestick). At Dedication in St. John's Gospel, Christ is falsely accused of blasphemy and threatened with stoning, because he has united the Father's Name with his own. Here in the Apocalypse the first Beast wears on his head names of blasphemy, he is given a mouth speaking boasts and blasphemies, and he opens it in blasphemy of God, his Name and his tabernacle. The second Beast organizes the worship of the first, and makes all men accomplices in the irremissible sin, by taking the blasphemous name of the Beast upon them as the Name of God. Then in defiance of him the Lamb is seen, standing on Mt. Zion with his flock of the 144,000 predestinate, having his own Name and the Name of his Father on their foreheads. Compare the Christ of the Johannine Gospel, standing on Mt. Zion (in Solomon's Porch) on Dedication Day, and saying: Ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep. My sheep hear my voice and they follow me (These are they that follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth) and I give unto them eternal life, and none shall snatch them out of my hand. My Father, which hath given them unto me, is greater than all, and none is able to snatch them out of the Father's hand; I and the Father are one. (Having his Name, which is his Father's Name, on their foreheads, they are inviolate.)

~~~ *Ibid.*, pp. 144-145.

★ ★ ★

## **APPENDIX TWENTY-SIX**

Dan. 9:24-27 and the Olivet Discourse



## Dan. 9:24-27 and the Olivet Discourse

The following quotations are representative references from commentators on the relationship between Mark 13 and 9:24-27 of Daniel.

Suivant le cadre tracé par Daniel, dans la prophétie des semaines, il faisait plutôt entendre qu'il y aurait pour Jérusalem un temps relative-ment court de desolation, profanation religieuse et calamites de toutes sortes, qui se terminerait par l'apparition glorieuse du Messie. Ces jours seraient abrèges, parce que, sans cela, „tout chair“, c'est-à-dire tous les hommes, pas livrer à la mort tous les élus. Ceux-ci ont du fuir au moment où a paru "l'abomination"; mais la Judée ne sera pas seule à souffrir, et le monde entier sera en proie aux douleurs du grand avènement.

~~~ A. Loisy, *Les Évangiles synoptiques* (Ceffonds, 1908), 11, p. 424.

★ ★ ★

We have no doubt ... that ... expositors in general are right in assuming, on the one hand, that our Lord's direct reference is to the great fontal predication in chapter ix. 24-27, and in assuming, on the other, that in the expression which he quotes, as well as in his own mind, there was a reference to something that was to happen in connection with the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans.

~~~ J. Morison, *Matthew's Memoirs of Christ* (London, 1873), pp. 507-508.

★ ★ ★

The Greek phrase ... comes from the Septuagint, or Greek, version of Dan. 9:27 ... But the time of our Gospel, the original reference of the passage had been lost sight of, and it was merely a mysterious prophecy which yet was to be fulfilled.

~~~ B. H. Branscombe, *The Gospel of Mark* (MC) (London, 1937), p. 327.

★ ★ ★

... the meaning of the prophecy was not regarded as having been exhausted by its contemporary fulfillment, and the mysterious phrase about the **abomination of desolation** ... was regarded as a prophetic word still destined to find fulfillment in the future.

~~~ A.E.J. Rawlinson, *The Gospel According to St. Mark* (WC) (1949), p. 187.

★ ★ ★

... in Mark the Little Apocalypse takes up those tragic events through which Israel must pass, and especially the destruction of the temple ... it uses a Danielic vocabulary, and follows the Danielic pattern. The words "come to an end" or "fulfillment" have a Danielic sound,

~~~ P. Carrington, *Mark* (Cambridge, 1960), p. 272.

★ ★ ★

The word [for "end"] which is used in this chapter of Mark is *telos*, which has the meaning of aim, purpose, objective and fulfillment, as well as finality ... We find it in Daniel ix, where it seems to imply the finale or outcome of the present historical afflictions in Israel, including, for instance, the capture of the city and the cessation of the daily sacrifice, which is itself an "end". ... In this context it assumes the meaning of the final fulfillment of the prophecies under consideration, whatever this may be.

~~~ *Ibid.*, p. 275.

★ ★ ★

A direct reference is now made to Daniel, and the lector is bidden to use his intelligence: “When ye see the abomination of desolation standing where it ought not — let him that readeth understand.” The reference is to the phrase in Daniel ix:27 ... it is clear to us at once what is being announced in the Little Apocalypse; it is a second agent of desecration and desolation of a comparable character.

~~~ *Ibid.*, p. 278.

★ ★ ★

Daniel does contemplate the destruction of the city and temple, as the intelligent lector would find if he turned to Daniel ix:27.

~~~ *Ibid.*, p. 279.

★ ★ ★

... Daniel, in a mysterious passage, speaks of a Prince-Messiah (who may be the high priest of his day), and a verse later says that “the Messiah will be cut off.” This chapter of Daniel contributed one or two important concepts or expressions to the tradition of Mark:

- Dan. ix. 26, 27: the Messiah cut off (Mark viii.31, ix.31, x.33).  
the sanctuary destroyed (Mark xiii.2, xiv.58 xv.29).  
war or wars (Mark xiii.7).  
the end (Mark xiii.7, 13).  
the abomination of desolation (Mark xiii.14).

Now Jesus certainly accepted the title of Messiah in xiv.62, and combined it with the symbolism of the Son of Man of Daniel vii.23, who comes with the clouds of heaven and receives the Kingdom from God; but it looks as if he also took into account the death of the Prince-Messiah in Daniel ix.26, 27, since he made use of those verses in his apocalyptic; it would seem that he saw in them an image of the tragic times through which Israel was to pass during that evil generation; the Messiah cut off, wars and rumours of wars, the temple destroyed, and the abomination of desolation standing where it ought not.

~~~ *Ibid.*, p. 183.

★ ★ ★

Setzen wir voraus dass die geprägte Wendung ἡ ὁ βδέλγμα ἡς ἐρημώσεως Dan. 12,11 entnommen sei, so konnte der Evangelist, der sie mit dem Vorlagentext übernahm, durchaus an die Zerstörung des Tempels denken. In Dan. 12, 11 ist zwar unmittelbar nur von der Entweihung des Tempels die Rede, der Ausdruck in Dan 12,11 bezieht sich aber wie auch Dan 11,31 auf Dan 9,26f. zurück, wo von dem die Rede ist, der die Stadt verwüstet. Vielleicht soll der Leser gerade auf diesen Zusammenhang achten, der sich von Mk 13, 2 her bereits nahelegt. In Dan 9, 26f. ist die Vernichtung von Stadt und Tempel angesagt, und Dan 11, 31; 12, 11 sind nur - literarkritisch vielleicht sogar sekundäre - Bezugnahmen auf diesen Spruch. Der Ausdruck ἡ ὁ βδέλγμα ἡς ἐρημώσεως kann also nicht nur an eine Entweihung des Tempels, sondern ebenso gut an Krieg und Zerstörung von Stadt und Tempel erinnern. Da die Tempelzerstörung in Mk 13,2 so deutlich geweissagt ist, da diese Vorhersage den Anlass zur Jüngerfrage und damit zur ganzen nachfolgenden Rede bietet, muss ἡ ὁ βδέλγμα ἡς ἐρημώσεως zwangsläufig im Licht von 13,2 verstanden werden. Der Evangelist spricht in Mk 13,14 von der Zerstörung des Tempels.

~~~ R. Pesch, *Näherwartungen. Tradition und Redaktion in Mk. 13* (Düsseldorf, 1968), pp. 142-143. (Pesch cites K. Staab, J. Huby, C. Perrot and others to similar effect.)



★ ★ ★

The more vividly Jesus Himself foresaw the coming ruin ... the fuller, moreover, the acquaintance which the disciples must have had with the prophecy in Dan. ix ... so much the more intelligible is this introductory passage. ...

~~~ Meyer, *Commentary on New Testament, The Gospel of Matthew* (E.T., New York, <sup>6</sup>1884), p. 406.

★ ★ ★

The main passage here referred to by the Lord is the remarkable prophecy Dan. 9:26-27, which we find more definitely expressed, Dan. xi. 31; xii. 11.

~~~ H. Olshausen, *Matthew, Commentary on the New Testament* (New York, 1957), p. 236.

★ ★ ★

## **APPENDIX TWENTY-SEVEN**

The Apocalypse, The Day Of Atonement, And  
The Latter Days



## Appendix G

### ***The Apocalypse, the Day of Atonement, and the Latter Days***

Almost all scholars have applied the Day of Atonement as a type of the priestly work of Christ throughout the entire Christian age. This is done primarily on the basis of Heb. 9:8, 12, 25; 10:19, 20; 6:19, 20. Almost all the commentaries listed in the bibliography make this application. Some scholars through the centuries, however, have believed that the Day of Atonement has a special application to events immediately preceding the return of Christ. This position is based mainly on the fact that the Book of Revelation in many places alludes to the imagery of this solemn Jewish fast. To show that this second position is sound is the aim of this appendix.

More than two centuries ago Sir Isaac Newton penned the following significant statement:

“The Temple is the scene of the visions, and the visions in the Temple relate to the feast of the seventh month, for the feasts of the Jews were typical of things to come. The Passover related to the first coming of Christ, and the feasts of the seventh month to his second coming; his first coming being therefore over before this Prophecy was given, the feasts of the seventh month are here only alluded unto.”<sup>1</sup>

The New Testament obviously endorses the idea that the Jewish festival year prefigured the entire Christian age. The typical genius of the Old Testament economy as everywhere recognized in the New Testament provides the foundation for such a supposition. Furthermore, the inspired apostles specifically apply the Jewish festivals in this way.

For example, in 1 Cor. 5:7 Paul alludes to the Passover as the type of the crucifixion of Christ. The gospel writers are also careful to point out that the climax to Christ’s ministry occurred in connection with the Passover. In Rev. 7:9 the redeemed are pictured as standing before the throne “clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands.” According to the translators of the KJV, as shown by their marginal notations, this is a reference to the Feast of Tabernacles.

In Lev. 23:40 we read: “And you shall take on the first day the fruit of goodly trees, branches of palm trees, and boughs of leafy trees, and willows of the brook; and you shall rejoice before the Lord your God seven days.” In harmony with this is Christ’s frequent allusion to the harvest in connection with the end of the world. The Feast of Tabernacles was also called the Feast of Harvest, occurring as it did after the completion of the gathering in of the year’s produce. The references in the New Testament to Christ as the firstfruits and the time record of the occurrence of Pentecost help to fill out this picture of the typical significance of the Jewish ceremonial year. A following comparison illustrates the point made by Sir Isaac Newton and other scholars on this matter:

#### *Spring Festivals Typifying Significant Events of First Advent*

|              |              |
|--------------|--------------|
| Passover     | Crucifixion  |
| First Fruits | Resurrection |
| Pentecost    | Pentecost    |

#### *Autumn Festivals Typifying Significant Events of Second Advent*

|                      |                         |
|----------------------|-------------------------|
| Trumpets             | Rev. 8 and 9            |
| Day of Atonement     | Rev. 8:1-6; 11:19; etc. |
| Feast of Tabernacles | Rev. 7:9; 14:14-19      |

The spring festivals have always come in for much attention and have been applied to the First Advent with universal consent by evangelical interpreters. Unfortunately, the festivals of autumn have not met with the same study emphasis. In a standard work on Leviticus in the *Expositor's Bible* we have the following illuminating statement by Dr. S.H. Kellogg as he of necessity turned his attention to the feasts of the seventh month:

“We have already seen that the earlier feasts of the year were also prophetic; that Passover and Unleavened Bread pointed forward to Christ, our Passover, slain for us; Pentecost, to the spiritual ingathering of the firstfruits of the world’s harvest, fifty days after the presentation of our Lord in resurrection, as the wave-sheaf of the firstfruits. We may therefore safely infer that these remaining feasts of the seventh month must be typical also. But, if so, typical of what? Two things may be safely said in this matter. The significance of the three festivals of this seventh month must be interpreted in harmony with what has already passed into fulfilment; and, in the second place, inasmuch as the feast of trumpets, the day of atonement, and the feast of tabernacles all belong to the seventh and last month of the ecclesiastical year, they must find their fulfilment in connection with what Scripture calls „the last times.”

“Keeping the first point in view, we may then safely say that if Pentecost typified the firstfruits of the world’s harvest in the ingathering of an election from all nations, the feast of tabernacles must then typify the completion of that harvest in a spiritual ingathering, final and universal. Not only so, but, inasmuch as in the antitypical fulfilment of the wave-sheaf in the resurrection of our Lord, we were reminded that the consummation of the new creation is in resurrection from the dead, and that in regeneration is therefore involved resurrection, hence the feast of tabernacles, as celebrating the absolute completion of the year’s harvest, must typify also the resurrection season, when all that are Christ’s shall arise from the dead at His coming.

“And, finally, whereas this means for the now burdened earth permanent deliverance from the curse, and the beginning of a new age thus signalised by glorious life in resurrection, in which are enjoyed the blessed fruits of life’s labours and pains for Christ, this was shadowed forth by the ordinance that immediately upon the seven days of tabernacles should follow a feast of the eighth day, the first day of a new week, in celebration of the beginning season of rest from all the labours of the field.

“Most beautifully, thus regarded, does all else connected with the feast of tabernacles correspond, as type to antitype, to the revelation of the last things, and therein reveal its truest and deepest spiritual significance: the joy, the reunion, the rejoicing with son and with daughter, the fullness of gladness also for the widow and the fatherless; and this, not only for those in Israel, but also for the stranger, not of Israel, — for Gentile as well as Israelite was to have part in the festivity of that day; and, again, the full attainment of the most complete consecration, signified in the tenfold burnt-offering; — all finds its place here.

“And so now we can see why it was that our Saviour declared (Matt. xiii. 39) that the end of this present age should be the time of harvest; and how Paul, looking at the future spiritual ingathering, places the ingathering of the Gentiles (Rom. xi. 25) as one of the last things. In full accord with this interpretation of the typical significance of this feast it is that in Zech. xiv. we find it written that in the predicted day of the Lord, when (ver. 5) the Lord „shall come, and all the holy ones” with Him, and (ver. 9) „the Lord shall be King over all the earth; ... the Lord ... one, and His name one,” then (ver. 16) „everyone

that is left of all the nations ... shall go up from year to year to worship the King, the Lord of hosts, and to keep the feast of tabernacles;" and, moreover, that so completely shall consecration be realised in that day that (ver. 20) even upon the bells of the horses shall the words be inscribed, „Holy unto the Lord!“<sup>2</sup>

This long quotation has been given in full because Dr. Kellogg adequately presents the reasoning of those who apply the feasts of autumn to antitypical events associated with the second advent of Christ. How, then, do such writers interpret the latter-day significance of the Day of Atonement? Dr. Kellogg asks:

“Now, if the feast of tabernacles has been correctly interpreted, as presignifying in symbol the completion of the great world harvest in the end of the age, does the prophetic word reveal anything in connection with the last things as preceding that wheat harvest; and, in some sense, preparing for and ushering in that day, which should be the antitype of the great day of atonement?”<sup>3</sup>

He then proceeds to suggest that the antitype would be the repentance of literal Israel and her cleansing from sin. This view of reclaiming Israel as the event signified in this connection is not peculiar to Dr. Kellogg, but has been echoed by several. The same scholars generally apply the Feast of Trumpets to the warning message of the approaching advent of Christ, and Mt. 24:14 is often quoted in this regard.

The above constitutes evidence that it is not a peculiar view which represents the Day of Atonement as having special application prior to the second coming of Christ. The next step is to inquire, What are some of the references in Revelation that employ Day of Atonement imagery, and who are some of the scholars that have drawn attention to such?

Frederick Nolan, noted linguist and theologian of the nineteenth century, asserted in *The Time of the Millennium Investigated* that on many occasions the attention of antiquaries and scholars had been drawn to the references to the Day of Atonement in the Book of Revelation. After declaring his belief that the imagery of the seventh seal was derived from the great Day of Atonement and the jubilee, he stated: “The analogy between this description, and the service of the Temple, upon one of the most solemn festivals of the Mosaic ceremonial, is so obvious that it has often excited the attention of the antiquary and scholar.”<sup>4</sup>

He further asserts that the frequent allusions in Rev. 9 and 15 to the ark of the tabernacle, the altar, and the incense, refer not to the “daily service,” but to the “peculiar solemnity” of the service on the “great day of Atonement,” performed “by the high priest, in the holiest place of the Temple,” and celebrated in the seventh month.

Nolan notes that the jubilee always commenced on the Day of Atonement and was ushered in with the sound of trumpets. Thus to him the opening of the seventh seal with its allusions to the Feast of Trumpets and to the Day of Atonement points to the opening of the millennium and the true jubilee.<sup>4</sup> Joshua Spalding, a contemporary of Nolan, was also a writer on the prophecies of the Book of Revelation. Like Nolan, he held that the feasts of the seventh month were symbolic of the final restitution of all things. L.E. Froom gives in some detail the views of this writer in his third volume of *Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers*.<sup>5</sup>

Another writer referred to by L.E. Froom is John Tudor, one-time editor of the *Church of England Quarterly Review*. Commenting on the pouring out of the last vial, Tudor wrote:

“The temple of God is then opened, and the ark of his testament seen, xi. 19; and the voice issues from *the throne*, xvi. 17; both expressions equally denoting the holy of

holies, which was only entered once a year, on the day of atonement. This period is therefore our day of atonement, and requires our particular notice, to know what events we may expect, answering to the type.”<sup>8</sup>

Elsewhere in speaking of Rev. 8:1-5 and 11:19, he affirms that “all the imagery in this poem was taken from the Day of Atonement” — the golden censer, the incense, the deep affliction, the temple opened, and the ark exposed (“indicating the opening of the veil on the day of atonement”).<sup>7</sup>

Sir Isaac Newton, perhaps more than any other scholar, has stressed the point made in the first quotation of this appendix, namely that the visions of the Book of Revelation abound with the imagery of the feasts of the seventh month.

Commenting on Rev. 5, Newton declares:

“It was the custom for the High-Priest, seven days before the fast of the seventh month, to continue constantly in the Temple, and study the book of the Law, that he might be perfect in it against the day of expiation; wherein the service, which was various and intricate, was wholly to be performed by himself; part of which service was reading the Law to the people; and to promote his studying it, there were certain Priests appointed by the Sanhedrin to be with him those seven days in one of his chambers in the Temple, and there to discourse with him about the Law, and read it to him and put him in mind of reading and studying it himself. This his opening and reading the Law those seven days, is alluded unto in the Lamb’s opening the seals.”<sup>7</sup>

And on Rev. 8:1-5, Newton further says:

“The seventh seal was therefore opened on the day of expiation, and then *there was silence in heaven for half an hour. And an Angel, the High-Priest, stood at the Altar, having a golden Censer; and there was given him much incense, that he should offer it with the prayers of all Saints, upon the golden Altar which was before the throne.* The custom was on other days, for one of the Priests to take fire from the great Altar in a silver Censer; but on this day, for the High-Priest to take fire from the great Altar in a golden Censer; and when he was come down from the great Altar, he took incense from one of the Priests who brought it to him, and went with it to the golden Altar: and while he offered the incense, the people prayed without in silence, which is the silence in heaven for half an hour.

“When the High-Priest had laid the incense on the Altar, he carried a Censer of it burning in his hand, into the most holy place before the Ark. *And the smoke of the incense, with the prayers of the Saints, ascended up before God out of the Angel’s hand.* On other days there was a certain measure of incense for the golden Altar: on this day there was a greater quantity for both the Altar and the most holy Place, and therefore it is called *much incense* ...

“The solemnity of the day of expiation being finished, the seven Angels sound their trumpets at the great sacrifices of the seven days of the feast of tabernacles; and at the same sacrifices, the seven thunders utter their voices which are the musick of the Temple, and singing of the *Levites*, intermixed with the soundings of the trumpets: and the seven Angels pour out their vials of wrath, which are the drink-offerings of those sacrifices.”<sup>9</sup>

Some will not agree with all the details of interpretation offered by Newton or all the references which he declares to point to the Day of Atonement ceremonial. However, certain features of analogy between the visions of Revelation and the solemn fast day of Yom Kippur are undeniable. All authorities are agreed, for example, that a golden censer such as referred to in Revelation 8:3 was used only by the Jewish High Priest on the Day of Atonement.<sup>10</sup>

Rev. 11:19 is a clearer reference still to another feature of the Day of Atonement, namely the entrance into the most holy place, and the viewing of the ark for the only time in the year. The fact that many scholars have made such quotations as the preceding is conclusive that the Bible's latest book, with its prophecies specially relating to the last times, harnesses the imagery of this special day to express vital truths. It is also significant that this imagery is associated with references to the other holy days of the seventh month, Trumpets and Tabernacles giving a combined witness to the latter-day application of these typical occasions.

Newton's remarks on the sealing work are especially interesting. He quotes Rev. 7:1-3, and says:

"This sealing alludes to a tradition of the Jews, that upon the day of expiation all the people of Israel are sealed up in the books of life and death (Buxtorf, in *Synagoga Judaica*, c. 18, 21.). For the Jews in their *Talmud* tell us, that in the beginning of every new year, or first day of the month Tishri, the seventh month of the sacred year, three books are opened in judgment: the book of life, in which the names of those are written who are perfectly just; the book of death, in which the names of those are written who are Atheists or very wicked; and a third book, of those whose judgment is suspended till the day of expiation, and whose names are not written in the book of life or death before that day. The first ten days of this month they call the penitential days; and all these days they fast and pray very much, and are very devout, that on the tenth day their sins may be remitted, and their names may be written in the book of life; which day is therefore called the day of expiation. And upon this tenth day, in returning home from the Synagogues, they say to one another, *God the creator seal you to a good year*. For they conceive that the books are now sealed up, and that the sentence of God remains unchanged henceforward to the end of the year.

"The same thing is signified by the two Goats, upon whose foreheads the High-Priest yearly, on the day of expiation, lays the two lots inscribed, *For God* and *For Azazel*; God's lot signifying the people who are sealed with the name of God in their foreheads; and the lot Azazel, which was sent into the wilderness, representing those who receive the mark and the name of the Beast, and go to the wilderness with the great Whore."<sup>11</sup>

By this statement Sir Isaac Newton declares his belief that the crisis of Rev. 13 over the mark of the beast and also the sealing work described earlier both apply to the antitypical Day of Atonement. He places these events in the setting of judgment as typified by Israel's ancient fast day.

Examining, then, the position of scholars on the Day of Atonement, we find evidence that a goodly number of repute believed the feasts of the seventh month to be typical of events associated with the second advent of Christ. These men did not believe that the significance of the Day of Atonement was exhausted by the use made of it by Paul in Heb. 9. That is to say, the scholars referred to believed that the Day of Atonement has a special significance for those living in the last days of earth's history. Commentaries on the Book of Revelation that have discerned the allusions of the visions to Old Testament ceremonial expressly affirm the



foregoing view. In the realm of eschatology these facts are of tremendous importance at this time.

---

<sup>1</sup> Isaac Newton, pp. 308, 309.

<sup>2</sup> S.H. Kellogg, „The Book of Leviticus,” *The Expositor’s Bible*, pp. 468-470.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 470.

<sup>4</sup> Cited by L.E. Froom, *Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers, III*, pp. 608-610.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 230-235.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 507.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 504.

<sup>8</sup> Isaac Newton, pp. 313, 314.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 314, 315.

<sup>10</sup> Herbert Danby (trans.), *The Mishnah*, Yoma iv. 4, p. 167.

<sup>11</sup> Isaac Newton, pp. 315, 316.

## **APPENDIX TWENTY-EIGHT**

### Quotations On Inaugurated Eschatology



## QUOTATIONS ON INAUGURATED ESCHATOLOGY

What the Jews expected of the future is still expected of the future; but the future event is no longer the centre of the redemptive history; rather, that centre lies now in a historical event. The centre has been reached but the end is still to come. I may illustrate this idea by an example: **The decisive battle in a war may already have occurred in a relatively early stage of the war, and yet the war still continues.** Although the decisive effect of that battle is perhaps not recognized by all, it nevertheless already means victory. But the war must still be carried on for an undefined time, until "Victory Day." Precisely this is the situation of which the New Testament is conscious, as a result of the recognition of the new division of time; the revelation consists precisely in the fact of the proclamation that **that event on the cross, together with the resurrection which followed, was the already concluded decisive battle.** In this faith-given knowledge, which likewise has as a result a harvesting of the fruits of that battle, consists that participation of faith in God's Lordship over time of which we spoke in the preceding chapter.

Upon the basis of this position, however, we must now say against Martin Werner, as well as against Albert Schweitzer, that the entire perspective in which they place the New Testament is not correct. They regard as the mid-point of the process the future coming of the Messianic Age, whereas the mid-point of time in the entire New Testament and **already for Jesus** is rather the historical work of Jesus himself. Accordingly, everything is to be explained from the point of view, not of the future, but of this event. It simply is not true that Primitive Christianity has the same eschatological orientation as does Judaism. To be sure, it has **also** an eschatological orientation. The Jewish expectation concerning the future retains its validity for Jesus and throughout the entire New Testament, but it is no longer the centre. That centre is the victorious event which the historical Jesus sees is being fulfilled in the exercise of his calling: "The blind see, the lame walk, lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, and to the poor the gospel is preached" (Matt. 11:5). For the Primitive Church after the death of Jesus, the crowning act of this work is the mighty fact of the resurrection of Christ. No other point of time in the entire process, either in the past or in the future, can have so central a significance as this one does for men who are convinced that Jesus Christ has risen in bodily form as the first-born of the dead!

He who does not see that the radically new thing in the New Testament is the Primitive Christian shifting of the centre of time can understand Christianity only as a Jewish sect. In reality, the Christian hope is not the Jewish one. To be sure, hope is also present in Primitive Christianity in its full intensity, indeed in increased intensity, although the event hoped for is no longer the centre of time. The fact that the Primitive Christian hope is still more intense than the Jewish one might give rise to the erroneous opinion that, according to the New Testament, eschatology stands in a particularly explicit way in the centre of what happens. Intensity and central position, however, are not to be confused. In reality, the increased intensity of hope in Primitive Christianity is to be explained by the very fact that the centre of time is not in the object of hope but rather in an already occurred historical fact. This then means that the hope for the future can now be supported by faith in the past, faith in the already concluded decisive battle. That which has already happened offers the solid guarantee for that which will take place. **The hope of the final victory is so much the more vivid because of the unshakably firm conviction that the battle that decides the victory has already taken place.**

With this decisive battle is connected the New Testament "expectation of the imminent end." This expectation, which is so much discussed by Martin Werner, really roots in the faith that

the redemptive event has already occurred and been completed. It must be strongly emphasized that this faith is the prior ground of the expectation that the end is imminent. Therefore it is not true that this faith in a fulfilment that has already taken place in Jesus Christ is a “substitute” for the unfulfilled expectation of the immediate coming of the Kingdom of God; on the contrary, this faith produced the expectation. The essential point in the proclamation that “the Kingdom has come near” does indeed concern chronology, but in the closest connection with the knowledge concerning the already reached decision. The chief point in question, therefore, is not the limitation that the imminent end will come within a generation, although this limitation is actually present in the New Testament. The theologically important point in the preaching of the nearness of the Kingdom of God is not this fact, but rather the implicit assertion that since the coming of Christ we already stand in a new period of time, and that therefore the end has drawn nearer.

~~~ O. Cullmann, *Christ and Time* (London, 1951), pp. 84-85, 86-87.



“Now is the judgment.” The whole life of Jesus had been a judgment, but that judgment reached its climax in the Cross before which the whole world stood condemned. If the world had been left alone to face its condemnation, the judgment of the world would have been the triumph of Satan, the prince of this world. As Tempter he would have succeeded to the uttermost; as the Great Accuser he would have won his case; as Destroyer he would have been free to claim his own. But because Jesus identified himself with the accused, the Cross became the defeat of Satan and the point where all men, released from Satan’s power, were drawn into unity with Jesus, and therefore into unity with the Father.

For John the eschatological events of the Last Day are so completely present in the person of Jesus that he has little to say about any final crisis. He never discusses whether or not all men will in the end be saved. But he does say that God intends the salvation of all, that God’s work of universal salvation has been accomplished once-for-all by Christ on Calvary, that Christians ought to abide in his love and not to be content with anything less than love’s total victory, that the final judgment will not be different in character from the judgment of the cross by which the prince of this world has been cast out and all men drawn, in fact if not yet in faith, into unity with the Crucified.

~~~ George B. Caird, “Judgment and Salvation,” *Canadian Journal of Theology*, Vol. 2, No. 4, pp. 235, 237.



The Pauline *kerygma*, therefore, is a proclamation of the facts of the death and resurrection of Christ in an eschatological setting which gives significance to the facts. They mark the transition from “this evil Age” to the “Age to Come.” The “Age to Come” is the age of fulfilment. Hence the importance of the statement that Christ died and rose “according to the Scriptures.” Whatever events the Old Testament prophets may indicate as impending, these events are for them significant as elements in the coming of “the Day of the Lord.” Thus the fulfilment of prophecy means that the Day of the Lord has dawned: the Age to Come has begun. The death and resurrection of Christ are the crucial fulfilment of prophecy. By virtue of them believers are already delivered out of this present evil age. The new age is here, of which Christ, again by virtue of His death and resurrection, is Lord. He will come to exercise His Lordship both as Judge and as Saviour at the consummation of the Age.

The preaching of the primitive Church had, as we have seen, an eschatological setting. Its terms were borrowed from the traditional eschatology of Judaism. But it differed from all

earlier prophecy and apocalypse in declaring that the eschatological process was already in being. The Kingdom of God had made its appearance with the coming of the Messiah; His works of power and His “new teaching with authority” had provided evidence of the presence of God among men; His death “according to the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God” had marked the end of the old order, and His resurrection and exaltation had definitely inaugurated the new age, characterized, as the prophets had foretold, by the outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon the people of God. It remained only for the new order to be consummated by the return of Christ in glory to judge the quick and the dead and to save His own from the wrath to come. The whole was conceived as a continuous, divinely directed process, in which past, present, and future alike had eschatological significance. In the recent past lay the ministry, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ; the experience of the present attested His power in the Church through the Spirit; the near future would bring the final revelation of the meaning of the whole.

Paul’s preaching was centred in the proclamation of the facts of the death and resurrection of Christ. His interpretation of these facts starts from the application to them of eschatological categories. Thus he says that in the death of Christ God manifested His righteousness and condemned sin in the flesh. The manifestation of righteousness and the condemnation of sin are functions of the Last Judgment. Again, he says that in the Cross God triumphed over principalities and powers. The overthrow of the “kingdom of the enemy” is in eschatological tradition the coming of the Kingdom of God, that is, the ultimate divine event. Similarly, the resurrection of Christ is for Paul the first stage of that transfiguration of human nature into a heavenly condition which the apocalypses predicted. He is the “first-fruits of them that sleep,” the “first-born from the dead,” and in union with Him Christians have already experienced the “new creation,” and are “being transfigured from glory to glory.” Thus the death and resurrection of Christ are interpreted as the divinely ordained crisis in history through which old things passed away and the new order came into being.

It is in this light that we must understand all that Paul says about redemption, justification, and the end of the Law. The “redemption” of Israel out of Egyptian slavery had already become for the prophets a foreshadowing of the ultimate “redemption” of the people of God from all the evil of this present age. It is this ultimate (eschatological) “redemption” that Paul sees to have been accomplished through the death and resurrection of Christ. Again, the very idea of “justification” implies a judgment which has already taken place. The righteousness of God is already revealed, and it has taken the form, as the prophets had foreseen that it would, of the “justification” of His people. And nothing short of the appearance of the Age to Come could supersede the Law, which was the complete expression of the purpose of God for man in “this age”. In dying to the Law, and rising into newness of life, Christ had made the decisive transition, on behalf of the whole people of God.

Finally, the philosophy of history expounded in Rom. 9-11, and more allusively elsewhere, with its acute and convincing valuation of the stages of Hebrew and Jewish history, implies a corresponding valuation of the events in which, for Paul, that history reached fulfilment, the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ.

In the New Testament the apocalyptic symbolism of the Old recurs freely, but with a profound difference. The divine event is declared to have happened. Consider the following propositions, taken from all parts of the New Testament:

“The Kingdom of God has come upon you” (Matt. 12:28).

“This is that which was spoken by the prophet” (Acts 2:16).

“If any man is in Christ, there is a new creation” (2 Cor. 5:17).

“He has rescued us out of the dominion of darkness and transferred us into the Kingdom of the Son of His Love” (Col. 1:13).

“We are being transfigured from glory to glory” (2 Cor. 3:18).

“He has saved us by the washing of rebirth and the renewal of the Holy Spirit” (Titus 3:5).

“Having tasted the powers of the Age to Come” (Heb. 6:5).

“Born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible” (1 Pet. 1:23).

“The darkness is passing, and the real light is already shining ... it is the last hour” (1 John 2:8).

From these and many similar passages it is surely clear that, for the New Testament writers in general, the *eschaton* has entered history; the hidden rule of God has been revealed; the Age to Come has come.

The characteristics of the Day of the Lord as described in prophecy and apocalypse are boldly transferred to the historical crisis.

First, it is fulfilment. “The time is fulfilled” is the declaration which Mark inscribes over the whole Gospel record. Similarly, Paul declares, “When the fullness of time had come, God sent forth His Son.” The frequent appeals to the fulfilment of prophecy, which the modern reader is apt to find tedious and unconvincing, are a piecemeal assertion of the one great fact that the meaning of history is now summed up.

That which the prophets foresaw was the Day of the Lord, and that alone. The fulfilment of prophecy means that the Day has dawned.

Secondly, the supernatural has manifestly entered history. The arm of the Lord is made bare. “The blind see, the lame walk, lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear, the dead are raised, and to the poor good tidings are proclaimed.” The miracle-stories of the Gospels correspond closely with the symbols which the prophets had used to depict the supernatural character of the Age to Come. They may be regarded, once again, as a piecemeal assertion of the one great fact that with the appearance of Christ the age of miracle arrived. The story of His ministry is told as a realized apocalypse.

Thirdly, this open manifestation of the power of God is the overthrow of the powers of evil. “If I by the finger of God cast out demons, then the Kingdom of God has come upon you,” says Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels. The Christ of the Fourth Gospel, on the eve of His death, declares, “Now shall the prince of this world be cast out.” Paul says that in the Cross God triumphed over principalities and powers. The theme recurs in other parts of the New Testament.

Fourthly, this is the judgment of the world. In the death of Christ, says Paul, God manifested His righteousness and condemned sin in the flesh. “This” (according to the Fourth Gospel) “is the judgment, that the Light has come into the world (with the incarnation of the Word), and men loved darkness rather than light.”

Finally, eternal life, the “life of the Age to Come,” is now realized in experience. Christ is risen from the dead, the first-fruits of them that sleep, and we are raised with Him in newness of life. He who believes **has** life eternal.

~~~ C.H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching* (New York, 1962), pp. 13, 36, 42-43, 84-85, 86.

It has come to be a commonplace in Pauline studies that even if Paul retains the eschatological perspective, the centre of gravity has shifted to “realized eschatology.”

The event in history in Jesus Christ is an eschatological event which in some way is related to the age to come and has significantly changed the structure of the time-line. This is reflected in the fact that while believers continue to live in this age, the death of Christ means deliverance from the power of this evil age (Gal. 1:4). Furthermore, God has brought new transforming powers to renew the minds of believers by virtue of which they need be no longer conformed to this age (Rom. 12:2). Here are two sides of the redemptive event in Christ: the meaning of his death and a new indwelling power which in some real way delivers believers from this age even while they continue to live in it. This can only mean that in Jesus Christ, the powers of the age to come have intervened in this age without having destroyed it, which is another way of saying that the God who will intervene in the cosmic apocalyptic event at the end of the age has already intervened in Jesus Christ to bring the blessings of the age to come in advance.

It is because of this modification of the redemptive time-line that Paul can speak of the Kingdom of God not only as an eschatological inheritance but also as the realm of present blessing. God has already delivered us from the power of darkness and transferred us **into** the Kingdom of his beloved Son (Col. 1:13). Although he still lives in the old evil age, the believer in some real sense is also already in the Kingdom of Christ. The blessings of this Kingdom are not to be found on the physical level, but include righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit (Rom. 14:17). Eternal life, which is an eschatological blessing, has come to men in the corruption and decay of the old age. The man in Christ shares the life of Jesus’ resurrection and therefore is to walk in newness of life (Rom. 6:4). Men who are dead in trespasses and sins have been raised up out of the grave of spiritual death by faith and have been made alive with Christ (Eph. 2:2ff).

This can be illustrated by an examination of several prominent Pauline doctrines, particularly those of justification and life in the Spirit — the objective and the subjective aspects of redemption. Furthermore, the eschatological character of both of these events helps to illuminate their relationship to each other.

The centre of Pauline thought is the realization of the coming of the powers of the new age; but this does not mean in any way a minimizing of the truth of justification in favour of mysticism or the life of the Spirit. On the contrary, it means an equal emphasis on the doctrine of justification; for justification is an eschatological event belonging to the end of the age, which, nevertheless, has already taken place in history because of the death of Jesus Christ. The very truth of justification is an element of realized eschatology.

The truth of justification must be understood against the Old Testament doctrine of righteousness, which has an essentially eschatological orientation. God is the righteous lawgiver and judge; and it is only in the divine judgment, when God will render a judicial verdict, that each man’s righteousness or unrighteousness will be finally declared.

The issue of judgment will be either a declaration of righteousness which will mean the acquittal from all guilt, or conviction of unrighteousness and subsequent condemnation. The essential meaning of justification, therefore, is forensic and involves acquittal by the righteous judge in the eschatological day of judgment.

This eschatological significance of justification is seen in several uses of the word *dikaioō*. When Paul says, “Who shall bring any charge against God’s elect? It is God who justifies;

who is to condemn?” (Rom. 8:33,34), he is looking forward to the final judgment, when God’s verdict of acquittal cannot be set aside by anyone who would bring an accusation which might result in condemnation. When we read that it is not the hearers of the law who in God’s sight are righteous but only the doers of the law who **will be** justified, we must look forward to a day of judgment when God will issue a verdict upon the conduct of men in terms of obedience or disobedience to the law (Rom. 2:13). The temporal orientation of the words “by one man’s obedience many will be made righteous” (Rom. 5:19) is the future judgment when God will pronounce the verdict of righteousness upon the many. The “**hope** of righteousness” for which we wait is the judicial pronouncement of righteousness, that is, of acquittal in the day of judgment. This acquittal is no longer sought by obedience and conformity to a legal code. Such a legal acquittal was insisted on by the Judaisers who would turn the Galatians away from grace to obedience to the law. The Christian hope of righteousness is through the Spirit by faith (Gal. 5:4, 5).

The eschatological setting of justification is seen even more clearly in one of the sayings of our Lord: “I tell you, on the day of judgment, men will render account for every careless word they utter; for by your words you will be justified, and by your words you will be condemned” (Matt. 12:36, 37).

In the eschatological understanding of justification, as well as in its forensic aspect, the Pauline doctrine agrees with that of contemporary Jewish thought. However, there are several points at which the Pauline teaching is radically different from the Jewish concept; and one of the essential differences is that the future eschatological justification has **already taken place**. “Since therefore we have now been justified by his blood, much more shall we be saved by him from the wrath of God” (Rom. 5:9). “Since we have been justified by faith, we have peace with God” (Rom. 5:1). “You were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ” (1 Cor. 6:11). In these instances the verb is in the aorist tense, expressing an act that has been accomplished. Through faith in Christ, on the ground of his shed blood, men have already been justified, acquitted of the guilt of sin, and therefore are delivered from condemnation.

Here again we find a further illustration of the modification of the antithetical eschatological structure of biblical thought. The justification that primarily means acquittal at the final judgment has already taken place in the present. The eschatological judgment is no longer alone future; it has become verdict in history. Justification that belongs to the age to come and issues in the future salvation has become a present reality inasmuch as the age to come has reached back into the present evil age to bring its soteric blessings to men. An essential element in the salvation of the future age is the divine acquittal and the pronouncement of righteousness; this acquittal, justification, which consists of the divine absolution of sin, has already been effected by the death of Christ and may be received by faith here and now. The future judgment has thus become essentially a present experience. God in Christ has acquitted the believer; therefore he is certain of deliverance from the wrath of God (Rom. 5:9), and he no longer stands under condemnation (Rom. 8:1).

Not only is justification an eschatological truth that has been contemporized by the new structure of the ages; the life of the Spirit is also an element of realized eschatology.

Paul makes it clear that he regards the resurrection of Jesus as the beginning of this eschatological resurrection. The resurrection, previously viewed as a single event at the end of the age, is now seen to occur in several stages: Christ’s resurrection is the “firstfruits” or the first stage of the eschatological harvest; the second stage will take place at the Parousia when those who belong to Christ are raised up; possibly there is a third stage at the *telos* or

final consummation at the end of Christ's reign, which will extend beyond the Parousia (1 Cor. 15:20-24). In any case, the resurrection of Christ, like the Kingdom of God, is an eschatological event that has taken place in the midst of history. The eschatological nature of Christ's resurrection is another of the crucial redemptive events that require us to see a realized eschatology, a restructuring of the redemptive time-line in Paul. This is why the resurrection means the appearance of life and immortality in the midst of history (2 Tim. 1:10).

The eschatological structure of Paul's thought is seen further in the fact that the very gift of the indwelling Holy Spirit is an eschatological concept. The prophets looked forward to the perfect establishment of God's reign when the enemies of God and of God's people would be either converted or destroyed, the burden of evil upon the natural world lifted so that joy and blessing alone prevail, and God's people, repentant, converted, and obedient be gathered in the redeemed land. The means of this conversion is variously described, but one important aspect of this hope was the gift of the Spirit to indwell God's people. The implanting of the *ruach Yahweh* will mean a new heart — a heart of flesh instead of a heart of stone, a life of obedience to God instead of disobedience, and the final realization of the goal of the covenant: "You shall be my people, and I will be your God" (Ezek. 36:28; cf. Gen. 17:7; Ex. 6:7; 2 Sam. 7:24, *passim*). Jeremiah, viewing the same day of redemption, describes it in terms of a new covenant when God will write his law upon the hearts of his people with the result that all shall know the Lord (Jer. 31:31ff). Joel sees an outpouring of the Spirit upon **all** flesh — i.e., not only upon judges, priests, kings and prophets, but upon even the least of God's people (Joel 2:28ff). The important fact to note is that these promises of the gift of the Spirit regenerating God's people are strictly eschatological and belong to the Day of the Lord (Joel 2:31).

Paul recognizes that the gift of the Spirit is an eschatological gift and that the life imparted by the indwelling Spirit is essentially the life of the age to come. This is attested by two Pauline metaphors. The indwelling Spirit is an *arrabōn* and an *aparchē*. The first term is a word used in commercial transactions in vernacular Greek of the earnest-money, or down payment given in advance of the total sum to be paid in full later. The present gift of the Spirit brings a partial but real experience of the life of the age to come (2 Cor. 1:22). In the age to come, the acquisition of the full inheritance (Eph. 1:14) will include the redemption of the body. Paul longs to put on the body not made with hands that what is mortal may be swallowed up in life (2 Cor. 5:4). Then he will receive a "spiritual body" (1 Cor. 15:44), i.e., a body transformed by the Spirit and thereby made imperishable, glorious, and powerful, conformed to the body of Christ's glory (Phil. 3:21). Then alone will the believer know the fullness of life. However, for this Paul must await the resurrection at the Parousia of Christ and the age to come. Meanwhile, the Christian life is far more than hope, it involves more than a "guarantee" of a future experience of life, as the RSV translates it. Christian experience is the life of the Spirit, which is an initial instalment of the fullness of the future life the same in kind although limited in degree. "Realized" eschatology does not displace realistic eschatology; rather, it is the reality of the life of the age to come which makes possible a partial experience of that life in the present age.

The same thought of eschatological experience is expressed by the word *aparchē*. Properly speaking, this means a gift of firstfruits offered to God, but it is used by Paul of God's gift to man. The life of the Spirit does not exhaust the fullness of God's redemptive gifts, for we still endure the bondage to decay which afflicts all creation. God did not create men that they might suffer and succumb to corruption and death. We are waiting eagerly for the adoption, namely, the redemption of the body. This blessing belongs to the age to come. However, in

spite of the fact that we are in this age in bondage to decay and death, we do have the Spirit as the firstfruits of the life of the age to come. Firstfruits means more than the promise given by the sprouting of leaves or the bursting of blossoms; it is more than the expectation held forth by green but indigestible fruits; firstfruits is the actual beginning of the harvest, yet not identical with the harvest itself. Such is the life of the Spirit: the life of the age to come, the beginning of the eschatological harvest, yet not the fullness of that harvest. This life has through the Spirit been made available to human experience even in the midst of the decay and death of this evil age.

~~~ G.E. Ladd, *The Pattern of New Testament Truth* (Grand Rapids, 1968), pp. 90, 91-92, 93, 94-95, 97, 100-102.



There is no book in the New Testament where the eschatology is more closely integrated with the teaching of the document as a whole. It is eschatology thoroughly appropriated and digested both in the mind of the author and in the life and thought of the Christians whom he addresses.

The position is fully illustrated in 1:19-21, when the author speaks of redemption having been already effected “by the precious blood of Christ ... who was foreknown indeed before the foundation of the world, but was manifested at the end of the times for your sake, who through him are believers in God, who raised him from the dead and gave him glory.” The end, that is to say, has already supervened (4:7) in the advent of the predestined Messiah, in his death and resurrection and exaltation, and in the believing community now called into existence by this new revelation of God.

The end, then, has supervened; the eschatological Messiah has entered history; the eschatological community has been called out of the Jewish and Gentile world. ... Riesenfeld has noted the connection between the ecstatic joy which marked the Feast of Tabernacles in Judaism and the concept of the eschatological joy which was associated with the future salvation.

Our author, therefore, conceives of the end as organically linked with what has already occurred, in the case both of Christ and of the Church: it is not a matter of something wholly novel but of the culmination of something already experienced and known. His favourite terms when speaking of the end are salvation, revelation, and glory. *Parousia*, on the other hand, which is almost a technical term elsewhere in the N.T., does not occur in this Epistle; and, except probably in 4:5, it is the Father rather than the Christ who is thought of as the Judge. Nevertheless, as Bengel observes (on 1 Pet. 4:17) “it is one and the same judgment from the time of the preaching of the Gospel by the apostles until the last judgment,” a doctrine well illustrated in 2:6-8.

~~~ E.G. Selwyn, *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology*, eds. W.D. Davies, D. Daube (Cambridge, 1956), pp. 394, 395, 396-397.



It lies at the very heart of the gospel message to affirm that the Kingdom of God has in a real sense become present fact, here and now. We have already remarked upon the dramatic change of tense which the New Testament brings in speaking of the Kingdom. The future tense of the Old Testament (“behold the days are coming,” and the like) has now become an emphatic present: “The kingdom of God is at hand” (Mark 1:15). The final act of the drama has even now begun, the messianic age has dawned; he who is greater than Solomon, greater

than Jonah (Luke 11:31-31), nay greater than temple and law (Matt. 12:6-8), is here. The Servant is even now on the scene (Luke 4:17-21), and his works may be seen of all (Matt. 11:2-6). This is the day which all the past desired to see, but did not (Luke 10:23-24). No need any more to look wildly about for signs of the Kingdom's imminent coming: it is right here "among you" (Luke 17:21). In the person and work of Jesus the Kingdom of God has intruded into the world.

The Cross thus stands in the eyes of the New Testament faith as the very pivot of history. It is the middle point of all things from which all events are to be dated. (And it is a sound instinct, though hardly evidence of deep Christian faith, that we divide all history in B.C. and A.D.). For the Cross is the beginning of the new age and the end of the old. Here Christ laid down his life for sin and broke the power of sin (Heb. 2:14). Then, rising again on the third day, he showed that even that "last enemy" death had been done away (1 Cor. 15:20-22). In fact Paul declared that in the events of Passion Week and Easter the whole history of mankind since Adam has been reversed (1 Cor. 15; Rom. 5:12-21). As Adam in his sin bequeathed to the world the poisonous heritage of rebellion against God and, through it, the sentence of death, so now has come a new Adam, a heavenly Adam (1 Cor. 15:45-49) — a Son of Man — who, obedient unto death, brings life.

Thus the New Testament faith is the victory! And in that victory, it declares, the Christian may participate here and now. In fact the new age has already dawned, and the church is living in that age. The miracle of Pentecost is proof that the end-time has begun, for the outpouring of the spirit spoken of by Joel has taken place (Acts 2:16-21; cf. Joel 2:28-32; 2 Cor. 1:22; Eph. 1:13-14). The Christian has been delivered out of the present evil age (Gal. 1:4), has "tasted ... the powers of the age to come" (Heb. 6:5), has transferred his citizenship to that age (Phil. 3:20). He has been freed from the demonic power of evil (Col. 1:13) into the Kingdom of the Son. His natural enmity to God has been removed, for he has been reconciled in Christ to his heavenly Father and King (2 Cor. 5:19; Rom. 5:10-11). He has been adopted as a son in the family of God (Gal. 4:5-7), he has been accounted righteous through his faith (Rom. 5:1-5). Indeed as he confronts his Christ face to face like one beholding the glory of God in a mirror, he himself takes on that image (2 Cor. 3:18). Man, made in the image of God (Gen. 1:27), finds that image restored — becomes at length what he was created to be — in the Kingdom of Christ.

In the service of the victorious and already present Kingdom of God the church is given a joyful and triumphant task. The New Testament church saw itself, as we have said, as the people of that Kingdom, the "eschatological community" which was living already in the age to come. It was, then, to busy itself in those last days between the Resurrection and the expected end in proclaiming the Kingdom in the entire world and in summoning men to its rule.

In the light of what has been said it becomes clear that the Kingdom of God in the New Testament must be understood in a twofold aspect: it has come and is even now in the world; it is also yet to come. In the tension between the two the Church must live, and must always live, as the "eschatological community."

This double manner of speaking which the New Testament employs is not altogether strange. We may observe it, to a certain degree, both in the Old Testament and in the teachings of the Jewish rabbis. The rule of God was always believed to be present fact in that it was not doubted that God was at all times in control, judging the affairs of men in the context of history and summoning men to his service. On the other hand, that rule was always viewed as a future thing to be consummated in the eschatological event at the issue of history. But

whereas in the Old Testament and in Judaism these two aspects of the future thing is made present, the Kingdom is at hand here and now, and one may enter it and know its victory. Furthermore, so the New Testament declares, Christ — through his ministry, his death and resurrection — has made the triumph of that Kingdom sure. The victorious Kingdom is thus no longer a passively awaited thing, but a dynamically active one.

But it is precisely that which introduces the note of extreme tension so characteristic of the New Testament. For although the ministry of Christ was understood eschatologically as the beginning of the new age, that eschatological hope could not be said to have been completely realized in the earthly career of Jesus. The promised victory, although it could not be doubted, was clearly not complete. So the New Testament assumes, as it must assume, a double view of the Kingdom: it has come (“the kingdom of God is at hand”); it is yet to come (“Thy kingdom come”). If it be asked, then, whether the New Testament looked upon the Kingdom as present fact or future hope, the only answer is **both**. Thus while it declared that the Kingdom was present and victorious, it also looked ahead with a heightened longing to the return of the Lord (e.g., Acts 1:11; 1 Thess. 4:15-17; Tit. 2:13) and to the final victory (e.g., 1 Cor. 15:25; Phil. 1:6; Acts 3:21).

That victory was not doubted, but eagerly and imminently expected. The early church felt that it was living in the last days and the time was short. It saw itself, as we have said, as the “eschatological community.”

~~~~ John Bright, *The Kingdom of God* (Nashville, 1953), pp. 216, 231-232, 237-238.



The hour has come. Today is this Scripture fulfilled (Luke 4:21). The Creator Spirit whom the sins of the people had driven into exile with the last of the writing prophets, now broods again over the thirsty land; new creation has begun. The wretched hear the good news, the prison-doors open, the oppressed breathe again the air of freedom, blind pilgrims see the light, the day of salvation is here.

„Realized eschatology“ is also the meaning of Mark 2:19. To the question why his disciples do not fast, Jesus replied: „Can the bridal guests mourn during the bridal celebrations?“ In the symbolic language of the East the wedding is the symbol of the day of salvation, as the language of Apocalypse bears witness: „The marriage of the Lamb is come“ (Apoc. 19:7, cf. v. 9; 21:2, 9; 22:17). The day is come, the wedding songs resound. Here is no place for mourning. This is the time for the bridal festivities, why then should my disciples fast?

Heb. 1:10-12, following Ps. 102:26-28, describes how at the *Parousia* Christ rolls up the cosmos like an old garment and unfolds the new cosmos. Even more significant is the passage in Acts 10:11ff; 11:5ff, where Peter, in the symbol of the sheet tied at the four corners and containing every kind of living creature, beholds the new cosmos, restored and declared clean by God. Tent, sheet, and garment are common symbols of the cosmos. To this context Mark 2:21 belongs: the old world’s age has run out; it is compared to the old garment which is no longer worth patching with new cloth; the New Age has arrived.

~~~~ Joachim Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus* (New York, 1963), pp. 117, 118.



APPENDIX TWENTY-NINE

The Practical Implications Of The New Testament Gospel

THE PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT GOSPEL

The more I behold Christ's perfect embodiment of infinite love and truth exemplified in His every motive, thought, look word, and deed, the more my conscience would be vexed did I not also believe that His personal righteousness is imputed every moment to this foolish, erring, weak, stumbling believer. John 13:10; 17:6; 1:9. Similarly, the more I perceive of the depths of the sacred law which demand of me all that Christ was and did in His humanity, the more I would despair did not Scripture assure me that all who have surrendered their lives to the Saviour are "accepted in the beloved," "complete in Him," "cleansed from all unrighteousness," and without "condemnation" or "separation." Eph. 1:6; Col. 2:10; 1 John 1:9; Rom. 8:1, 33-39.

Despite the fact that we strive to fulfil every known duty we remain "unprofitable servants," righteous only by faith in the merits of Christ "for we all make many mistakes" and must daily pray "forgive us our trespasses." James 3:2; Matt. 6:12; Rom. 3:20-26. In other words, the good news assures me that if I have given myself to Christ I am perfectly His child, though not a perfect child. Heb. 12:5-7; John 13:1. While I am a sinner in myself all my days, in Christ I have perfect righteousness, for "this man [Jesus] receiveth sinners," and God is One who justifieth the ungodly who believe. Matt. 7:11; Luke 13:3; Rom. 5:4.

While at every advance step in my Christian experience my penitence will deepen, and I will make the apostle's confession my own, "I know that in me ... there dwelleth no good thing," and my prayers will urgently ascend that the Saviour might heal the disorders of my sin-sick soul, simultaneously I will rejoice that Christ is made unto me righteousness, sanctification, wisdom, and redemption, and that I can never be lost while I trust in His merits. 1 Cor. 1:31; Heb. 13:7; Rev. 8:1-4; Zech. 3:1-5; Matt. 18:21, 22.

Furthermore, while sin remains in me and ever easily besets me, it shall not reign, for once I learn that my standing before God is determined by divine grace "regardless of my success in keeping the law" [Rom 3:28 NEB], then sin ceases to have dominion over me. Rom. 6:14. The tenor of my life is heavenward, despite manifold inconsistencies and failures. Being now united with Christ by faith, the fruit of righteousness is spontaneous. Rom. 7:4. For it is not possible for me to accept Christ's death without also accepting His resurrection life. Rom. 6:1-12.

Paul declares that the two typical objections to the true gospel are invalid for the believer. I cannot accept the work of the second member of the Godhead and reject that of the third. Rom. 3:31; 6:1-3. God gives His gifts with two hands, and justifies no man whom He does not proceed to sanctify. **Thus there will be no separation between justification and sanctification in my experience, but there will be distinction, for the first is complete and perfect, but the latter being the work of a lifetime is neither complete nor perfect.** Compare Heb. 1:3; John 19:30; Col. 2:11-15 with 1 Cor. 9:27; Gal. 5:17; 1 John 1:8.

Thus in every place where Paul mentions "the righteousness which is of faith" he means not sanctification, but that justification which is based on the finished atonement. Justification means a declaring righteous, never making righteous in the sense of infusion of character. Rom. 1:6, 17; 3:21, 22; 4:11, 13; 9:30 to 10:1-13; Gal. 5:6; Phil. 3:9; Rom. 5:4; 3:24; 5:17, 18. For justification is both instantaneous and one hundred per cent, but it is not so with character development. The imputation of righteousness in justification is not a legal fiction, for when Christ died as the representative of the race, then "all died," 2 Cor. 5:14, and when

He rose, all rose. Col. 3:1; Eph. 2:6. God declares me not subjectively righteous but forensically so. Justification has to do with my standing, not my state.

Believing this good news that my acceptance with Christ is conditional on His perfection and not mine, I am free to work for others without feeling hypocritical concerning my own inadequacies and failures. Only this gospel offers a message for others which will inspire faith, hope, and love, thus bringing that quality of life which all perfectionism strives in vain to accomplish. Is not this the approach of the New Testament, which while sketching the many infirmities of the early believers, encourages them to fight the fight of faith with the assurance of an ultimate abundant entrance into heaven?

The New Testament offers many verbal pictures of the Gospel which characterize the new age ushered in by the cross of Christ. These figures include ransom, reconciliation, atonement, justification, etc. The reality always transcends the figure, and the forensic understanding of justification does not imply that acceptance with God is merely a bookkeeping transaction. The gift of the indwelling Spirit and the event of regeneration ever accompany saving faith. But the forensic metaphor is valuable as enabling those aware of their pollution of soul to depend upon a perfect righteousness which was wrought out 2000 years ago and offered today as a free gift immediately available to all who will accept it. Isa. 6:5-7. This outward and upward look accomplishes a thousand-fold more than all sanctified spiritual navel-watching could, for it lays the glory of man in the dust and does for him what he could never do for himself. The Spirit of holiness does not speak of Himself but testifies of Christ alone and His righteousness, and so should we.

This everlasting gospel, the faith once-for-all given to the saints, is the theme which has inspired all revivals, and should ever prevail in Christian preaching, swallowing up all other themes, for it is the third angel's message in verity, and the last hope for a hopeless world. Jude 3; Matt. 24:14; Rev. 14:6; 1 Cor. 2:2; Gal. 6:14; 1 Cor. 15:3 RSV. Far from being a newfangled heresy, it is the very gospel foretold in Gen. 3:15, and cherished by prophets, apostles, martyrs, reformers, and the greatest evangelists of all ages.

Desmond Ford

APPENDIX THIRTY

The Biblical Doctrine Of Judgment

THE BIBLICAL DOCTRINE OF JUDGMENT

Judgment is a term applicable to an objective point in the past (Calvary); a process in the present (Christ's mediatorial rule as priest-king) which marks the relationship of men to the cross and seals each at the close of his personal probation; and to yet another objective point in the future, when the destinies already sealed and adjudged will be objectively manifested.

In John 12:31 we have the first; in Rom. 1:16-32, Rev. 1-3; Zech. 3; Rom. 8:33-34; Rev. 7:1-4; Heb. 4:12; 1 Cor. 4:4 the second; and in 1 Cor. 4:5; 2 Tim. 4:1; Rom. 2:3-10; Rev. 19:11, etc. the third.

What Adventists have called the investigative judgment belongs to the second meaning, and what they have called the executive judgment the third. The terms are not biblical — but the concepts are.

A chief problem with Adventism's view has been the long continuation of the judgment process. But understood in the light of Matt. 24:34, which teaches that Christ can return to any generation which spreads His gospel to the world, that problem is not insuperable. Had Miller's message been responded to, rather than opposed by the professing church, 1844 could have marked the end of the world, or at least the borders of that event. The many Spirit of Prophecy statements to the effect that the kingdom could have been here long ago substantiate this.

What theologians call the delay of the Parousia is a similar situation. The whole New Testament expects the end of the world in that generation. Only the failure of the church to fulfil the Great Commission prevented the fulfilment of the promise of Matt. 24:34.

As regards the present judgment taking place while Christ is our King-priest we must see its parallel to our individual sealing of destiny here below by our response to the Gospel. God sums up moment by moment a man's relationship to Him. Death for most, seals destiny, but for the living the final test of Rev. 13 will have that function. Men judge themselves by their relationship to Christ and His cross. This is not done in a moment as though an impulsive decision alone can seal destiny. The decision of faith has to be continually reaffirmed right up to the time of death or the close of probation for the living. He that endureth to the end shall be saved. Matt. 24:13; Heb. 10:26-31. Therefore justification, while an anticipated last judgment, must not be confused with the sealing of one's destiny which can only take place at the end of one's probationary tests and before the Parousia. This is just as clear as the fact that the first advent is not the same as the second, and the kingdom of grace is not identical with the kingdom of glory.

What SDAs call the investigative judgment is the sealing of one's destiny by our own choices and God's declaration of that event by the sealing of Rev. 7 and 14. It takes place before Christ comes. 1844 witnessed a stress on that truth which was particularly pertinent in that the public manifestation of judgment by Christ's second advent was about to take place. Obviously resurrection and translation are manifestations not investigations. They are results of a previous process of judgment in probationary time.

Christ sealed His destiny as our substitute in Gethsemane. The angel came to strengthen Him. Heaven affirmed His decision. But Calvary was the manifestation. So it will be at the end of the age. The saints must make their decision and thus seal their destiny before the public manifestation of that destiny at the advent. In that sense they are judged beforehand when Christ, as since the moment of faith, but now finally, imputes His righteousness

eschatologically, after their loyalty to Him has been demonstrated. Thus they do not partake of the plagues which constitute the wrath of God. Instead white robes are given them as to the earlier martyrs. Rev. 6:11. They have been delivered from that wrath by the Judgment decision of Christ. Zech. 3; Rom. 8:33-34; Rev. 22:11; 7:1-4; 14:1. Thus also all who had sealed their destiny aright before death are “accounted worthy” (Luke 20:35) to obtain the resurrection of the dead — this latter event being the public judgment or manifestation of the previous.

The concern of men now should be with the sealing of their destiny, not the public manifestation of that decision.

As men confess Christ by choosing Him He confesses them before the Father. Matt. 10:30-32. Thus in the last crisis they are “accounted worthy,” delivered from Antichrist and death because “found written in the book.” (Dan. 12:1) for Christ has promised concerning those who choose Him “I will not blot out his name from the book of life; I will confess his name before my Father and before his angels.” Rev. 3:5.

“The hour of His Judgment has come” (or “is come” KJV) points to the manifestation of what is already decided. Compare John 12:23, and see Rev. 18:9; 19:2; 15:4; 17:1; 20:4. It is a declaration affirming that punishment already decided is about to be meted out. In John’s writings “judgment” is never a neutral term, but a negative one pointing to condemnation. It is also true that other Scriptures make it clear that such condemnation of the wicked also brings vindication to the saints. See Dan. 7; Luke 18:1-8 and consider the judgments of the Flood, the Exodus, and upon Babylon. Thus “judgment” can be good news to believers.

The Day of Atonement in Scripture is used soteriologically and eschatologically. It applies to inaugurated eschatology and to consummated just as is also the case with the Jubilee and the kingdom of God. (See Luke 4:16; Matt. 12:28.)

The Spirit of Prophecy applies the Day of Atonement and the high priest’s entrance into the most holy both to Christ’s ascension and to His final work of judgment at the end of the age. See *DA*, 757; *SDABC*, 5:1109 (Letter 230, 1907 and *YI*, June 21, 1900) *COL*, 385. Similarly E.G. White applied “within the veil” not just to the first apartment but to the second. See *EW*, 55 and compare *IT*, 566; 57,113; *SD*, 354; *MYP*, 89; *COL*, 14.

This is but an echo of Scripture which in Hebrews applies the Day of Atonement to the cross and ascension, but in Scripture applies it to the final judgment. See Heb. 6, 9, 10, 13 and Rev. 8:1-5; 11:19; 15:1-8; 20:1-3. The mark of the beast and seal of God presentations in Revelation are allusions to the seals placed on the two goats on the Day of Atonement. Even the Pseudepigrapha applies the Day of Atonement eschatologically.

In the typical Day of Atonement Israelites did not enter personally for judgment into the presence of God. All was decided in their Representative — the High Priest. Then when he left the inner sanctum and reappeared to the people **the decision already made while he was in the most holy** was now made publically manifest. Even so in the great antitypical Day of Atonement.

Because the public judgment at Christ’s advent belongs to the supernal realm all descriptions of it by inspired messengers are necessarily parabolic or metaphorical. Thus Matt. 24:31-45 with the righteous and wicked of all ages together before the great throne, and then separated after divine investigation, will never literally take place. Similarly the giving account of every idle word of Matt. 12:36 or the giving account of every deed done in the body of 2 Cor.

5:10. The case is the same with the *GC* chapter on the Investigative Judgment which, like Christ and Paul, stresses the solemnity of present Christian stewardship which is sealing our destiny now before the eyes of the great Judge who is even at this moment judging the thoughts and intents of our hearts. Heb. 4:12. The record of our stewardship is a testimony regarding our attitude to the cross of Christ. Works point to the faith which saves through its acceptance of Christ's righteousness. At the second advent, either resurrection or translation constitute the divine reward and public manifestation of the acceptance given saints (justification full and complete) at the close of their probation before the coming of Christ.

It is quite clear from New Testament passages that inspired writers speak of judgment as both a process and an event. The process is now during the priestly ministry of Christ, when men are either being covered by Christ's continual intercession or "given up" to "wrath" in the sense of Rom. 1 and John 3. The judgment event is the second coming of Christ and includes the great white throne condemnation of the wicked at the end of the millennium. **Before the latter, the wicked have already been judged and rejected.** Therefore they were not raised in the first resurrection. Similarly, before Christ's manifestation of His acceptance of the saints at the second advent there has been prior judgment and acceptance. The first resurrection was the fruit of that judgment. This process judgment has attended the whole period of Christ's heavenly ministry for he is the priest-king, but it is the message of the three angels which reminds all men of that fact, and reins them up before the present judgment bar. Because the end is imminent, Christ's judgment ministry has special pertinence in this hour of the cleansing of the sanctuary as human probation is about to close.

Dan. 8:14 as well as Rev. 14:7 points to that judgment which ushers in the eschatological kingdom. Until recent years SDAs have been virtually alone in recognizing that Dan. 8:14 is parallel with the judgment scene of Dan. 7:9-13, and therefore is not to be limited to the days of Antiochus Epiphanes. Similarly until 1844 almost all believed that the final sequence of events would include a general resurrection of righteous and wicked and THEN Judgment day. Adventism, though sometimes crude in its eschatological pictures, has nevertheless been in the vanguard of truth about the great consummation.

The way we have usually proclaimed the judgment omits some precious New Testament emphases, and overdramatizes other ones. For example, we have not seen clearly enough the wonder of the gospel truth that believers need not in person stand before the judgment bar. Christ is there in our behalf as both judge and advocate. We need have no fear in judgment. The sad evidence of the testimony of many SDAs is that they are unsure how it will go with them in the Judgment — a far cry from the assurance of Paul, John, and other New Testament worthies.

In speaking of the Day of Atonement we have often forgotten to say that its original and chief application is to the sacrifice of Christ and its acceptance in the heaven of heavens above. Obviously Christ was not sacrificed in 1844. The Judgment was but the final application of the merits of Calvary. Neither have we clearly enunciated the fact that men are being judged as they listen to the gospel message. Too often our emphasis on books of record have made it sound as though the Judgment were a balancing of good deeds over bad rather than a perception of the tenor of a man's life as revelatory of his attitude to the cross.

The investigative judgment is and always has been Christ's scrutiny of His own, summing up day by day their progress in well doing as evidence of their trust in His merits. This judgment for individuals terminates with the close of their probation by death or at the last test. In 1844, Adventists perceiving themselves to be on the borders of the promised land, and

anticipating the imminent close of probation for them while living, applied the Day of Atonement imagery in a special way appropriate for those who saw the New Testament significance of being an eschatological community. Thus now, before the advent, destinies are sealed and adjudged by heaven, but at the parousia such judgment will be made publicly manifest.

Desmond Ford

APPENDIX THIRTY-ONE

The Relationship Between Inaugurated Eschatology (First Advent) And Consummated Eschatology (Second Advent)

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INAUGURATED ESCHATOLOGY (FIRST ADVENT) AND CONSUMMATED ESCHATOLOGY (SECOND ADVENT)

(Note that the list on the left uses "eschatological" concepts for events of the first century A.D., but the same events on the right apply to the real end of the world.)

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| The coming of the Kingdom | Mt 12:28 | The coming of the Kingdom | Mt 6:10 |
| The last days | Heb 1:2 | The last days | Dan 8:17 |
| Making an end of sin | Dan 9:24 | Making an end of sin | Rev 19 & 20 |
| Bring in everlasting righteousness | Dan 9:24 | Bring in everlasting righteousness | Rev 21 & 22 |
| Destroying Satan | Heb 2:14 | Destroying Satan | Rev 20:10 |
| Abolishing death | 2 Tim 1:10 | Abolishing death | Rev 21:4 |
| Everlasting life | Jn 5:24 | Everlasting life | Rev 21:4 |
| Translating believers | Col 1:13 | Translating believers | 1 Thess 4:17 |
| Gift of Spirit | Eph 1:13 | Gift of Spirit | Rom 8:23 |
| New Creation | 2 Cor 5:17 | New Creation | Rev 21:5 |
| Judgment | Jn 12:31 | Judgment | Rev 20 |
| Justification | Rom 5:1 | Justification | Gal 5:5
Rom 5:19 |
| Passover | Jn 12:1 | Passover | Lk 22:16 |
| Pentecost | Acts 2 | Pentecost | Joel 2:28 |
| Jubilee | Lk 4: 17-19 | Jubilee | Rev 21 & 22 |
| Day of Atonement | Heb 9:8, 12, 25 | Day of Atonement | Rev 8:1-4;
11:19; 14:6, 7;
20:1 |
| Within the Veil | Heb 6:19;
10:19-20 | Within the Veil | Rev 11:19 |
| Cleansing of the Sanctuary | Heb 9:23 | Cleansing of the Sanctuary | Dan 8:14 |

APPENDIX THIRTY-TWO

Quotations From Church Leaders Relevant To Topics
Of The Authority, Inspiration And Errancy Of
Ellen G. White

QUOTATIONS FROM CHURCH LEADERS RELEVANT TO TOPICS OF THE AUTHORITY, INSPIRATION AND ERRANCY OF ELLEN G. WHITE

(The reader should observe that the best-informed men amongst us have had a different view on these topics than that of most of the laity. Our leaders have ever understood the official position of the church to be that Scripture alone is authoritative for doctrine — though in matters where evidence may seem equally divided, the counsel of E.G. White should be sought. Similarly, our leaders have never affirmed either verbal inspiration or inerrancy for either Scripture or the Testimonies.

Many of the quotations included, particularly those with reference to *The Great Controversy* and *The Desire of Ages*, cast light on how inspiration operated for Ellen G. White. Inspiration never did miraculously anything that could be done naturally. Neither was it primarily concerned with technical accuracy in minor areas. The reader should specially note that according to both Sister White and her son, it was never God's intention that her writings should be brought to the fore as though part of the canon of Scripture.

As regards the sanctuary issue, it will only be possible to rightly weigh the *Great Controversy* statements on that topic in the light of other prophetic expositions set forth in that book, including Matt. 25:1-12; Rev. 6:12, 13; 2 Thess. 2; Rev. 11:7-9; 9:15. Scholars amongst us hold that these positions of *Great Controversy* were more appropriate for the 19th century Advent movement than for today. It has been many years since our scholars as a body have been prepared to publish any detailed apologetic in support of the pioneer positions on these Scriptures, despite the usage of them found in *Great Controversy*.

Also significant is the recent study of sources from the E.G. White writings, particularly *Great Controversy*, which in prophetic expositions drew largely from Uriah Smith, even where Smith was demonstrably wrong historically and exegetically.)



Extracts From "Shifting Views of Inspiration: Ellen G. White Studies in the 1970s," by Donald R. McAdams, *Spectrum*, April, 1980.

In 1970, 55 years after the death of Ellen G. White, Adventist scholars began for the first time to examine critically her writings and to share their conclusions with the community of Adventist intellectuals. (p. 27) William S. Peterson's article, "A Textual and Historical Study of Ellen White's Account of the French Revolution," was the first article to examine critically Ellen White's sources. Peterson asked the following questions:

What historians did Ellen White regard most highly? Do they have in common any particular social or political bias? How careful was she in her use of historical evidence? Did she ever make copying errors in transcribing material from her sources? Is there any particular category of historical information which she consistently ignored? Did she make use of the best scholarship available in her day? What did the revisions and the successive editions of *The Great Controversy* reveal about her changing intentions?

After a brief survey of the development of the chapter on the French Revolution, Peterson examined nine of the historians cited in the chapter. He concluded that all were anti-Catholic and anti-Democratic, strong on "moral fervour and weak on factual evidence." Second,

Peterson examined how Ellen White used these sources. He concluded that she used them carelessly, sometimes simply misreading them, other times exaggerating them, and occasionally leaving out crucial facts, thereby distorting the significance of the event. (p. 29)

The most detailed and abrasive response to Peterson was an article in the Autumn 1971 SPECTRUM by John W. Wood, Jr., a **master of divinity** student at Andrews University. His conclusion can be best summarized in his own words: "I have shown that the sources used [by Ellen White] were not poor ones, nor were they mishandled. Instead, they were used soundly and consistently to present those things which Mrs. White had seen in vision." Wood was industrious; and he did catch Peterson in several errors. But all his industry failed to rescue the reputation of the historians in question or alter Peterson's conclusion that the chapter on the French Revolution in the 1888 *Great Controversy* contained historical errors. (p. 30)

A study of the notes left by Clarence C. Crisler, Ellen White's secretary when the 1911 revision of the *Great Controversy* was being prepared, disclosed that the literary source for the chapter on the French Revolution was not a collection of historians, whether good ones or poor ones, but primarily one writer, Uriah Smith. His *Thoughts on Daniel and Revelation* was the basic source for the chapter. One discovers, wrote Graybill, that Ellen White

... used nothing from Scott, Gleig, Thiers, or Alison that Smith did not have. Every time Smith deleted material, she deleted the same material. Although occasionally she deleted more. She even used the quotations in exactly the same order on pages 275 and 276. There can be no doubt that she drew the historical quotations from Smith, not from the original works.

So it was not Ellen White who selected poor historians and misread or distorted the evidence found in them. It was Uriah Smith!

Peterson had noted in his response to Wood that this chapter... was an untypical chapter in its use of a wide variety of historical sources. Some of the earlier chapters of *The Great Controversy* are based almost exclusively on D'Aubigné — that is, virtually every paragraph is a quotation, close paraphrase, or summary of D'Aubigné.

Peterson added, "D'Aubigné, in these chapters, is supplying the **structure** and **perspective** of the book, not merely a few illustrative details." Graybill's articles made it clear that the chapter on the French Revolution was not untypical after all. Ellen White was continuing with this chapter the pattern of the book.

Graybill's article may have satisfied many who thought Peterson had been finally put in his place. But, in fact, Graybill's article opened the can of worms even farther. At least in Peterson's view, Ellen White had been doing historical research, albeit poor historical research. Graybill's article made it clear that she was not doing historical research at all, merely following one major source. (p. 31)

The most significant work on Ellen White in the 1970s was *Prophetess of Health: A Study of Ellen G. White* by Ronald L Numbers. (p. 31)

Some facts must be considered to have been established by Numbers in *Prophetess of Health*: (1) Ellen White was a part of the nineteenth century American health reform movement and was influenced by other health reformers. (2) During the course of her life, Ellen White's views on health reform changed. (3) Ellen White held some views about the laws of health that few Adventists today consider scientifically valid. (p. 33)

During the summer of 1973, while reading letters and documents in the White Estate on the history of the Adventist publishing work, I became acquainted with several Ellen White manuscript fragments that appeared to be portions of the first draft of the 1888 *The Great Controversy*. The longest manuscript, consisting of 64 sheets of full-size writing paper with writing filling the front of each sheet and on 11 pages filling some portion of the back, turned out to be the rough draft for the half-chapter on John Huss. The White Estate allowed me to transcribe this manuscript into typescript.

I had completed in February of 1973 a 105-page study that examined Ellen White's use of historians in Chapter XIV, "Later English Reformers," and the first half of Chapter VI, "Huss and Jerome." Discovery of the Huss manuscript seemed providential. I was now able to present in a revised paper in one column James A. Wylie's account of Huss from *The History of Protestantism*, in a second column Ellen White's rough draft, and in a third column her account as published in *The Great Controversy*. I presented this, along with some introductory and explanatory material, to the White Estate in March of 1974.

What did the evidence prove?

... the historical portions of *The Great Controversy* that I have examined are selective abridgements and adaptation of historians. Ellen White was not just borrowing paragraphs here and there that she ran across in her reading, but in fact following the historians page after page, leaving out much material, but using their sequence, some of their ideas, and often their words. In the examples I have examined I have found no historical fact in her text that is not in their text. The hand-written manuscript on John Huss follows the historian so closely that it does not often seem to have gone through an intermediary stage, but rather from the historian's printed page to Mrs. White's manuscript, including historical errors and moral exhortations.

Study of the Huss manuscript also revealed that Mrs. White's literary assistant at the time, Miss Marian Davis, not only improved Mrs. White's English usage but also played a very significant role in deleting a large amount of original material dealing with the spiritual significance of events and adding additional material from Wylie. (p. 34)

Elder White pointed out that a "rigid and distorted" concept of inspiration could easily set up a person for discouragement and eventual rejection of God's gift to Ellen White. No mention was made in this series of any of the research taking place.

Eighteen months later, in a seven-part series in the *Adventist Review* entitled "The E.G. White Historical Writings," Arthur White became far more specific. He still made no specific reference to the research of others or to the decade of critical scholarship on Ellen White. But clearly the readers of the *Review* were being prepared for the evidence that Ellen White borrowed extensively from secular sources. Elder White acknowledged the discussions going on in Adventist intellectual circles by introducing the first article with the following comment: "In recent months there has been an increasing interest in what have been termed Ellen White's „sources" for the **Conflict of the Ages** books in general, and *The Great Controversy* and *The Desire of Ages* in particular." "The articles," continued White, "will lead us some distance from the narrow concepts held by some of a mechanical, verbal inspiration according to which Ellen White wrote only what was revealed to her in vision or dictated to her by the Holy Spirit."

The third article of the series dealt specifically with the sources for *The Great Controversy* and included facsimile reproductions from both the Luther manuscript and the Huss

manuscript. Referring to the Huss manuscript, Arthur White said, “She condensed materials from Wylie and others and interspersed with spiritual lessons and comments the portions she used.” Then in the second paragraph following, he added, “Unfortunately, for space reasons, the spiritual lessons that she had set forth in the Huss manuscript could not be included. This left the bare historical record as a part of the overall great-controversy narrative.” The careful reader of the *Review* article who put these two statements together could see that Elder White was acknowledging that the material left for publication in *The Great Controversy* on Huss was taken from Wylie and others. Also in the third article, Elder White asked specifically the question, “Would it have been possible for some inaccuracy to have crept into Ellen White’s descriptions of historical events or that the historians from whom she quoted may have been mistaken in some points of detail and thus, Ellen White, not being especially informed, allowed these mistakes to slip through into her narrative?” His answer was a straightforward affirmative. (pp. 36-37)

Meanwhile Walter Rea had broadened his research and, with the help of others, was attempting to locate every major source for every Ellen White book. In response to his assertions that an alarming proportion of her published work had been borrowed from nineteenth-century writers, Neal Wilson, president of the General Conference, appointed a committee to examine his evidence (see p. 15). The committee, mostly scholars and church administrators, met at the Glendale Adventist Hospital on January 28 and 29, 1980 with G. Ralph Thompson, a General Conference general vice-president in the chair.

In the March 20, 1980 *Adventist Review* in an article entitled “This I Believe About Ellen G. White,” Neal Wilson informed the church about the Rea committee. The initial report indicates that “in her writing Ellen White used sources more extensively than we have heretofore been aware of or recognized. The committee, however, cautions against the loose use of such terms as „literary dependency” and „extensive borrowing and paraphrasing.”” Wilson went on to make five points about the work of a prophet. (1) “Originality is not a test of inspiration.” (2) “God inspires people, not words.” (3) “The Holy Spirit helps the messenger to select his material carefully.” (4) “The prophet’s use of existing materials does not necessarily mean that the prophet is dependent upon these sources” and (5) “Whenever we recognize similarities we must also see the dissimilarities.”

The statement is a most significant article to appear in the *Review* in this century. The president of the General Conference is openly and honestly acknowledging the facts about Ellen White’s use of sources and pointing the church toward a definition of inspiration that will be new to most Adventists and threatening to some. (p. 38)

After one decade of critical examination of Ellen White’s writings, where do we now stand? What questions have been answered? What facts have been established? What are the implications of this research for the Adventist Church, and where do we go from here?

Three points have been clearly established. One is that Ellen White took much material from other authors. And she did not use secular literary sources just to provide clear descriptions of historical events, health principles or other information revealed to her in vision; she also used these sources to provide information not seen in vision.

Second, Ellen White was a part of later nineteenth-century American culture and was influenced by contemporary health reformers, authors and fellow Adventist church leaders. This fact should not surprise us, for no one can live outside the culture and be uninfluenced by contemporary values and contemporary tastes. Ellen White travelled extensively, read widely, and learned from experience. Without diminishing one whit from the special

revelation of the Holy Spirit to Ellen White, we must acknowledge that she was shaped by her environment just as all of us have been shaped by ours.

The third point which recent Ellen White scholarship has established is that Ellen White was not inerrant. Inevitably, as she incorporated into her own articles and books contemporary ideas and the words of contemporary historians, health reformers and devotional writers, she passed along errors of fact and some of the misconceptions of her generation. (p. 39)

To consider her words as possibly derived from someone else and not necessarily the final authority introduces an element of chaos into the very heart of Adventism that makes all of us uneasy. Benjamin McArthur, assistant professor of history at Southern Missionary College, has made this point in the November 1979 *SPECTRUM* in an article entitled “Where Are Historians Taking the Church?” And yet we have no choice but to be honest at heart, acknowledge facts, and seek the truth. The search for truth is, after all, the basic premise upon which Adventism is founded.

This is the dilemma that confronted those who accepted Ellen White’s spiritual gift even in her day. The publication of partial transcripts of the 1919 Bible Conference makes this abundantly clear. On the one hand, these college Bible teachers, editors and General Conference administrators had personal knowledge of Ellen White’s unique spiritual gift.

But alongside this, some of these men — like A.G. Daniells, president of the General Conference, W.W. Prescott, former editor of the *Review and Herald* and H.C. Lacey, teacher of religion at the Washington Foreign Missionary Seminary — also knew that Ellen White copied from other sources and made statements that were not correct. Her works were not entirely original and they were not infallible. This was, and still is, the dilemma for Adventists. (p. 40)



Extracts from “The Bible Conference of 1919,” *Spectrum* 10(1)

W.E. Howell: I am sure the teachers would like to have some suggestions on the use of the spirit of prophecy and its writings in their teaching work.

A.G. Daniells: Well, give me a question that will be definite, in a particular way.

C.L Taylor: I would like to ask you to discuss for us the exegetical value of the Testimonies. Of course I think it is generally understood by us that there are many texts to which she makes no reference. There are many texts that she explains, and there may be other explanations that are equally true that she does not touch. But my question is really this: May we accept the explanations of scripture that she gives? Are those dependable:

A.G. Daniells: I have always felt that they were. It may be that in some very critical matters there may be some difficulties; but I have used the writings for years in a way to clarify or elucidate the thought in the texts of scripture. Take *Desire of Ages* and *Patriarchs and Prophets*. In reading them through I have found many instances of good illumination.

Does that answer your question? Do you mean whether students should resort to the writings for their interpretation of the Bible, or to get additional light? That is to say, is it necessary to have these writings in order to understand the Bible? Must we go to her explanations to get our meaning of the Bible? Is that the question or is that involved in it?

C.L. Taylor: Not directly, but possibly indirectly. But I will give a more concrete example. We will suppose that a student comes for help on a certain scripture, and wants to know what it means. Is it proper for the teacher to explain that scripture, with perhaps other scriptures illuminating the text, and then bring in the spirit of prophecy also as additional light on the text? Or suppose two students differ on the meaning of a text, and they come to the teacher to find out what it means: Should the teacher explain the text and then use the Testimonies to support the position he takes? Or take still a third case: Suppose that two brethren, both of them believers in the Testimonies, and of course believers in the Bible primarily, have a difference of opinion on a certain text: Is it right for them in their study of that text to bring in the spirit of prophecy to aid in their understanding of it, or should they leave that out of the question entirely?

A.G. Daniells: On that first point, I think this, that we are to get our interpretation from this Book, primarily. I think that the Book explains itself, and I think we can understand the Book, fundamentally through the Book, without resorting to the Testimonies to prove up on it.

W.E. Howell: The Spirit of prophecy says the Bible is its own expositor.

A.G. Daniells: Yes, but I have heard ministers say that the spirit of prophecy is the interpreter of the Bible. I heard it preached at the General Conference some years ago, when it was said that the only way we could understand the Bible was through the writings of the spirit of prophecy.

J.M. Anderson: And he also said “infallible interpreter.”

C.M. Sorenson; That expression has been cancelled. That is not our position.

A.G. Daniels: It is not our position, and it is not right that the spirit of prophecy is the only safe interpreter of the Bible. That is a false doctrine, a false view. It will not stand. Why, my friends what would all the people have done from John’s day down to the present if there were no way to understand the Bible except through the writings of the spirit of prophecy! It is a terrible position to take! That is false, it is error. It is positively dangerous! What do those people do over in Roumania? We have hundreds of Sabbathkeepers there who have not seen a book on the spirit of prophecy! What do those people in China do? Can’t they understand this Book only as we get the interpretation through the spirit of prophecy and then take it to them? That is heathenish!

L.L. Caviness: Do you understand that the early believers got their understanding from the Bible, or did it come through the spirit of prophecy?

A.G. Daniells: They got their knowledge of the Scriptures as they went along through the Scriptures themselves. It pains me to hear the way some people talk, that the spirit of prophecy led out and gave all the instruction, all the doctrines, to the pioneers, and they accepted them right along. That is not according to the writings themselves, “*Early Writings*.” We are told how they did; they searched these scriptures together and studied and prayed over them until they got together on them. Sister White says in her works that for a long time she could not understand, that her mind was locked over these things, and the brethren worked their way along. She did not bring to this movement the Sabbath truth. She opposed the Sabbath truth. It did not seem right to her when Brother Bates presented it to her. But she had help from the Lord and when that clear knowledge was given her in that way, she

was a weak child, and could not understand theology, but she had a clear outline given to her, and from that day to her death she never wavered a minute. But the Lord did not by revelation give to another all that He had given in this Book. He gave this Book, and He gave men brains and thinking power to study the Book.

I would not, in my class work, give out the idea at all to students that they can not understand this book only through the writings of Sister White. I would hold out to students, as I do to preachers, and in ministerial meetings, the necessity of getting our understanding of the Bible from the Bible itself, and using the spirit of prophecy to enlarge our view. I tell them not to be lazy about studying the Book, and not to rummage around first for something that has been written on a point that they can just swallow without study. I think that would be a very dangerous thing for our ministers to get into that habit. And there are some, I must confess, who will hunt around to find a statement in the Testimonies and spend no time in deep study of the Book. They do not have a taste for it, and if they can look around and find something that is already made out, they are glad to pick that up and go along without studying the Bible. The earnest study of the Bible is the security, the safety of man. He must come to the book itself and get it by careful study, and then whatever he finds in the spirit of prophecy or any other writings that will help him and throw light and clarify his vision on it, — that is alright. Does that cover your point? (pp. 30-31)

W.W. Prescott: How should we use the writings of the spirit of prophecy as an authority by which to settle historical questions?

A.G. Daniells: Well, now, as I understand it, Sister White never claimed to be an authority on history, and never claimed to be a dogmatic teacher on theology, like Mrs. Eddy's book on teaching. She just gave out fragmentary statements, but left the pastors and evangelists and preachers to work out all these problems of scripture and of theology and of history. She never claimed to be an authority on history; and as I have understood it, where the history that related to the interpretation of prophecy was clear and expressive, she wove it into her writings; but I have always understood that, as far as she was concerned, she was ready to correct in revision such statements as she thought should be corrected. I have never gone to her writings, and taken the history that I found in her writings, as the positive statement of history regarding the fulfilment of prophecy. I do not know how others may view that, but I have felt that I should deal with history in the same way that I am exhorted to deal with the Bible, — prove it all carefully and thoroughly, and then let her go on and make such revisions from time to time as seem best.

Just one more thought: Now you know something about that little book, "*The Life of Paul*." You know the difficulty we got into about that. We could never claim inspiration in the whole thought and makeup of the book, because it has been thrown aside because it was badly put together. Credits were not given to the proper authorities, and some of that crept into "*The Great Controversy*," — the lack of credits; and in the revision of that book those things were carefully run down and made right. Personally that has never shaken my faith, but there are men who have been greatly hurt by it, and I think it is because they claimed too much for these writings. Just as Brother White says, there is a danger in going away from the Book, and claiming too much. Let it have its full weight, just as God has fixed it, and then I think we will stand without being shaken when some of these things do appear that we can not harmonize with our theory.

W.W. Prescott: There is another experience that you know of that applies to what Brother Taylor has brought up. Some of the brethren here remember very well a

serious controversy over the interpretation of the 8th chapter of Daniel, and there were some of the brethren who ranged themselves against what was called the new view, and they took her writings to uphold their position. She wrote to those brethren and instructed them not to use her writings to settle that controversy. I think that ought to be remembered as being her own counsel when brethren that did claim to believe the Bible and the spirit of prophecy were divided over an interpretation, and it was a matter of public controversy.

J.N. Anderson: How far would you take that word from Sister White to be a general statement about her writings?

A.G. Daniells: I think it was especially on the case then, but I think we have to use the same judgment about using her writings in other cases.

C.A. Shull: Just how shall we use the Testimonies in the class room? What shall be our attitude toward them in the line of history, especially? Before I knew that there was any statement in the spirit of prophecy regarding the experience of John, I stated to the class that there was a tradition that John had been thrown into a caldron of boiling oil, and a student immediately produced that statement in the Testimonies that John **was** thrown into the boiling oil. Now, I want to know, was she given a divine revelation that John was thrown into a vat of boiling oil?

Now another question, on the taking of Babylon. Mrs. White in the spirit of prophecy mentions that Babylon was taken according to the historian, by the turning aside of the waters. Modern scholarship says it was not taken that way. What should be our attitude in regard to such things?

Mrs. Williams: We have that question to meet every year.

E.F. Albertsworth: I have been confronted in my classes by students who come with the Testimonies and endeavour to settle a question by quoting where she says, "I have been shown." They said that of all things that must settle the matter. I have wanted to know what attitude we should taken on a question of that kind.

C.P. Boliman: Wouldn't that latter question require a concrete example?

A.G. Daniells: Yes, I think it would.

E.F. Albertsworth: I do not recall the example; but some of the students would say that meant she had a direct revelation, and others would say that meant that she was shown by people around her.

A.G. Daniells: I do not think that is what she means when she says that. When she was shown, it was by the angel or the revelation that was made to her. I feel sure that was her meaning.

E.F. Albertsworth: I have found students who had doubts about that.

W.G. Wirth: Suppose we do have a conflict between the authorized and revised versions?

A.G. Daniells: That question was up before. You must not count me an authority for I am just like you in the matter. I have to form my own opinions. I do not think Sister White meant at all to establish the certainty of a translation. I do not think she had that in mind, or had anything to do with putting her seal of approval on the authorized version or on the

revised version when she quoted that. She uses whichever version helps to bring out the thought she has most clearly.

With reference to this historical matter, I cannot say anything more than I have said, that I never have understood that Sister White undertook to settle historical questions. (pp. 34-35)

A.G. Daniells: Casting doubts and reflections is one way to hurt a student. Another way is to take an extreme and unwarranted position. You can do that and pass it over; but when that student gets out and gets in contact with things, he may be shaken, and perhaps shaken clear out and away. I think we should be candid and honest and never put a claim forth that is not well founded simply to appear to believe. You will have to be careful in giving this instruction, because many of the students have heard from their parents things that are not so, and they hear from preachers things that are not so, and so their foundation is false.

I must refer again to the attitude of A.T. Jones. In his heyday you know he just drank the whole thing in, and he would hang a man on a word. I have seen him take just a word in the Testimonies and hang to it, and that would settle everything, — just a word. I was with him when he made a discovery, — or, if he didn't make it, he appeared to make it, — and that was that there were words in the Testimonies and writings of Sister White that God did not order her to put in there, and that there were words which she did not put in by divine inspiration, the Lord picking the words, but that somebody had helped to fix that up. And so he took two testimonies and compared them, and he got into great trouble. He went on with Dr. Kellogg, where he could just pick things to pieces.

F.M. Wilcox: Back in the 60's or 70's a General Conference in session passed this resolution, — they said, we recognize that the Testimonies have been prepared under great pressure and stress of circumstances, and that the wording is not always the happiest, and we recommend their republication with such changes as will bring them to a standard.

A.G. Daniells: I would like to get hold of that resolution. Now, brethren, I want to ask you honestly if there is a man here who has had doubt created in your mind from my attitude and the positions I have taken? [VOICES: No! No!] Or is there one of you that thinks I am shaky on the Testimonies? — I will not say that [...] thinks my position is not just right, for you might not agree with me, but from what I have said, is there a tendency to lead you to believe that I am shaky, and that some time I will help to get you away from the Testimonies? [Several decided no's were heard].

C.L. Taylor: In your talk a few evenings ago I agreed 100% in everything you said. Today there is just one question in my mind.

A.G. Daniells: Let us have it.

C.L. Taylor: That is regarding those outward manifestations, those things of perhaps a miraculous nature. I do not know whether you intend to carry the impression that you discredit those or that you simply would not teach them. If it is that you would not hold them up as proof that the work is inspired, I am heartily in agreement with that. On the other hand, if you take the position that those things are not to be relied on, that Elder Loughborough and others are mistaken about these things, I should have to disagree with you.

A.G. Daniells: No, I do not discount them nor disbelieve them; but they are not the kind of evidence I would use with students or with unbelievers.

C.L. Taylor: I agree with that.

A.G. Daniells: I do not question them, but I do not think they are the best kind of evidence to produce. For instance, I do not think the best kind of proof for me to give an audience on the Sabbath question or the nature of man or baptism, is to go and read Sister White's writings to them. I believe the best proof I can give is the Bible. Perhaps you will remember that it fell to me to preach Sister White's funeral sermon; and if you will remember, I took that occasion to give evidence of her high calling. I did not give a long list of fruits and miraculous evidences. I knew the matter would be published to the world in hundreds of papers, and I wanted to give them something that would be a high authority, and this is what I gave.

First, that she stood with the word of God from Genesis to Revelation in all its teaching.

Then, she stood with mankind in his highest endeavours to help mankind, — elaborating on those points.

That is what I mean, Brother Taylor; but I do not discount those other things.

What I want to know is this, brethren: Does my position appear to be of such character that you would be led to think I am shaky? [VOICES: No!] If you think it, just say it right out! I do not want to do that, but I have to be honest, — I can not camouflage in a thing like this. I have stood through it about forty years unshaken, and I think it is a safe position; but if I were driven to take the position that some do on the Testimonies, I would be shaken. [VOICE: That's right!] I would not know where to stand, for I cannot say that white is black and black is white.

H.C. Lacey: To us there is no doubt that you believe the Testimonies, but will you mind my adding another personal note to it?

A.G. Daniells: No.

H.C. Lacey: It is this: Those who have not heard you, as we have here, and are taking the other side of the question, — some of them are deliberately saying that neither you nor Professor Prescott believe the Testimonies. For instance, I went out to Mt. Vernon and I met the graduating class there, and when the exercises were over, I had a private talk with three of four of those young people, and they told me that they certainly understood that our General Conference men down here — they did not mean me or Brother Sorenson — did not believe the Testimonies.

W.W. Prescott: You are not telling us news.

H.C. Lacey: We as teachers are in a terribly hard position. We have got nearly down to bed-rock in the questions that have been asked here; but the students do get **right down to bedrock** on some of these things, and we need to get a little deeper here. There are people here at these meetings who do not dare to ask certain questions that have come up in their minds or in private talks. But you know that the teacher is in a very difficult position.

On that matter of the capture of Babylon, I have felt free to say that I thought the evidence was that Cyrus did not capture it that way, but we would hold the matter in abeyance and simply study it. Suppose now that further tablets would come to light, and other evidence would be brought in to prove indisputably that Cyrus did not capture Babylon that way, would it be right to say that if there is a revision of that book, — "*Patriarchs and Prophets*," which indorses, in one casual sentence, that old view, — the revision would be brought into harmony with recently discovered facts?

A.G. Daniells: I think that is the position Sister White occupies. I think that is what she had done. I never understood that she put infallibility into the historical quotations.

H.C. Lacey: But there are some who **do** understand it.

W.W. Prescott: It is interesting to know that even a higher critic like George Adams Smith agrees with Herodotus (?) on that.

Brother Daniells was speaking about this question of physical outward evidences. One of those evidences has been that the eyes were open, as you will remember, and this scripture in the 24th chapter of Numbers is always referred to, showing that it is in harmony with that. But you read the Revised Version, and you find it reads, "And he took up his parable, and said, Balaam the son of Beor saith, And the man whose eye was closed saith:" In this text it puts it just the other way. Then I would not want to use that as an argument, that the prophet's eyes were open.

A.G. Daniells: That is what I mean by referring to secondary matters.

H.C. Lacey: **In our estimate of the spirit of prophecy, isn't its value to us more in the spiritual light it throws into our own hearts and lives than in the intellectual accuracy in historical and theological matters. Ought we not to take those writings as the voice of the Spirit of our hearts, instead of as the voice of the teacher to our heads? And isn't the final proof of the spirit of prophecy its spiritual value rather than its historical accuracy?**

A.G. Daniells: Yes, I think so. (pp. 36-38)

W.W. Prescott: **Can you explain how it is that two brethren can disagree on the inspiration of the Bible, one holding to the verbal inspiration and the other opposed to it, and yet no disturbance be created in the denomination whatever. That situation is right here before us. But if two brethren take the same attitude on the spirit of prophecy, one holding to verbal inspiration and the other discrediting it, he that does not hold to the verbal inspiration is discredited.**

F.M. Wilcox: Do you believe that a man who doesn't believe in the verbal inspiration of the Bible believes the Bible?

W.W. Prescott: I do not have any trouble over it at all. I have a different view myself. If a man does not believe in the verbal inspiration of the Bible, he is still in good standing; but if he says he does not believe in the verbal inspiration of the Testimonies, he is discounted right away. I think it is an unhealthful situation. It puts the spirit of prophecy above the Bible.

W.G. Wirth: Really, that is my biggest problem. I shall certainly be discredited if I go back and give this view, I would like to see some published statement given out by those who lead this work so that if that thing should come up there would be some authority back of it, because I am in for a lot of trouble on that thing. I would like to see something done, because that education is going right on, and our students are being sent out with the idea that the Testimonies are verbally inspired, and woe be to the man out where I am that does not line up to that.

Now as to health reform: Frequently a student will come to me and quote what Sister White says about butter. But we serve butter on our tables right along. And they will bring up about meat, how under no consideration is that to be eaten. And I know that that is unreasonable,

and there are times it is necessary to eat meat. What shall we do about that? I would like a little light on some of those details, as to whether we ought to take them at full value.

A.G. Daniells: I am willing to answer part of that, for I have had it about a thousand times. Take this question of health reform. It is well known from the writings themselves and from personal contact with Sister White, and from common sense, that in travelling and in knowledge of different parts of the world, that the instructions set forth in the Testimonies was never intended to be one great wholesale blanket regulation for peoples' eating and drinking, and it applies to various individuals according to their physical condition and according to the situation in which they find themselves. I have always explained it that way to our ministers in ministers' meetings. We had a ministers' meeting over in Scandinavia, and we had one man there from the "land of the midnight sun," up in Hammerfest where you never grow a banana or an apple or a peach, and hardly even a green thing. It is snow and cold there nearly all the time, and the people live to a large extent on fish and various animal foods that they get there. We had sent a nurse from Christiania up there as a missionary. He had the strict idea of the diet according to the Testimonies, and he would not touch a fish or a bit of reindeer, nor any kind of animal food, and he was getting poor; because missionaries that are sent out do not have much money, and they cannot import fresh fruits; and it was in the day when even canned goods were not shipped much. The fellow nearly starved to death. He came down to attend that meeting, and he was nearly as white as your dress [speaking to Sister Williams]. He had hardly any blood in his body. I talked to him, and I said, "Brother Olson, what is the matter with you? We will have to bring you away from up there if you do not get better. You have no red blood corpuscles in your blood." I talked with him a while, and finally asked him, "What do you live on?"

"Well," he said, "I live a good deal on the north wind."

I said, "You look like it, sure enough."

We went on talking, and I found out that the man wasn't eating much but potatoes and starchy foods, — just a limited dietary. I went at him with all the terror I could inspire for such foolishness.

Voice: Did you make any impression?

A.G. Daniells: Yes, I did. And I got other brethren to join me. We told that man he would be buried up there if he tried to live that way. We talked with him straight about it.

When I got back to this country I talked with Sister White about it, and she said, "Why don't the people use common sense?" (pp. 39-40)

A.G. Daniells: Now with reference to the Testimonies: I think more mischief can be done with the Testimonies by claiming their verbal inspiration than can with the Bible. If you ask for the logic of it, it might take some time to bring it out, and I might not be able to satisfy every mind; but if you ask for practical experience, I can give it to you, plenty of it.

F.M. Wilcox: Because we know how the Testimonies were brought together, and we do not know anything about the Bible.

A.G. Daniells: Yes, that is one point. We do know, and it is no kind of use for anybody to stand up and talk about the verbal inspiration of the Testimonies, because everybody who has ever seen the work done knows better, and we might as well dismiss it.

M.E. Kern: I am not so sure that some of the brethren are right in saying that we are all agreed on this question. (pp. 47-48)

W.W. Prescott: I would like to ask if you think that, after his writings had been published a series of years, Jeremiah changed them because he was convinced that there were historical errors in them?

M.E. Kern: I cannot answer that. (p. 49)

A.G. Daniells: I hardly know where to begin or what to say. I think I must repeat this, that our difficulty lies in two points, especially. One is on infallibility and the other is on verbal inspiration. I think Brother James White foresaw difficulties along this line away back at the beginning. He knew that he took Sister White's testimonies and helped to write them out and make them clear and grammatical and plain. He knew that he was doing that right along. And he knew that the secretaries they employed took them and put them into grammatical condition, transposed sentences, completed sentences, and used words that Sister White did not herself write in her original copy. He saw that, and yet he saw some brethren who did not know this, and who had great confidence in the Testimonies, just believing and teaching that these words were given to Sister White as well as the thought. And he tried to correct that idea. You will find those statements in the *Review and Herald*, like the one Brother Wilcox read the other day. If that explanation had been accepted and passed on down, we would have been free from a great many perplexities that we have now.

F.M. Wilcox: Articles were published in those early *Reviews* disclaiming that.

A.G. Daniells: Yes, but you know there are some brethren who go in all over. We could mention some old and some young who think they cannot believe the Testimonies without just putting them up as absolutely infallible and word-inspired, taking the whole thing as given verbally by the Lord. They do not see how to believe them and how to get good out of them except in that way; and I suppose some people would feel that if they did not believe in the verbal inspiration of the Bible, they could not have confidence in it, and take it as the great Book that they now see it to be. Some men are technical, and can hardly understand it in any other way. Some other men are not so technical in logic, but they have great faith and great confidence, and so they can go through on another line of thought. **I am sure there has been advocated an idea of infallibility in Sister White and verbal inspiration in the Testimonies that has led people to expect too much and to make too great claims, and so we have gotten into difficulty.**

Now, as I have studied it these years since I was thrown into the controversy at Battle Creek, I have endeavoured to ascertain the truth and then be true to the truth. I do not know how to do except that way. It will never help me, or help the people, to make a false claim to evade some trouble. I know we have difficulties here, but let us dispose of some of the main things first. Brethren, are we going to evade difficulties or help out the difficulties by taking a false position? [Voices: No!] Well, then let us take an honest, true position, and reach our end somehow, because I never will put up a false claim to evade something that will come up a little later on. That is not honest and it is not Christian, and so I take my stand there.

In Australia I saw „The Desire of Ages” being made up, and I saw the rewriting of chapters, some of them written over and over and over again. I saw that, and when I talked with Sister Davis about it, I tell you I had to square up to this thing and begin to settle things about the spirit of prophecy. If these false positions had never been taken, the thing would be much plainer than it is today. What was charged as plagiarism would all have been simplified, and I

believe men would have been saved to the cause if from the start we had understood this thing as it should have been. With those false views held, we face difficulties in straightening up. We will not meet those difficulties by resorting to a false claim. (pp. 50-51)

A.G. Daniells: There is no use of our claiming anything more on the verbal inspiration of the Testimonies, because she never claimed it, and James White never claimed it, and W.C. White never claimed it; and all the persons who helped to prepare those Testimonies knew they were not verbally inspired. I will say no more along that line.

D.A. Parsons: She not only did not claim it, but she denied it.

A.G. Daniells: Yes, she tried to correct the people.

Now on infallibility. I suppose Sister White used Paul's text, "We have this treasure in earthen vessels," as much as any other scripture. She used to repeat that often, "We have this treasure in earthen vessels," with the idea that she was a poor, feeble woman, a messenger of the Lord trying to do her duty and meet the mind of God in this work. **When you take the position that she was not infallible, and that her writings were not verbally inspired, isn't there a chance for the manifestation of the human? If there isn't, then what is infallibility? And should we be surprised when we know that the instrument was fallible, and that the general truths, as she says, were revealed, then aren't we prepared to see mistakes?**

M.E. Kern: She was an author and not merely a pen.

A.G. Daniells: Yes; and now take that "*Life of Paul*," — I suppose you all know about it and knew what claims were put up against her, charges made of plagiarism, even by the authors of the book, Conybeare and Howson, and were liable to make the denomination trouble because there was so much of their book put into "*The Life of Paul*" without any credit or quotation marks. Some people of strict logic might fly the track on that ground, but I am not built that way. I found it out, and I read it with Brother Palmer when he found it, and we got Conybeare and Howson, and we got Wylie's "*History of the Reformation*," and we read word for word, page after page, and no quotations, no credit, and really I did not know the difference until I began to compare them. I supposed it was Sister White's own work. The poor sister said, "Why, I didn't know about quotations and credits. My secretary should have looked after that, and the publishing house should have looked after it."

She did not claim that that was all revealed to her and written word for word under the inspiration of the Lord. There I saw the manifestation of the human in these writings. Of course I could have said this, and I did say it, that I wished a different course had been taken in the compilation of the books. If proper care had been exercised, it would have saved a lot of people from being thrown off the track. (pp. 51-52)

B.L. House: In that old edition of "*Sketches of the Life of Paul*," she is very clear about the ceremonial law. That is not in the new book, and I wondered why that was left out.

D.A. Parsons: I have an answer to that. I was in California when the book was compiled, and I took the old edition and talked with Brother Will White about this very question. He said the whole book, with the exception of that chapter, had been compiled for some time, and they had held it up until they could arrange that chapter in such a way as to prevent controversy arising. They did not desire the book to be used to settle any controversy, and therefore they eliminated most of these statements on the ceremonial law just to prevent a renewal of the great controversy over the ceremonial law in Galatians.

B.L. House: It is not a repudiation of what was written by her in the first volume, is it?

D.A. Parsons: No, not at all; but they just put enough in to satisfy the inquiring mind, but eliminated those striking statements to prevent a renewal of the controversy. (pp. 52-53)

A.G. Daniells: Shall we not confine ourselves just now to this question of Brother Benson's and lead our way up to the real difficulty, and then deal with it? Do you have a clear conception of the way the difficulty arose? — that in making the first edition of "*Great Controversy*" those who helped her prepare the copy were allowed to bring forward historical quotations that seemed to fit the case. She may have asked, "Now, what good history do you have for that?" I do not know just how she brought it in, but she never would allow us to claim anything for her as a historian. She did not put herself up as a corrector of history, — not only did not do that, but protested against it. Just how they dealt in bringing the history along, I could not say, but I suspect that she referred to this as she went along, and then allowed them to gather the very best historical statements they could and submit them to her, and she approved of them. (pp. 53-54)

W.W. Prescott: You are touching exactly the experience through which I went, personally, because you all know that I contributed something toward the revision of "*Great Controversy*." I furnished considerable material bearing upon that question.

A.G. Daniells: By request.

W.W. Prescott: Yes, I was asked to do it, and at first I said, "No, I will not do it. I know what it means." But I was urged into it. When I had gone over it with W.C. White, then I said, "Here is my difficulty. I have gone over this and suggested changes that ought to be made in order to correct statements. These changes have been accepted. My personal difficulty will be to retain faith on those things that I cannot deal with on that basis." But I did not throw up the spirit of prophecy, and have not yet; but I have had to adjust my view of things. I will say to you, as a matter of fact, that the relation of those writings to this movement and to our work, is clearer and more consistent in my mind than it was then. But still you know what I am charged with. I have gone through the personal experience myself over that very thing that you speak of. If we correct it here and correct it there, how are we going to stand with it in the other places?

F.M. Wilcox: Those things do not involve the general philosophy of the book.

W.W. Prescott: No, but they did involve quite large details. For instance, before "*Great Controversy*" was revised, I was unorthodox on a certain point, but after it was revised, I was perfectly orthodox.

C.M. Sorenson: On what point?

W.W. Prescott: My interpretation was, (and I taught it for years in *The Protestant Magazine*) that Babylon stood for the great apostasy against God, which headed up in the papacy, but which included all minor forms, and that before we come to the end, they would all come under one. That was not the teaching of "*Great Controversy*." "*Great Controversy*" said that Babylon could not mean the Romish church, and I had made it mean that largely and primarily. After the book was revised, although the whole argument remained the same, it said that it could not mean the Roman Church **alone**, just that one word added.

F.M. Wilcox: That helped you out.

W.W. Prescott: Yes, but I told W.C. White I did not think anybody had any right to do that. And I did not believe anybody had any right to use it against me before or afterward. I simply went right on with my teaching.

J.W. Anderson: Would you not claim other portions of the book as on the same basis?

W.W. Prescott: No, I would refuse to do that. I had to deal with A.R. Henry over that question. He was determined to crush those men that took a wrong course concerning him. I spent hours with that man trying to help him. We were intimate in our work, and I used to go to his house and spend hours with him. He brought up this question about the authority of the spirit of prophecy and wanted me to draw the line between what was authoritative and what was not. I said, "Brother Henry, I will not attempt to do it, and I advise you not to do it. There is an authority in that gift here, and we must recognize it."

I have tried to maintain personal confidence in this gift in the church, and I use it and use it. I have gotten great help from those books, but I will tell you frankly that I held to that position on the question of Babylon for years when I knew it was exactly contrary to "*Great Controversy*," but I went on, and in due time I became orthodox. I did not enjoy that experience at all, and I hope you will not have to go through it. It means something.

C.L. Benson: That is the pivotal point. You had something that enabled you to take that position. What was it?

W.W. Prescott: I cannot lay down any rule for anybody. What settled me to take that position was the Bible, not any secular authority. (pp. 54-55)

W.W. Prescott: If I should speak my mind frankly, I should say that I have felt for years that great mistakes were made in handling her writings for commercial purposes.

C.M. Sorenson: By whom?

W.W. Prescott: I do not want to charge anybody. But I do think great mistakes were made in that way. That is why I have made a distinction as I have. **When I talked with W.C. White about it (and I do not know that he is an infallible authority), he told me frankly that when they got out "*Great Controversy*," if they did not find in her writings anything on certain chapters to make the historical connections, they took other books, like "*Daniel and the Revelation*," and used portions of them; and sometimes her secretaries, and sometimes she herself, would prepare a chapter that would fill the gap.** (pp. 55-56)

A.G. Daniells: We must use good sense in dealing with this whole question, brethren. Do not be careless with your words. Do not be careless in **reporting** or representing men's views. I have had this thing to deal with for years and years, as you know, in every ministers' meeting; and I have been called into college classes over and over again, and have had to say things that those ministers and students never heard before about this; and I have prayed for wisdom and for the Spirit of the Lord to direct them and to give faith and to cover up those things that would leave doubt. And I have never had it come back on me that a careful, cautious statement made in the fear of God has upset a single person. It may have done it, but it has never come back to me. You take our ministers: This brother [meaning Brother Waldorf] knows how much this was brought up in our ministers' meeting over in Australia, and we dealt with it plainly. We did not try to pull the wool over the people's eyes, and I believe you will find the Australian preachers and churches as firm believers in the spirit of prophecy and in Sister White's call by the Lord as you will find any place on the face of the

earth. Take New Zealand: I brought them up there, and I think it is well known that there is not a place in the world where the people stand truer to this gift than they do there.

I do not believe it is necessary to dissemble a bit, but I do believe, brethren, that we have got to use wisdom that God alone can give us in dealing with this until matters gradually work over. We have made a wonderful change in nineteen years, Brother Prescott. Fifteen years ago we could not have talked what we are talking here today. It would not have been safe. This matter has come along gradually, and yet people are not losing their confidence in the gift. (p. 57)

A.G. Daniells: I want to tell you that the clearer view we get on the exact facts in the case, the stronger the position of our people will be in the whole thing.

Now, Brother Benson, I see the whole line running through there that you referred to. We can not correct that in a day. We must use great judgment and caution. I hope you Bible teachers will be exceedingly careful. I was called up here twice to speak on the spirit of prophecy to the Bible and pastoral training classes. They brought up this question of history. I simply said, "Now, boys, Sister White never claimed to be a historian nor a corrector of history. She used the best she knew for the matter she was writing on." I have never heard from a teacher that those boys buzzed around them and said, "Brother Daniells does not believe Sister White's writings are reliable." I believe the Lord will help us to take care of this if we will be careful and use good sense. I think that is all I can say in this sort of discussion.



The Relationship of the Ellen G. White Writings to the Development of Doctrine and of Prophetic Interpretation Among Seventh-day Adventists, by H.W. Lowe. GC Archives.

For fifty or sixty years after the disappointment of 1844, there was almost continuous criticism of some of our basic teachings. This was especially true of the sanctuary question. The most bitter attacks were made on the SDA views on the investigative judgment and the cleansing of the sanctuary. This unfavourable reaction against the nature of our Lord's heavenly ministry has continued with varying intensity to the present time. There is probably no point of our teaching that has aroused more bitter opposition than this. These attacks almost always impugn.

Our Sources of Evidence

Some critics have charged us with distortion of Scripture; others with proving our teaching largely or wholly with extra-Biblical evidence. The issue has been complicated by the claim, on the part of some SDA's, that we have accepted some doctrines direct and wholly from Ellen G. White apart from Biblical evidence. This has led people within our own ranks from time to time to ask for a clear statement as to our relation between the Bible and the Ellen G. White writings in the realm of primary evidential sources. Such statements have been made from time to time, but the question persists.

Our position on doctrinal sources has been expressed sometimes in strongly Protestant terminology, such as the following:

"But God will have a people upon the earth to maintain the Bible, and the Bible only, as the standard of all doctrines and the basis of all reforms ... Before accepting any

doctrine or precept, we should demand a plain „Thus saith the Lord“ in its support” (*GC*, 595).

“I am fully in harmony with you in your work when you present the Bible, and the Bible alone, as the foundation of our faith” (*2SM*, 85).

“In the work of teaching the truth it is necessary that the important points of our position be well fortified with Scripture evidences” (*IT*, 447, 448).

These and other statements maintain the supremacy of Biblical evidence as “the standard of all doctrines,” “the basis of all reforms,” “the foundation of our faith,” “the important points of our position.”

That our fundamental doctrines had their origin, if not always their complete proof, in the Bible, is clear. For example, the original doctrine of the second advent was common to all our first pioneers before the gift of prophecy was manifested among them, and before the Sabbath truth called them out of their former denominational connections. Ellen G. White’s writings on this doctrine were not additional basic proofs, but she added details and drew spiritual lessons for the church.

In the formative period 1844-1845, what we refer to as the fundamental truths were few in number, and not much detail of prophetic interpretation was attached to them. In 1854 the fundamentals were:

1. The second advent of our Lord
2. The seventh-day Sabbath
3. The three angels’ messages of Rev. 14
4. The sanctuary truth with its 1844 emphasis
5. The conditional immortality truth

Some thirty years later, in 1889, Ellen G. White, in *MS*, 13 (see *CE*, 30, 31) listed these same five fundamentals, but detailed exposition had grown, especially on numbers 3 and 4 above.

Development of Doctrine and Prophetic Interpretation

The development of doctrine always appears to have originated in Bible study. It is not possible always to determine exactly at what point the Spirit of Prophecy counsel appeared in confirmation of any given detail. Sometimes it was given during or immediately following current discussions, sometimes much later. The basic structure of both doctrine and prophetic interpretation came from the study of Scripture, and was often confirmed and at times augmented by the counsels of Ellen G. White. This was the pattern in the eleven or twelve years after 1844, when there was no organizational structure, and up until 1849, no periodicals to act as a doctrinal forum and a unifying influence. Even when confirming views already discovered in the Scriptures, Ellen G. White stressed the necessity of personal and continuous Bible study.

“Previous light has come, appropriate for this time. It is Bible truth, showing the perils that are right upon us. This light should lead us to a diligent study of the Scriptures and a most critical examination of the positions which we hold. God would have all the bearings and positions of truth thoroughly and perseveringly searched, with prayer and fasting. Believers are not to rest in suppositions and ill-defined ideas of what constitutes truth. Their faith must be firmly founded upon the word of God ...

“Whatever may be man’s intellectual advancement, let him not for a moment think that there is no need of thorough and continuous searching of the Scriptures for greater light. As a people we are called individually to be students of prophecy. We must watch with earnestness that we may discern any ray of light which God shall present to us. We are to catch the first gleamings of truth; and through prayerful study clearer light may be obtained, which can be brought before others.

“When God’s people are at ease and satisfied with their present enlightenment, we may be sure that He will not favour them. It is His will that they should be ever moving forward to receive the increased and ever-increasing light which is shining for them” (5T, 707-709. [1889]).

It is abundantly clear from other sources and at later dates that Ellen G. White sought repeatedly to put Bible study in the forefront and regarded her own writings as contributing to the confirmation of truths therein revealed:

“The testimonies of Sister White should not be carried to the front. God’s Word is the unerring standard. The testimonies are not to take the place of the Word” (Ev, 256).

“The written testimonies are not to give new light, but to impress vividly upon the heart the truths of inspiration already revealed. ... Additional truth is not brought out; but God has through the Testimonies simplified the great truths already given, and in His own chosen way brought them before the people, to awaken and impress the mind with them, that all may be left without excuse” (2T, 605).

“... The Testimonies are not to belittle the Word of God, but to exalt it and attract minds to it, that the beautiful simplicity of truth may impress all” (5T, 665).

One of Mrs. White’s best known statements pertinent to this subject was:

“Little heed is given to the Bible, and the Lord has given a lesser light to lead men and women to greater light” (Ev, 257).

It was on the basis of this relationship between the Bible and the prophetic gift that our SDA doctrines have developed over the years. New light came on such subjects as the deity of Christ, the Trinity, righteousness by faith, the sanctuary question, as well as on major prophetic interpretations, especially those connected with the final events — almost always on the basis of initial discovery in the Word of God, confirmed and sometimes augmented in detail by the Spirit of Prophecy in Mrs. White’s writings. The prophetic gift was also exercised in the curtailment of erroneous, non-Biblical views. See *EW*, 78.

The Problem of Augmentation

We have to admit that there are in Ellen G. White’s counsels and testimonies some factual details that are not found in the Holy Scriptures. (Her view that the saints would pass through the time of trouble in the future, and that therefore those expecting the Lord to come in the seventh month of 1845 would be disappointed, is a case in point. See *A Word to the Little Flock*, p. 22.) Some critics have used her extra-Biblical comments as an argument against Mrs. White’s work, and some of our members have at times been somewhat confused by it.

In later days, after the doctrinal views of the denomination had crystallized into recorded fundamental beliefs, Elder F.M. Wilcox could write of Ellen G. White’s work: “Her writings are in perfect harmony with the statements of divine revelation. She has taken the great

principles of truth expressed in the Bible, and drawn them out in finer detail” (*The Present Truth*, 3[133]).

It does not seem illogical, once we have accepted the fact of inspiration through the Holy Spirit, to expect that early written revelations may be confirmed, clarified, and augmented by later revelations. The Old Testament comes alive through the fuller revelations of truth in the New Testament, which dealt with old truths augmented and clarified for a new age. The apostle Paul often took Old Testament statements and used them in an entirely new context. In fact, New Testament writers sometimes used quotations not found in the Old Testament. These may have come from men inspired by the Holy Spirit during the inter-testamental period, or in some other pre-Christian age, but they are in the category of extra-Biblical evidence. They may have come from some of the anonymous prophets mentioned in the Bible. They are used in evidence, even though authorship is unknown to us.

Some specific instances of New Testament teaching not clearly discernible in the Old Testament are:

1. **Genesis 3.** The serpent is regarded as a symbol of Satan according to 2 Cor. 11:3; Rev. 12:9. From the Old Testament the serpent may look like a symbol of the Saviour, and also from John 3:14.
2. **Isa. 53.** The “suffering servant of Jehovah.” The New Testament applies this to Jesus of Nazareth. (Acts 8:27-35; Mark 9:12; Luke 22:37; Matt. 8:17). But what of Isaiah’s words: “But Thou, Israel, art my servant, Jacob whom I have chosen.” Isa. 41:8. See also Isa. 41:9; 44:1, 2; 45:4.
3. **Jude 14.** “And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints.” (This is not mentioned in the Old Testament, but is found in the Apocryphal book of Enoch, 1:9; 14:22; 40:1.)
4. **Heb. 1:6.** “He saith, let all the angels of God worship him.” (This is not in the Old Testament, but is in the LXX of Deut. 32:43.)

That there are things in the Ellen G. White writings which are old facts or truths used in entirely new contexts, and that they sometimes do not seem to follow the normal principles of hermeneutics, is not denied; but she originates no new doctrine, and her teachings do not conflict with the teachings of the Bible. We cannot avoid the fact that new ideas and facts appear in her writings. To expect revelations of this nature to conform strictly to the usual principles of exegesis could conceivably lead us into constricting the operations of the Holy Spirit into the too confining channels of human devising. We are not coldly analysing a scientific problem. We are seeking to understand God’s way with men through His Word, and that transcends all philosophy and all rationalization.

“Scriptural difficulties can never be mastered by the same methods that are employed in grappling with philosophical problems. We should not engage in the study of the Bible with that self-reliance with which so many enter the domains of science” (*GC*, 599).

We ought to remember that all philosophy founders at the cross, and that some things must be accepted on the basis of faith in the special revelation in God’s Word, and through His Spirit.

Problems Relevant to Daniel's Prophecies

We are here concerned with: (a) What were the basic interpretations of Daniel's prophecies that our pioneers believed they had found in the Scriptures? (b) What was Ellen G. White's attitude to the Bible evidence found by the pioneers on the sanctuary question?

On (a) above, Ellen G. White stated categorically:

"In their investigation they learned that there is no Scripture evidence sustaining the popular view that the earth is the sanctuary, but they found in the Bible a full explanation of the subject of the sanctuary, its nature, location, and services; the testimony of the sacred writers being so clear and ample as to place the matter beyond all question" (*GC*, 411).

The context then shows that Heb. 8:1, 2; 9:1-5; Rev. 11:19 were key passages in convincing the pioneers that Christ's anti-typical ministry was in heaven in the true tabernacle. To these and other passages they added certain lessons from the Levitical types to show that:

"As anciently the sins of the people were by faith placed upon the sin-offering, and through its blood transferred, in figure, to the earthly sanctuary; so in the new covenant the sins of the repentant are by faith placed upon Christ, and transferred, in fact, to the heavenly sanctuary. And as the typical cleansing of the earthly was accomplished by the removal of the sins by which it had been polluted, so the actual cleansing of the heavenly is to be accomplished by the removal, or blotting out, of the sins which are there recorded. But before this can be accomplished, there must be an examination of the books of record to determine who, through repentance of sin and faith in Christ, are entitled to the benefits of His atonement. The cleansing of the sanctuary therefore involves a work of investigation, — a work of judgment. This work must be performed prior to the coming of Christ to redeem His people; for when He comes, His reward is with him to give to every man according to his works" (*Ibid.*, 421,422).

On (b) we have her explicit statement that they found "indisputable proof" of the existence of the true sanctuary in heaven (*Ibid.*, 415). She wrote chapters 22, 23, 24, 25 of *The Great Controversy* confirming and elucidating pioneer findings on the sanctuary question, as well as many pages elsewhere clarifying obscurities and setting forth the spiritual meanings and implications of the whole subject of the investigative judgment.

Our first pioneers lived in the turbulent atmosphere of the days following the French Revolution. Irreligion produced the reaction that sent men to the Bible in a frantic search for an explanation of their distressing times. Commentators delved into apocalyptic prophecies and came forth with volumes on Daniel, and on the Revelation. From the mid-eighteenth to the mid-nineteenth century there was a phenomenal literary output in the field of prophetic interpretation, and it was undoubtedly on the basis of some of this prophetic investigation that Miller and his colleagues were helped to build up their interpretations of the "kingdom prophecies." Even their chronological interpretations were not wholly original, except in the area of the seventy weeks and the 2300 days. It is historically demonstrable that most of our views on the sanctuary question, the second advent, the Sabbath, the law of God, conditional immortality, the Trinity, the incarnation, etc., were not originated by us. Rather, we were the inheritors of sacred truths which we revived and clarified under the Holy Spirit's guidance.

Daniel, chapters 2, 7, 8 and 11 engaged the earnest attention of these non-Adventist people. Also the time prophecies — the 2300 days, the 1260 days, "the time of the end," and the end of time, — were the substance of much study by Christians of various connections around the

turn of the century. Unfortunately some of the numerous writers on prophecy back there were confused on what they called “the kingdom” prophecies to be fulfilled through literal Israel, as are some today. Sometimes we may have erred in forgetting that the plans of God might have been accomplished before the crucifixion, had Israel been ready, and that therefore some details of conditional prophecy will never be fulfilled exactly as we may have imagined. But through His church, in another context, God’s plans and purposes will unerringly come to pass, and He will be justified before the universe.

We can see clearly in our earliest literature that the fundamental prophetic beliefs of the pioneers, arrived at without benefit of the prophetic gift, were based on (1) the world history of the image of Daniel 2; (2) the four beasts of Daniel 7; (3) the ram and the he-goat of Daniel 8, with the 2300 days of Daniel 8 and 9; (4) the kings of Daniel 11 and (5) the standing up of Michael in Daniel 12.

Stated otherwise, our early believers built up their chronological prophetic interpretations around the history of the nations — Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, Persia, Greece, pagan Rome emerging into Papal Rome, and the ten kingdoms preceding the establishment of the everlasting kingdom.

They found in the Revelation certain similarity of phraseology and episode with the book of Daniel, and therefore felt sure that the last book in the Bible was an inspired comment on the earlier prophet. Early Adventist literature, and a good deal of non-Adventist literature, contains many comparisons between the books of Daniel and the Revelation. They saw that Revelation 12 and 13 concerned the age-long controversy between Christ and Satan. In later years we have come to think of Daniel 8 in the same apocalyptic connection as Rev. 12, 13, 14, and therefore of the same cosmic, rather than local, scope. This is one reason why we have always rejected the rather localized Antiochus Epiphanes interpretation of the little horn of Daniel 8.

The Sabbath and the Prophetic Gift

An illustration of the way in which basic Bible truth was confirmed by Ellen G. White is found in the acceptance of the Sabbath by the early Adventists. Rachel Oakes Preston brought this truth to the Adventists in Washington, New Hampshire, about the time of the 1844 disappointment. Early in 1845 T.M. Preble’s article on the subject, in *The Hope of Israel*, came into the hands of Joseph Bates, who accepted and started to circulate it among others. Ellen Harmon and James White heard it in New Bedford in 1846, but did **not** see its importance (See *Life Sketches*, 95.)

In the autumn of the same year they were married and about the same time read Joseph Bates’ 48-page tract, “The Seventh-day Sabbath a Perpetual Sign.” They at once began to observe the seventh day (see *1T*, 75). Mrs. White’s comment later was:

“I believed the truth upon the Sabbath question before I had seen anything in vision in reference to the Sabbath. It was months after I had commenced keeping the Sabbath before I was shown its importance and its place in the third angel’s message.” Letter 2, 1874, quoted in *Ellen G. White, Messenger to the Remnant*, p. 34, White Trustees.

For ten years, however, these Sabbathkeeping Adventists observed the Sabbath from 6 p.m. Friday to 6 p.m. Saturday, James and Ellen White among them. Some urged sunrise to sunrise, some suggested sunset to sunset, others vaguely evening to evening. There was much debate over this question, and much earnest Bible study, till in 1855 at a Battle Creek

conference, Ellen White was shown that the sunset time was correct. Elder Andrews gave much study to this question and had reported the results before the confirmation came through Ellen G. White. This is a classic illustration of the way in which Bible study and the prophetic gift have worked together, though not simultaneously, in leading the church into a full doctrinal truth.

The Sanctuary and the Prophetic Gift

The sanctuary truth combines doctrine and prophetic interpretation with similar results. Hiram Edson was impressed, the morning after the great disappointment, that the prophecy of the 1844 cleansing was correct as to date, but it was not correct in the event, for the **cleansing** was the coming of Christ to the second apartment of the tabernacle in heaven. Levitical typology and the ancient of days vision in Daniel 7 led him to this conclusion. Edson, Hahn and Crosier then for some months studied these basic ideas. Thus the winter of 1845-46 saw the publication of the *Day-Dawn* containing these views. In February, 1845, Ellen Harmon had “a view of Jesus rising from His mediatorial throne and going to the holiest as Bridegroom to receive His Kingdom” (*Ellen G. White, Messenger to the Remnant*, p. 37, White Trustees), but the significance of this was not perceived by her at the time. In January, 1846, her first vision was published in the *Day-Star*, and was the first intimation of the prophetic gift that was to appear among Seventh-day Adventists. The March 14, 1846, issue related her now year-old vision of Christ’s ministry in the heavenly sanctuary.

“Thus was ratified by vision this essential high point of the sanctuary truth which had been set forth on the basis of Scriptural evidence by Bible students, entirely unknown to Ellen Harmon” (*Ellen G. White, Messenger to the Remnant*, p. 37, White Trustees).

It should be noted, in view of our experience in this area, that it is unwarranted for us to add to “the sanctuary truth” matters of major doctrinal importance that are not clearly intimated in the Scriptures.

This brief study of the relative importance of the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy in the development of our doctrines and of our prophetic interpretations, could be continued consistently through all of our major beliefs. It would undoubtedly be true that our original and basic beliefs came from the Scriptures, confirmed and often developed in detail by Ellen G. White writings.

It is doubtful if we could find a single instance where a major doctrine or prophetic interpretation originated with Mrs. White. James and Ellen White took this position.

In our program of public evangelism we have adhered to the principles set forth here, and have drawn wholly upon Scripture to prove the truth of our basic doctrines, using Ellen G. White’s writings for devotional and complementary spiritual purposes. The testimonies and other matters prepared by her for the church only, have always been used for that purpose. In her first book, *Experiences and Views* (1851) she clearly enunciated the view here taken that the material produced from her visions was not to be a rule of faith, but for the edifying of the church:

“I recommend to you, dear reader, the Word of God as the rule of your faith and practice. By that Word we are to be judged. God has, in that Word, promised to give visions in the „last days;“ not as a new rule of faith, but for the comfort of His people, and to correct those who err from Bible truth” (*EW*, 78).

Letter from W.C. White to Luther Warren, Jan. 1, 1904, GC Archives

Dear Brother:

Mother does not care to have this or any similar enterprise pushed on the strength of her say-so. She thinks the right way is to teach the principles from the word of God, from the Testimonies, and from our own observation and knowledge of cause and effect; and then build up your plans of work, construct your pledges and your appeals, as based on these principles, and go ahead, appealing to the reason of the people, rather than to some definite form of sentences which Sister White has written or spoken.

While speaking of this, I will mention to you a protest which I have often made to our preachers, teachers, and editors, and that is that they use the most modest terms in referring to Mother's writings, and to her statements. You and I know that the Lord speaks through Mother; and when a Brother quotes her writings to you and me, saying, "The Lord says this, or that," we understand what he means, — that He has put the thought in Mother's mind, and she has written it. But I consider it a very unfortunate form of expression, and one which, used in the pulpit, in the classroom, and in our periodicals and books, may be a great stumbling-block, and which will naturally lead our young people to use expressions which will be a stumbling-block.

Yours very truly,
(Signed) W.C. White

★ ★ ★

Letter from M.E. Kern to F.M. Wilcox, April 4, 1946, GC Archives

Dear Brother Wilcox:

The attitude toward the Spirit of prophecy on the part of many workers concerns me very much, Brother Wilcox. Of course there are always those who are inclined to discredit the Spirit of prophecy when it condemns their practices or goes against their pet theories. Then there are many, as you know, who take an extreme attitude regarding the infallibility of everything Sister White ever wrote or said, which amounts to a belief in verbal inspiration, — a position which Sister White or the pioneers never took. Such people need educating, but of course it is extremely hard to help them without being accused of unbelief in the Spirit of prophecy. But this extreme group, I fear, are causing a serious reaction against the Spirit of prophecy. Then of course the fact that our Education and Medical Departments have departed so far from the clear teaching and emphasis of the Spirit of prophecy tends to weaken confidence in it.

There are, I believe, a lot of sincere, devoted people, including influential workers, who are troubled in their minds as to just what our position is regarding this gift. Some questions regarding this matter were discussed at a joint meeting of our college Bible and history teachers two years ago. Arthur was there and made a good statement, using some things which have been presented in the brochures that have been prepared. At the close it was suggested and voted that a committee should be appointed to prepare a statement regarding the nature, purpose and authority of the Spirit of prophecy — a statement to be presented to the officers of the General Conference for counsel and clarification.

This was near the end of the Bible and history teachers' meetings. Because of a pressure of work, and probably some fear that the proposal would not be understood, the action was not carried out. Some months later I was shocked to read a copy of a letter written by one of

these teachers telling a friend about this discussion of which I have spoken, and saying that it was the consensus of opinion at the meeting that Sister White's writings were on the same basis as any other good Bible commentator and that this was practically the attitude of General Conference men. I joined with Arthur in statements to the inquirer who wrote about it that we had no such understanding of that meeting.

What Sister White wrote in Letter 16, 1890 is surely very true that "Satan will work ingeniously in different ways and through different agencies to unsettle the confidence of God's remnant people in the true testimony." We can easily see the "different ways" and "different agencies." And much of it, I believe, is a lack of information, and that is due in part, I think to a fear to speak plainly and to correct erroneous conceptions. We are afraid to admit that there are sometimes loose or obscure statements that need clarification by comparison with the whole tenor of Sister White's teachings, or that some data used to fill out an historical picture were taken from the best available sources which may not have been absolutely accurate. I fear in this way we undermine the confidence of the present and more critical generation of our people; whereas a more rational view of the combination of the human and divine elements in the Spirit of prophecy would strengthen that confidence.

Dr. Paulson got terribly upset because Sister White spoke of a certain sanitarium having so many rooms, whereas it had one less than that number. Some people would be terribly shocked to know that Sister White expressed regret that in a talk at College View she got off her subject and made uncomplimentary remarks about the mattresses at the sanitarium. It certainly will shock some people if they learn that Sister White once advised that brethren and sisters should wash each other's feet in carrying out the ordinance of humility.

(Signed) M. E. Kern

★ ★ ★

Letter from W.A. Spicer to I. Keck, July 18, 1910, GC Archives

Dear Brother Keck:

I am sorry you find any difficulty over the matter of the Bible only as a rule of faith. That is squarely my position, as Eld. James White so clearly stated it years ago in words which I quoted.

Men swing from one side to the other, from over-spiritualization and the fanciful, to repudiation of fundamentals; from using the testimonies as the supreme test to doctrines, to repudiating them altogether.

(Signed) W.A. Spicer

★ ★ ★

Letter from U. Smith to D. Canright, April 6, 1883

Dear Brother Canright:

The idea has been studiously instilled into the minds of the people that to question the visions in the least is to become at once, a hopeless apostate and rebel; and too many, I am sorry to say, have not strength of character enough to shake off such a conception, hence the moment anything is done to shake them on the visions they lose faith in everything and go to destruction. I believe this state of things never would have occurred had the position of our

people on this manifestation of the gifts been correct. If our people would come together and calmly, candidly, kindly and freely deliberate upon this matter, I believe, as I have said to you and others, that a consistent position could be found, which would free the subject from difficulties, meet and satisfy the scrutiny of an intelligent public, and not rob the gift of a whit of the good it was intended to do. But there are many too doggedly bigoted and stubborn to offer any very flattering outlook in this direction.

(Signed) U. Smith

★ ★ ★

Letter from U. Smith to D. Canright, March 22, 1883, GC Archives

Dear Brother Canright:

I was interested in your queries to Uncle George on the omissions in “Early Writings.” We have the Marion paper in exchange, and I had noticed the article. Under the circumstance I think it must come down on him something like an avalanche; and I have a curiosity to know how he has answered it, as he put a note on the margin that he had answered it. I have no doubt the quotations are correct. I remember coming across the tome “*Word to Little Flock*” when we were in Rochester, but I have not seen a copy since, and did not know but “*Experience and Views*” contained the full text of the early visions. It seems to me that the testimonies, **practically**, have come into shape, that it is not of any use to try to defend the enormous claims that are now put forth for them. At least, after the unjust treatment I have received the past year, I feel no burden in that direction. Theoretically, the doctrine of Spiritual Gifts is clear enough and I think all our people stand together on that. Brother Littlejohn has preached on the subject here, treating it mostly from a theoretical standpoint. But that does not touch the question at issue among us at all. I presume you noticed in the Review of March 13, Bro. Waggoner’s extinguisher of the Mormon gifts. But if the same reasoning will not apply somewhat to our own experience, I cannot see straight. The cases of Fuller, Cowell and Smith Shorr are stunners to me. If all the brethren were willing to investigate this matter candidly and broadly, I believe some consistent common ground for all to stand upon could be found. But some, of the rule or ruin spirit, are so dogmatical and stubborn that I suppose that any effort in that direction would only lead to a rupture of the body.

(Signed) U. Smith

★ ★ ★

Article by W.W. Prescott, “The Bible Only,” Advent Review & Sabbath Herald, Dec. 23, 1909, p. 4.

In just that proportion that we put some other authority in place of the Scripture, to the same degree do we become feeble and uncertain in our Christian experience. There is no exposition of the Bible that can take the place of the Bible itself. There are no helps to the study of the Bible that can profitably be substituted for the Bible itself.

★ ★ ★

Article by W.W. Prescott, “The Protestant Platform,” Advent Review and Sabbath Herald, Dec. 16, 1909.

It is one thing to accept and repeat as a formula the familiar words, “The Bible, the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants,” but it is another thing to apply this principle in practise. It is natural to us to appeal to some kind of visible authority to interpret the Scriptures to us, and without realizing it we may be led step by step to substitute something else for the Bible, and to rest our message upon some other foundation than the Word of God, or at least upon the Word of God and something else.

Every teacher of the truth for this time should so study the Scriptures that for every doctrine presented to the people he will have Biblical proof, and every interpretation which he makes should commend itself to his hearers as being based upon an enlightened understanding of the Word of God itself.

When we seek to win to this movement those who acknowledge the authority of the Scriptures, it is incumbent upon us to present to them clear Scriptural reasons for all that we ask them to accept. In our study of the Word of God we may receive suggestions from many sources, but the material for our teaching should be drawn directly from God’s Book.



From Questions on Doctrine, pp. 89, 90.

1. We do not regard the writings of Ellen G. White as an addition to the sacred canon of Scripture.
2. We do not think of them as of universal application, as is the Bible, but particularly for the Seventh-day Adventist Church.
3. We do not regard them in the same sense as the Holy Scriptures, which stand alone and unique as the standard by which all other writings must be judged.

Seventh-day Adventists uniformly believe that the canon of Scripture closed with the book of Revelation.

We test the writings of Ellen G. White by the Bible, but in no sense do we test the Bible by her writings. Ellen G. White and others of our writers have gone on record again and again on this point.

In her first book, in 1851, she said concerning the Bible:

I recommend to you, dear reader, the Word of God as the rule of your faith and practice. By that Word we are to be judged. (*EW*, 78)

Later she wrote:

The Spirit was not given — nor can it ever be bestowed — to supersede the Bible, for the Scriptures explicitly state that the Word of God is the standard by which all teaching and experience must be tested. (*GC*, Intro, vii)

And in her last appearance before the assembled delegates at the session of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists in Washington, D.C., in 1909, after her message to the vast congregation, she held the Bible aloft in hands trembling with age, and said, “Brethren

and sisters, I commend to you the Book.” It was typical of her lifelong attitude — ever exalting, high above all, the Holy Scriptures as the foundation of our faith.

We have never considered Ellen G. White to be in the same category as the writers of the canon of Scripture.

★ ★ ★

**“Replies to Questions Raised by L.R. Conradi, Manuscript No. 18,”
Issued by M.E. Kern, Associate Secretary of the General Conference,
[194?], pp. 13-14 & last page.**

God revealed truth but gradually, and that usually in response to the prayerful study of the Word by the brethren, confirming or correcting their conclusions through the Spirit of prophecy, guiding and uniting them when division threatened. Many errors were held for years, along with full or partial truths, but which were not corrected by this gift, such as the time of beginning the Sabbath, pork eating, and other beliefs or practices. The first item will illustrate our point:

The customary time — between the years 1846 and 1855 — for observing the Sabbath was from 6 p.m. to 6 p.m., on the basis of “are there not twelve hours in the day,” (John 11:9). Some contended for midnight to midnight, others for sunset to sunset, and still others for sunrise to sunrise. As agitation developed in favour of the sunrise position, Sister White reproved it, and this held the wrong movement in check. The six o’clock theory continued to hold sway for a time, until the Bible teaching of sunset as the intent of “even,” was discovered. **But in condemning the sunrise position, Mrs. White did not thereby endorse the “six to six” custom, — though this was assumed by many, and was probably practiced by her personally.** She was simply silent thereon, as light had not yet come to the brethren on this point, as it later did through their study of the Scriptures. Mrs. White simply saw and testified that the sunrise position was wrong. And God’s purpose for the moment was served in the corrective message she bore.

Likewise, in the “shut door” period, when the view that the work of the church for the world at large was done forever was held by all — Mrs. White herself sharing it in her personal understanding — she first endorsed in her message from the Lord the truth of Christ’s continued mediation for the saints, declaring that the close of probation was future, along with the time of trouble, and the plagues, which were to precede the coming of the heavenly King. That was her message at the moment. But she was silent concerning the tremendous work for the world yet to be done, for that had not yet been revealed either to her or to the brethren in their study of the word. She was silent, whereas others were vocal in disclaiming responsibility outside the circle of former advent believers. And her very silence, under the circumstances, is tremendously significant. Her messages throughout that period did not contradict her later statements, when God had opened to her and to all the flood-light of truth on the vast work for the world yet to be done.

Question 37: “Is the viewpoint of President Irwin, to which Brother Conradi refers, namely, that the testimonies are „the only infallible interpreter of the Holy Scriptures“, the viewpoint of the General Conference?”

Answer: The answer to this question is a negative one. The denomination has never officially taught through the years that the testimonies were the infallible interpreter of the

Holy Scriptures. The Holy Spirit is the only infallible interpreter of the Scriptures of truth, this is clearly taught in such scriptures as John 16:5-14.

We believe it is proper to recognize, however, that God has set certain gifts in the church. Among these is the gift of prophecy. The same as the apostles and prophets of New Testament times shed light upon the Old Testament scriptures and we interpret the Old Testament prophecies in the light of this New Testament revelation; so we believe that it is justifiable to take into account in Biblical exposition the light which Mrs. White's writings shed upon the scripture. Doing this we are only giving recognition to one of the gifts which God has set in His church, and a gift through which we believe the Holy Spirit operates in giving God's messages to men.



Letter from A.G. Daniells to W.C. White, Aug. 4, 1910, GC Archives

Dear Brother White:

I think it is not only foolish, but extremely dangerous for us to take the position that every detail of the arguments used by our pioneers is absolutely right. This places the same kind of infallibility upon the pioneers as their teaching that all other denominations have adopted. I suppose you have seen the eighteen-page document sent out by L.A. Smith some months ago. If you have not, I will be pleased to send you my copy for investigation. I cannot think you, nor any other sound man, can possibly approve of the spirit in which this document is written. The poor brother seems to mistake ridicule and harsh statements for well-grounded facts which we are all seeking for.

Really, Brother White, the developments in this controversy regarding the "daily" show plainly that we are dealing with a question more serious than the facts concerning the daily, and that is the question as to what extent men are free to pursue an original investigation of the scripture, and to follow the honest conclusions at which they arrive. Personally I stand for liberty. Eight years ago I was brought face to face with the question as to whether men occupying responsible position in this denomination were to be free to follow their consciences, or whether they were to be dominated by a denominational "boss." I took my stand on this question. I notified Doctor Kellogg that the Creator had endowed me with both a judgment and a conscience. And that I believed He had also endowed me not only with the liberty but the duty of being true to my judgment and conscience. I acknowledged that what the Creator had given me was no doubt quite inferior to what He had given him; but what I had was the best I had, and it was that to which I must answer at the final tribunal. I further notified him that I should stand by my best judgment and honest convictions, if that should drive me into exile for ever.

It looks to me as though we have another question to settle, and that is whether we are a free people, in the matter of Biblical research, and in the matter of following the light that comes to us from such research. It is idle to say that we shall not receive additional light. Both the scriptures and testimonies assure us that we will. The testimonies positively affirm that this additional light will correct some of the mistakes and errors now existing among us. On the other hand, the testimonies assure us, and I believe it with all my heart, that not a block or a pin of the true foundation of the third angel's message will be removed. The new light that came to us in 1888 regarding the law in Galatians and righteousness by faith did not remove a block or a pin from the foundation of the third angel's message; but it did remove a pillar from the foundation of the argument we made regarding the ceremonial law. Personally I

would infinitely rather hold the position which we have taken since the light of ,88 than the position we formerly held.

(Signed) A.G. Daniells

★ ★ ★

Article by W.C. White, “The Influence of the Prophetic Gift in the Establishment of Church Doctrine,” pp. 8-9,14-17. GC Archives.

Nor should we overlook the fact that while groping for truth, the pioneers of the message did not always advocate views that we today, or that they themselves later would regard as sound. The messenger of God, herself, with those whom God was preparing to lead out a united people with a harmonious message, sometimes shared with her brethren in the acceptance of partial truths or mistaken views of Scripture teaching. Thus she says:

“With my brethren and sisters, after the time passed in forty-four, I did believe no more sinners would be converted. But I never had a vision that no more sinners would be converted. And am clear and free to state no one has ever heard me say or had read from my pen statements which will justify them in the charges they have made against me” (E.G. White Letter, Aug. 24, 1874. From facsimile copy in “*Testimony of Jesus*,” p. 84.).

James and Ellen White, however, accepted the Sabbath truth through reading the pamphlet prepared by Joseph Bates. They began its observance “in the autumn of 1846,” while the vision in question was not given until April, 1847, as may be seen by reference to “*Early Writings*,” pp. 32-35, where it is reprinted.

And here again we see that while revelations from heaven have confirmed the Sabbath truth, and have illuminated the truths that cluster about it, yet it was first received and accepted from the Bible evidence. Mrs. White wrote:

“I believed the truth upon the Sabbath question before I had seen anything in vision in reference to the Sabbath. It was months after I had commenced keeping the Sabbath before I was shown its importance and its place in the third angel’s message” (E.G. White Letter 2, 1874).

Time to Begin the Sabbath

As an outstanding instance of the principle that the truths were to be first accepted as a result of thorough Bible study before being endorsed by the gift of prophecy, we cite the fact that for a period of more than a decade the believers began the observance of the Sabbath at six o’clock instead of at sundown, before the subject was thoroughly investigated.

In a conference at Topsham in 1847, some present inferred from the wording of Matt. 28:1, “In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week,” that sunrise should mark the beginning and end of the Sabbath. While the question was being discussed, Mrs. White was given a vision in which she heard an angel repeat the words, “From even unto even shall ye celebrate your Sabbaths.”

This settled the question as far as the faulty application of the verse in Matthew was concerned, but the question remained as to the meaning of the word “even.” Joseph Bates, with his enthusiasm for astronomy and his experience as a sea captain was naturally looked to

as one whose views would carry weight upon such a subject and he succeeded in convincing all present that they should adopt equatorial time.

A semblance of scriptural support was found in the question of Jesus, “Are there not twelve hours in the day?” No provision being made for the longer days in summer or shorter days in winter, it seemed logical to conclude that irrespective of the seasons, the day should be reckoned from six to six. Also in the parable of the labourers who were hired at the third, sixth, ninth, and eleventh hours, and who were reckoned with “when **even** was come,” it was natural to conclude that the twelfth hour, or six o’clock, was the “even” that marked the beginning and close of the day.

From time to time the practice of beginning the Sabbath at six o’clock was questioned by various individuals, though they did not give convincing Scriptural reasons for changing the practice generally followed.

In the summer of 1855, at the request of James White, Elder J.N. Andrews gave careful study to the question, and a paper prepared by him was read at a Conference in Battle Creek on Sabbath, November 17. He showed from competent authorities that the brethren had erred in concluding the “hours” as reckoned by the Jews to be the same as our sixty-minute hours. They were rather equal divisions of the time between sunrise and sunset irrespective of the season of the year. Using nine texts in the Old Testament, and two in the New, he showed the identity of the “even” with the setting of the sun.

The arguments were so conclusive that nearly all present accepted the views as set forth in the paper. However, it was difficult for the venerable Elder Bates to grant that the view that he had held so long was unscriptural. He and a few others protested against a change of their practice at this late date. A serious division among strong leaders seemed inevitable.

So the matter stood for two days, and then the Lord in His providence moved to affect unity. While the ministers and others especially interested in the prosperity of the cause were engaged in a special season of prayer, Mrs. White was given a vision, “One item of which was that sunset time was correct.”

Elder Bates and others who had stood with him in maintenance of their former belief and practice accepted the testimony as settling the question and harmony prevailed.

At the Opportune Time

In commenting upon this experience, James White said:

“For one, I have ever been thankful that God corrected the error in His own good time, and did not suffer an unhappy division to exist among us upon this point...

“It does not appear to be the desire of the Lord to teach His people by the gifts of the Spirit on the Bible questions until His servants have diligently searched His word. When this was done upon the subject of time to commence the Sabbath, and most were established, and some were in danger of being out of harmony with the body on this subject, then, yes, **then** was the very time for God to magnify His goodness in the manifestation of the gift of His Spirit in the accomplishment of its proper work”
(*Review and Herald*, February 5, 1868).

James White, in the same connection stated anew his confidence in the supremacy of God's Word, and the place of the gifts in guiding the honest-hearted in a right understanding of that Word. He said further:

"Let the gifts have their proper place in the church. God has never set them in the very front, and commanded us to look to them to lead us in the path of truth and the way to heaven. His word He has magnified. The Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are man's lamp to light up His path to the kingdom. Follow that. But if you err from Bible truth, and are in danger of being lost, it may be that God will in the time of His choice correct you, and bring you back to the Bible, and save you.

★ ★ ★

Letter from W.A. Spicer to L.R. Conradi, Nov. 30, 1914, GC Archives.

Dear Brother Conradi:

Brother Town has let me read a letter from you speaking of some problems you have been sending on to Brother White concerning book revision. Then I have just had yours, giving me a copy of your letter to Brother White dealing with different paragraphs. You will no doubt hear from him. I suppose he will authorize you to drop out the specific references to that meeting of Christ with the disciples. I should think the simplest thing would be to abbreviate the difficulty out of it. Certainly I should not put in the new version as contrary to the old in "*Das Leben Christi*."

It is too bad that the editors of these manuscripts should try to settle some of these controverted questions where authorities disagree, and where the various editors of the manuscripts evidently disagree. A larger question than the question of the mere detail of a correction or of an erroneous statement is **the question as to how we shall treat these matters that have been passed through the hands of the various editors. We have had quite a battle, some of us, for several years, trying to make the brethren see that it was not right to claim any extraordinary authority for matters of this kind. While this is conceded freely enough privately, the difficulty has been, it seems to me, that courage has been lacking to take a straight and consistent position. Years ago, when I was out at St. Helena, I urged W.C. White to have a statement in the revised "*Great Controversy*" that would relieve the whole situation. I hoped it would be there, but it has not been made.** People are left to run across places where the revised edition corrects statements in the old edition, and then some poor soul has a worrying time over it, when it is altogether unnecessary. The trouble is all in the book-making, and there has been too much of an effort on the part of the book-makers, I believe, to emphasize the fact that they do it all under observation, as though that would make sure of inspiration and correct work.

There is one thing sure, Brother Conradi, it is firmly settled that **phrases and historical statements in these books have to be corrected just the same as in other books.** Of course we are supposed to take full counsel with the author in making corrections. On the other hand, I believe **the editors have been a little hard to deal with in accepting suggestions, though no doubt they have felt that they have been very liberal.** A comparison of the new and old edition of "*Great Controversy*" will show many things changed, although **some things should surely have been corrected further.**

We have lately had some meetings of a sub-committee appointed by the Review and Herald Board, dealing especially with "*Bible Readings*" and other books published by the R & H, of

which they will have to bring out new editions. Some criticisms were passed in also on “*Great Controversy*.” I will send you a copy of these.

I will also enclose some material that we have had out on the **dates of the prophetic periods of Revelation 9**. Some little time ago here the question was up, and Professor Prescott and I went down to the Congressional Library. He looked up the History of Pachymeris, translated into Latin by Possinus, to which Gibbon refers for his date, July 27, 1299. I looked up Von Hammer, who is the heaviest German author, apparently, on Ottoman history in those times.

It is very clear that Gibbon made a distinct error, which Von Hammer and others have corrected these years. Gibbon’s mistake is easily seen by looking at the book. He saw July 27 at the opening of chapter 25, and then over in the chronological tables given by Possinus he saw the date 1299 for the beginning of the events dealt with in this chapter; but he failed to note that while the chapter began with July 27, it later went back, as this first paragraph suggests, and dealt with earlier events. These earlier events were the events of 1299, and it was not until 1301 or 1302, as various authorities compute the Mohammedan era, that the battle of July 27 took place.

Well, then about this time Professor Benson, who is now with us here, formerly of Union College, came on with Blue Books that he had received from London, showing conclusively that **the ultimatum of the Powers was not delivered to the Pasha of Egypt on August 11, 1840**. Then we began to look the thing up a bit, and presented some of these features to the recent council. You may well understand that some of the brethren had to sit up and take notice, as we say over here. The shadow of the “Daily” controversy is still upon us. **It is remarkable how loath people are to look at facts, or to correct any facts.** But they had to agree that we must study this thing. I send you a copy of a statement presented by Professor Prescott on July 27, some notes presented by Professor Benson on August 11, 1840, and a series of suggestive notes to help in the study of the question which the brethren asked me to prepare, giving some facts on the positive side. I told the Committee that I would not endorse my own paper at the present time, but that I had merely tried to set down some facts that did seem to be established.

Personally, I would rather hold to 1849 if it could be done, but really it is pretty hard to figure out anything there. Our folks have taught right along that John Palaeologus died, one would infer, July 27, 1449; but he didn’t, he died in the previous year.

(Signed) W.A. Spicer.

★ ★ ★

Letter from L.E. Froom to W.C. White, Dec. 28, 1932.

Dear Brother White:

I sincerely hope, Brother White, that some of these points that have been perplexing, and have been subject to the two extremes, of fanaticism on the one hand, and unwholesome liberalism on the other, can receive adequate treatment to put a denominational stamp upon that sane, impregnable, middle ground which is shared by practically all the thoughtful leaders. I refer to such matters as verbal inspiration versus the true statement of the inspiration of the thought, with exact expression left to the human instrument, and her literary associates, who would recast portions, submitting the same for final approval before publication, so that it became in deed and verity the authorized expression of Sister White.

(Signed) L E. Froom

★ ★ ★

Letter from L.E. Froom to W.C. White, July 20,1931.

Dear Brother White:

I occasionally hear some of our workers who are without personal knowledge of the facts, suggest that we received the doctrines of present truth by divine revelation, intimating or emphatically stating that these special truths were pointed out to Sister White and that was the way we came to have our group of beliefs. I understand this not to be the fact. Sister White ever encouraged the brethren to study the word and to dig out the truth, and never did this gift take the place of personal investigation, according to my understanding. At times when there was perplexity, division, and threatened catastrophe, Sister White often came with a steadying word and an indication of light on some perplexing problem.

(Signed) L E. Froom

★ ★ ★

Letter from L.E. Froom to W.C. White, Feb. 28, 1932.

Dear Brother White:

I should also be pleased to have information as to whether Sister White ever took occasion to rebuke in any way, publicly or privately, or to give expression upon the extreme positions set forth by Brother Loughborough, Haskell, and some others? You of course understand, Brother White, that I hold these brethren in high esteem. I recognize the place that they occupy in the work of God, but I do feel that they took unwarranted positions in some of these matters which have in turn brought great perplexity, and in instances ridicule of the whole gift of prophecy to this movement.

(Signed) L.E. Froom

★ ★ ★

Letter from W.C. White to L.E. Froom, Feb. 18,1932

Dear Brother Froom:

Your letter of February 12, led me to a very interesting study. I enjoyed reading not only the article by Elder James White, entitled "A Test," but also several other articles in the *Review* of October 16, 1855.

The statements made by Elder White are quite in harmony with my memory of his teachings and the views of other pioneers in the earlier days of our denominational work, and I have never heard it asserted by Elder White or by any other of the pioneers that the fundamental doctrines of the SDA denomination were first introduced to them through the vision. My understanding of the matter has always been that God led apostolic men to study the word and find what the truth therein taught and thus to lay the foundation and set the pillars of our denominational views.

In the establishment of the pillars of our faith, there was not always perfection manifested at the beginning, but as brethren studied together, they helped one another to arrive at correct views.

While the pioneers were engaged in this work of establishing the pillars of our faith, they met with many questions, many objections, much opposition and the presentation of vital views which were contended for very earnestly by their advocates. Then our Father in heaven, in His infinite mercy and love, sent His angel to His chosen messenger with messages which confirmed the faith of those who had discovered precious truth and corrected the views of those who were in error and led into the unity of the faith those that were willing to be led.

In presenting these matters before students in our schools, I enjoy presenting the matter in this way. That God permitted apostolic men to dig in the mine of truth and find precious gold, silver and precious stones and He then let influential men oppose these truths until the contention had concentrated the attention of our people upon the question. Then He sent His angel with messages that pointed out who were right and who were wrong, and what was right and what was wrong.

In your study of this question, you must bear in mind that for many years the mind of Ellen G. White was locked to argument and it was with much sorrow that she was obliged to confess to our brethren that she was not able to follow them in their arguments. Consequently she never dealt largely in the outlining of doctrinal truth.

The manner in which she was used to indicate what was truth and what was error, was by the giving to her and through her to the brethren of brief statements indicating that the views presented by Brother A were correct, and that the views presented by Brother B were misleading and full of error. Thus you will see that her relation to the battle for the establishment of truth was more like the work of an umpire in a great football game, and not like the work of one who entered the game and showed in detail how it should be played.

Regarding Elder Underwood's article, I think I have read it, or something similar to it. My memory of what I read is like this, that in the main he had stated the truth, but that he had not stated it very nicely. In fact, he stated it rather clumsily, and in a way that led many young people who did not understand what he was talking about, to get wrong impressions.

In answer to your question regarding the personnel of the Committee to whom was committed the work of supervising the grammatical corrections to be made in copy for the reprint of the *Testimonies*, I must say that I have forgotten who were appointed by the Conference. I presume it was Elder J.H. Waggoner, Brother C.H. Jones, W.C. White, and two others in California, who could personally take part in the deliberations. I do remember that the burden of the work of supervision fell upon J.H. Waggoner and W.C. White, and that the burden of the detail work, fell upon Mary A. Davis and Mary K. White.

The more I deal with this question regarding how the pillars of our faith were hued out and set in place, the more I fell to admire God's plan of leading apostolic men to study out the doctrine and then when other men opposed them and the interest of our people were centred on the controversy, to send His message which brought peace and unity in the place of contention and division. When we meet again I shall be glad to discuss these matters further.

In your letter of February 9, you ask several questions that I cannot answer. I have no knowledge whatever regarding the influence which ancient records may have had upon Moses in His writing of the Pentateuch.

Regarding the exact value and character of the influence of Sister White's writings from her study of histories and through her quotations from historians, I cannot well answer in a few words. When we meet again at the time of the Spring Council, I shall be glad to tell you what I can about this.

Sister White never gave us encouragement in our efforts to analyse and define the work of Inspiration. She did make it plain to us that she was instructed regarding the general plan and the method to bring before the world the matter contained in the *Great Controversy*, Volume 4. She referred to the fact that many people having read portions of what she had written about the great controversy remarked what beautiful fiction it was. Others said the writer must be inspired. And Sister White was fully persuaded that it would add to the value of *Great Controversy* and would carry conviction to a much larger number of readers if in presenting the history of the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century, she made quotations from historians.

In our conversations with her regarding the truthfulness and the accuracy of what she had quoted from historians, she expressed confidence in the historians from whom she had drawn, but never would consent to the course pursued by a few men who took her writings as a standard and endeavoured by the use of them to prove the correctness of one historian as against the correctness of another. From this I gained the impression that the principle use of the passage quoted from historians, was not to make a new history, not to correct errors in history, but to use valuable illustrations to make plain important spiritual truths.

If our brethren will endeavour to get from the writings of Sister White that which she endeavoured to put into them, — if they will abandon the plan of trying to use them in argumentative contention, much blessing will come to us all.

(Signed) W.C. White

★ ★ ★

Article by R.A. Underwood, "The Relation of the Testimonies to the Bible and Their Place in the Church," GC Archives.

God has set certain gifts of the Spirit in the church, and among them is the gift of prophecy. 1 Cor. 12:28. In doing this God has made no man infallible in any of these gifts. The cause of Christ has suffered more as a rule, by its zealous advocates who have taken unsound positions in their zeal and effort to advocate certain doctrines, than it has received from its open enemies.

The position taken by some that the Testimonies are on an equality with the writings of Moses, the Apostle Paul, and all the writers of the Bible, is contrary to the purpose which that gift is designed to serve in the Christian church since the canon of the scripture was completed. (p. 1)

I have heard some of our ministers and workers read in public congregation Testimonies and then make the statement like this, "God says so and so," or the "Lord says so and so," and repeat these statements over and over again in one discourse. I have overheard those not of our faith say, "I have heard that Seventh-day Adventists have a Bible different from the authorized version of the Scriptures, and now I know it is so," and then they turn away with a look of disgust. The golden opportunity to make a good impression upon those strangers within our gates had been lost by placing **this precious gift in "false light"**. We may have the fullest confidence in the Spirit of Prophecy and in the exercise of that gift in the church as

it is, and as it may be more fully seen in the latter rain, but we should never dishonour the cause we love before the world by placing it in an unwarranted “false light”.

One person said in my house, but a few hours since, that if they did not believe every word Sister White had written was infallible, and just as much inspired as the Bible and rested upon the same basis, itself, then “I would give up the whole message”. That is the trouble with those taking extreme positions. I have known and worked with ministers that preached that every word Sister White had written or spoken was inspired the same as the Bible. I know of several such men who are not with us today and are fighting this movement. We must have our faith grounded by the eternal truth as revealed in the Bible and our vision of the Bible sided by the Spirit of Prophecy and we shall not be shaken out by something we may not understand.

★ ★ ★

J.H. Waggoner, “To the General Conference,” pp. 8-9, GC Archives

Expositions of Scriptures cannot rest on authority. They can be settled only by calm investigation, and just reasoning, and then all must have an equal right to express their opinions. For years past I have been grieved to see the view obtaining that certain opinions must be received as the faith of the church, and that if any dissent they shall be considered rebellious to the cause. This course may secure peace for a season, and an apparent coinciding with the authorized view; but it will prove a deceitful peace, and many will be weak in the faith, ready to be overthrown when the faith is assailed.

★ ★ ★

Letter from L.E. Froom to W.C. White, Aug. 17, 1932

Dear Brother White:

I most highly value the documents that you have sent me from time to time in response to my request. I find myself wishing, Brother White, for an opportunity to talk with you deliberately over some problems. Undoubtedly there are two groups forming the extreme wings relative to the Spirit of Prophecy. The one group is rather sceptical regarding any statement that does not have very clear support from other sources. The other group has elevated Sister White to a place never assumed by her, nor, I believe, given to the Bible prophets of old. I am convinced that in the end our conflicts will centre about the Spirit of Prophecy, and it behooves us to have a sane, loyal, and unbreakable platform on which to stand relative to this gift.

As I understand it, Sister White was a human being, endowed with faculties such as the rest of us have. She exercised those faculties constantly; she had her opinions; she expressed those opinions; she read books; she was influenced by the information of those books; but she was also a chosen instrument through whom God spoke to the remnant church. This I believe with all my soul. Now the stumbling of some over little details which they themselves cannot reconcile appeals to me as totally foolish.

(Signed) L.E. Froom

★ ★ ★

Letter from W.C. White to L.E. Froom, Dec. 12, 1930

Dear Brother Froom:

My memory testifies that two or three times in the 80's that proposals were made by ministers that we needed a creed. To these proposals our people gave very little serious attention as it was understood that the Bible was our only creed. At the Minneapolis Conference, after there was developed a wide difference of belief and of sentiment, it was urged quite strongly by half a dozen influential ministers that a creed would be a great blessing to our work. This was vigorously opposed, and Sister White bore her testimony against such a proposition. (p. 2)

In later years men have argued that Elder White and Elder Wilcox and others holding somewhat similar views, were wrong because Elder White was reproved, but I was never able to find any evidence that the vision given at the camp meeting in 1878 threw any light on the doctrinal controversy, but it did throw a flood of light upon the way our brethren should treat one another in presenting Bible doctrines. (p. 4)

(Signed) W.C. White

★ ★ ★

Letter from L.E. Froom to D.E. Robinson, July 31, 1932

Dear Brother Robinson:

As relates to your suggestion that a statement be prepared relative to the editorial work done by Sister White's secretaries and by herself, I have long felt, Brother Robinson, that we are placed in a precarious position relative to this gift in the church through the statements made by some ardent but extreme champions of the gift, making it far more difficult for those who take a loyal but more reasonable position, to maintain an attitude that will satisfactorily meet the critical. I feel that a policy of evasion has marked our dealing with a number of fundamental questions for so many years that it is now increasingly difficult to satisfactorily answer some of these queries. The pressure from our enemies, such as Ballenger with his *Gathering Call*, makes it still more difficult. I should be very deeply interested in anything that you might prepare, and wish that at some time when our paths may cross that we could have a talk over some specific matters that I will not set forth at this writing.

(Signed) L E. Froom

★ ★ ★

Editorial by F.M. Wilcox, "The Gift of the Spirit of Prophecy," *Review and Herald*, June 10, 1915, 92 (29), p. 7.

The proof of this gift rests upon the broad basis of the work it has done and of the fruit it has borne. Doubters and opposers may point to what appears to them inconsistencies; they may haggle over some turn of a phrase, some change of expression in revision, etc. These are little details, which, to our mind, do not affect the broader principles governing the work of this gift or the basis upon which it rests. We doubt not that in other ages of the church similar objections were raised against the work of the messengers of the Lord.

There may be circumstances connected with the exercise of the gift which we cannot understand. Some misguided insight or judgment may make wrong application of the instruction given, using it to further their own plans, or as a club against those who differ

from their viewpoint, but neither the gift itself nor the one through whom the gift is exercised is responsible for these abuses.

We do not credit Sister White with infallibility. She has never claimed this. She is a fallible, mortal woman, and, the same as the one who writes these words and the ones who read them, must avail herself of the merits and mercies of the Lord Jesus Christ for salvation. Her work has been to point mankind to Christ, the Saviour of men; to lead them to search the Scriptures of Truth with greater diligence. In all her work she has exalted the Word of God, and pointed her fellows to it as the man of their counsel.



Article by F.M. Wilcox, "The Work of Mrs. E.G. White," *Review and Herald*, Feb. 27, 1913.

The Lord has wonderfully sustained his servant for many years. The story of her life is the story of this movement. The two are identified in experience. God has wonderfully used her in the promotion of his cause of truth in the earth through the many trying years since she has been made his special messenger to this people.

As we review her experiences, the evidence of her call of God to the position which she has so long occupied in this church does not rest alone upon the logic of reasoning or the enumeration of providential happenings in her work and labours. The evidence which makes the most sensible appeal to us is the general character and influence of her work and teaching.

1. Her message has never been self-centred nor self-directed. It has always pointed to Christ as man's personal Saviour, to the Scriptures of Truth as the source of wisdom and the rule and test of Christian experience.
2. The spirit of prophecy as manifested through Sister White has been in full harmony with the manifestation of this same spirit in ages of the past. The Testimonies proclaim no new gospel. They call the people to no lowered standard. Truth and righteousness, purity and holiness, have ever been held up as the standard of attainment of the people of God.
3. This agency has been used of God in the preservation of the integrity of this movement and in the promotion of its united and harmonious operation. How many instances might be cited where the cause of truth has been saved from serious division and perhaps utter shipwreck by the clear testimony that has been borne relative to questions affecting the church. We have no Church South nor Church North, no American Church nor European Church; but our work stands as one united whole. The influence of the spirit of prophecy has had much to do in the maintenance of this desirable condition.
4. God has used this humble instrumentality to lead his people out of themselves, out of and beyond their own natural conceptions and plans. Repeatedly in response to the instruction which has come, important movements have been inaugurated, appearing to human reasoning most unwise at the time, but the ample justification of which was found in later years. Through it the church of God has been led on by his providence to build better than it realized; and perhaps to this one instrument, above all other agencies, is due the breadth and scope which this movement has taken on during the last few decades.

5. The spirit of prophecy as manifested among us has saved the church from falling into many sophistries and delusions. Repeatedly fanaticism has been rebuked. Again and again the specious deceptions of error have been uncovered. The truth of God has been caused to shine in its brightness and clearness, and the people of God saved from making moves that would bring confusion and disaster.

These are some of the great general reasons that appeal to us and lead us to believe that God has especially wrought through his servant in connection with the work of this church.

We recognize that this gift which he has placed among us sustains the same relationship to this people and this work today that it has sustained through all the years of the past. We believe confidently that as light and blessing and power have come to this church by heeding the counsel of the Lord's messenger in years gone by, so light and blessing and power will come to the church today if it still heeds the messages that God has been pleased to send through his aged servant. We also recognize that while God spoke through her as a young girl, in her weakness and inexperience, so he is abundantly able to speak through her in her declining years, even as he did through Simeon and Anna in the days of Christ.

We have not by any means outgrown in our experience as a people this precious gift which has been set in the church of God. We have not yet reached the place where we can dispense with the warning voice that God has been pleased to let sound these many years. We thank him today for all the light contained in the excellent books and publications that have been issued. We believe that these books should be found today in every Seventh-day Adventist home. Next to the Scriptures of Truth the "*Testimonies for the Church*" should have a place in our daily reading. We can testify personally, as can scores of our brethren and sisters, that their reading incites to deeper consecration, to higher ideals, to greater earnestness. The instruction and exhortation they contain appeal to our hearts. They drive us to the Scriptures of Truth for light and leading. They lead us to feel like humbling ourselves before God and putting away our sins, like throwing ourselves with renewed consecration into his work and service. Their power does not consist in the phrasing of a sentence or in the turn of a word, but in the spirit which accompanies them. This influence will be felt in the life of every one who will give to these volumes faithful study.



Letter from L.E. Froom to C.E. Holmes, Jan. 3, 1927, GC Archives.

My dear Claude:

Now coming to your notes on "*Controversy*." In general I agree with most of the position that you take, though I think in some places you stress words out of the intended meaning and definition. You stress the point that Sister White was never to change a single word. And yet, Claude, if you looked through her manuscripts as I did in California a couple of months ago, you would find her writing scratched out, rewritten, seeking ever to more clearly present the thing that had been shown to her. The vision was inspired. Her writing was the result of that inspiration. Again and again the identical scene would be presented to her. She would rewrite the same scene, but in different words. Sometimes as high as a dozen times she would rewrite a particular scene that had been shown. Now which of those is the one in which there is to be no verbal change?

When her books were written all the particular writings upon a given point were assembled by her or upon her direction by one of her helpers, and the strongest and most forceful presentations compiled and arranged, which she very carefully scrutinized and if there was

divergence from the original view she would correct it. Of sometimes after it had been put in shape she would be given a new vision making it still more clear, and she would cross out a whole section and rewrite and amplify.

Now, Claude, it does not seem to me that we can hold to what some people would denominate verbal inspiration. The very first document that Sister White wrote, in December, 1844, "The Word to the Little Flock," was changed in the reprint a few years later. In comparing this reprint with the original, there is an omission upon page ten of two sentences involving thirty-nine words, also an omission, page 16, of twenty-three printed lines. In other places single words or brief sentences of two or three words are omitted. Then again, there are various substitutions of words as, for instance, the word "better" instead of "upper," the word "glittering" is used instead of "gold" in referring to crowns. In all, there are eleven omissions and ten slight changes in the printed message of 1851 as compared with the printed document of 1847. And these changes were made by the author herself. But there is no variation in the truth presented, nothing that could be denominated a change.

Another interesting fact concerning Sister White's visions is that very little chronology or geography were given in connection with these scenes. In the later editions of "*Controversy*" whole sections were introduced, and when Elder White asked her why she hadn't put them in before, she said, "I didn't know where they belonged." How did she find out, Claude, where they belonged — by studying history and by asking her associates where such and such a thing occurred in history. You might say, Couldn't God have shown her those things? Surely. But the fact that He did not and left the matter as it was is evidence that He desired her to work as she did.

The changes in "*Controversy*" were made with the full understanding of Sister White, and with no message from the Lord indicating His disapproval of the same. You state that "*Controversy*" was first issued as the spirit of prophecy volume no. 4, later revised and enlarged and called "*Great Controversy*," but it did not contradict the old edition. You may not be aware, Claude, that the same identical plates were used in the printing of volume 4 of the spirit of prophecy were first used to print "*Great Controversy*" in its original form. The only difference was the change in title, wider margins, and thicker paper. Then at a later date when through the study of history Sister White had found the location of many of these scenes, it was increased in size and clarity.

The case of "*Sketches from the Life of Paul*" is another one in point. Sister White had been sending out articles to the *Review* and *Signs* on the life of Paul, but each was complete in itself and there were many gaps and breaks between the various sections of his life. This was about the year 1891. When the Sabbath school lessons were to be upon the life of Paul, the publishers asked if she could not assemble her articles and quickly put them into book form to use as collateral reading in the study of the lesson. She agreed to this, but when the matter was assembled many breaks were found and although she had had much light given her on those very portions she did not have time to write them out. Instead she quoted in sections from Conybeare and Howson, which were in harmony with what had been shown to her. She then went on to Australia. When the brethren wanted to reprint another edition of the book she immediately said "No, if it is to be reprinted I have much yet to write out and to add, and clarify what has been placed in print." So in the present "*Acts of the Apostles*" none of the original sections from Conybeare and Howson are included.

Now, Claude, those things do not disturb me in the least. I receive her messages as inspired of Heaven. I do not believe in their verbal inspiration in the sense that they were dictated

word for word, and that we cannot change a word. She herself did not believe nor teach that, but she always reserved the right to clarify when a statement was misunderstood.

(Signed) L E. Froom

★ ★ ★

Letter from L.E. Froom to W.C. White, May 18, 1932.

Dear Brother White:

Forgive another intrusion, Brother White, but here is a question that has several times come to my attention recently; and another mention of it this morning leads me to make inquiry upon expressions appearing in "*Controversy*," page 418, and also in "*Patriarchs*," pages 354 and 355. About the middle of the page a line begins, stating, "Day by day the repentant sinner brought his sin offering ..." And then the paragraph continues with the thought that the blood was taken into the holy place and sprinkled before the veil except in the cases where the flesh was eaten by the priest. Now what is the scripture proof for this? In Lev. 4, four classes are set forth. In the case of the appointed priest and the whole congregation, that was so; but in the case of the common people or the ruler, the record specifically states that the blood was sprinkled by the priest upon the horns of the brazen altar of burnt offerings in the court outside the sanctuary proper.

In "*Patriarchs*" there is a note, Number nine, in the Appendix, page 761, and I have a question concerning these notes, Brother White. By whom were they prepared, or at least were they prepared while Sister White had an opportunity to read and put her personal approval upon them, or were they the sincere efforts of those who sought to clarify obscure statements or those which might be wrested and cause a misunderstanding?

Of course, you will understand, Brother White, that in making this inquiry I am not doing so in a critical or challenging spirit whatever. The sins of the people were transferred to the sanctuary. Upon that there is universal agreement among us. But the allusion in "*Controversy*" is to the fact that day by day the repentant sinner in connection with the bringing and slaying of his sin offering, had the blood carried by the priest into the holy place, sprinkling the same before the veil. It is this particular point that has caused perplexity to many of our loyal ministers, who do not find the scriptural statement bearing out this broad declaration. Any help you may be able to give me upon this point will be greatly appreciated.

(Signed) L.E. Froom

★ ★ ★

Letter from L.E. From to D.E. Robinson, Aug. 24, 1932.

Dear Brother Robinson:

With reference to the inquiry as to blood in the Holy Place, my chief desire was to learn whether or not in some of the unpublished writings of Sister White there was further discussion of this that would be helpful. Apparently you have not discovered such.

(Signed) L.E. Froom

★ ★ ★

Letter from W.C. White to L.E. Froom, Jan. 8, 1928.

Dear Brother Froom:

Why will not our brethren study God's merciful dealings to us by imparting information to us by the Spirit of Prophecy in its beautiful, harmonious and helpful features, instead of picking and criticising and dissecting, trying to cut it up into little mechanical concrete blocks such as we buy for our children to play with and then ask somebody else to fit it together so that it will make a pattern that pleases them and leave out the particular parts of the pattern that they do not like. I pray the Lord to give us patience and guidance in doing what we can to help such ones to see the beauty of God's work.

(Signed) W.C. White

★ ★ ★

Letter from G.B. Starr to W.W. Fletcher, July 10, 1930, GC Archives.

Dear Brother Fletcher:

There is the same blending of the human and the divine in the testimonies as is seen in the Bible. Moses, Joshua, Samuel, David, Isaiah, Ezekiel, Matthew, Mark, Luke and John and Paul, are all in the writings; but is God speaking all the time, in divers manners. You do not reject the inspiration of the writings of Peter because he exhibited human weakness in the denial of Jesus, and in his dissimulation, at Antioch. Why should you deny that to Ellen G. White? Did she not grow with the work? Did the disciples understand perfectly all that Jesus told them, when He was personally present with them? Did it not take time for those truths to penetrate their darkened intellects? I heard Sr. White answer an objector once, who stated that he regarded that as her personal opinion only. "Well," she said, "suppose it was my opinion only, it doesn't happen to be however; but suppose it was? Is not my opinion of any more value than a novice? Have I not learned anything in the school of Christ during these past sixty or more years? I must be a very poor scholar, if I have not? I would not dishonour my Lord so much as to acknowledge that I had learned nothing, in all these years under His teaching. I think this is good sound sense, and those who diligently study the testimonies are in a good school to learn wisdom from Him in whom are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge."

I think I will mail you under separate cover her own statements regarding her views of the inspiration of her writings. I think they will appeal to you, and give you a position that you can take.

(Signed) G.B. Starr

★ ★ ★

Contemporary Sources Relating to the Revisions of *Spirit of Prophecy*, Volumes 1 and 4 (*Patriarchs and Prophets* and *The Great Controversy*) 1885-1887.

Page 2

"Tell me what you think about Marian's coming over. Will it not be the best chance we shall ever have to get Vol. one ready for the Press? It looks that way to me. When we

get back to U.S. we shall be pulled and hauled in every direction. Write fully about this and have mother write to Marian.”

~~~ W.C. White to M.K. White, Nov. 18, 1885 (while sailing to America for 1855 GC)

“We are all well and of good spirits. Perhaps, however, I ought to except Marian. She is much discouraged about her work. I have tried my best to get her to take a trip down to where you are, but she will not do it. Yesterday I got her to go downtown with me, and so occupied most of the afternoon. I try to talk courage all I can to her. She has finished revising the sketch [Historical Sketches?], and has been working a day or two on Volume One again. I think one reason why she gets so discouraged is because she has got hold of a batch of matter that Mother wrote when she was not feeling well, and it is unusually hard to prepare. I hope Mother will give her head an entire rest from writing, and enjoy the journey so as to be fresh and strong to write when she returns.”

~~~ M.K. White to W.C. White, May 25, 1886

“Yesterday we received your letter accompanied by a long one for Bro. A.C.B. Mary will try to fix it as she has strength. I had not the heart to give it to Marion. She is worn out with this sort of work and it is a great burden to her to take these very long manuscripts, and decide how to fix them.”

~~~ W.C. White to E.G. White, Nov. 22, 1886, WCW/A1/421

#### Page 4

“Sr. Davis came over here at Mother’s own expense to complete the preparation of the manuscript for Vol. 1, but fully half of her time has been occupied in the preparation of addresses to be read at the camp meetings, testimonies to individuals and on the manuscript of our Mission Sketch Book. This is not only very expensive to mother, but very discouraging to Sr. Davis who has a great anxiety and ambition to see this work completed.

“Up to the time our little Mabel was born, Mary has prepared Mother’s articles for the *Review*. This of course is much easier work than preparing articles for the *Signs*. But now we believe it is our duty to concentrate our efforts on the Volume 1. Mary will help Marion what she can, and mother has notified the editors of the *Review* that she will furnish them with manuscript if they will prepare it for the paper. The larger part of the sermons which mother has delivered over here have been reported and written out and we can furnish you with a good supply of them. If you have some one there who can prepare them for the paper. It is not reasonable for us to attempt to do the work here. Mother will gladly furnish this manuscript without charge if we are released from the task of preparing them for the papers.”

~~~ W.C. White to C.H. Jones, Dec. 5, 1886, WCW/a1/473, 474.

Page 5

“Sr. Davis has not been very well, and her time has been taken up with a variety of work that was rather discouraging, but now she is working on Vol. One and is making fine progress. We hope to have the mss. ready for examination by the time we get back. It will be a great improvement on *SP* Vol. One. It will count more for present truth ...

~~~ W.C. White to J.H. Waggoner, Dec. 29, 1886, WCW/A2/16, 17.



## Page 8

“When Mother returned from Italy I read to her your letter, and she seemed to think such a book would be valuable. [Jones proposed to write a book on the history of the papacy.] I offered to read the articles to her, but she had no time to hear them and did not think it was profitable for her to engage in the investigation of historical matters. Her mind now is fully occupied with the completion of her Old Testament History. The manuscripts are growing and the book is enlarging somewhat as Vol. 4 did after we had begun to set the type. Until about eight weeks ago I have thought that all of the Old Testament History could be printed in one Vol. But this will be impossible. The first vol. will carry the history to the time of Solomon, and the book will contain about twice as much reading as the old Vol. one. Chapters and parts of chapters are being added to the manuscripts on the ark, ministration of the earthly sanctuary, comparing it with the ministration of the heavenly and other matter of this sort giving the book a practical value which the first edition never had. We hope to have the manuscript completed while here; criticised by our brethren in Michigan next summer, and printed by Pacific Press in time for the holiday trade of 1887 ...

“The long document which you sent us on sanctification came all right. I thank you very much. Mother is so occupied now with Old Testament History that her work on Sanctification will rest for a few weeks, then she will endeavour to complete her pamphlet on that subject.

~~~ W.C. White to A.T. Jones, Jan. 6, 1887, WCW/A2/40, 41.

Page 14

“As regards *GC* Vol. 4. We like your suggestions as to the size of type and size of page, and shall soon be ready for you to begin to set. We will give the book a careful examination, so as to correct some trifling errors, and smoothe some rough expressions, and I think we will add some more references at the foot of pages. We are now examining it for translation, and shall be able to give you a few chapters soon ...

“Mother will bear the expense of resetting the Vol. 4. and will ask but 15 cents a copy royalty.”

~~~ W.C. White to C.H. Jones, Apr. 4, 1887, WCW/A2/176.

## Page 15

“Bro. Jones has been writing to us about resetting Vol. 4 in small pica leaded, the size page of Dan. and Rev. and we have consented. We are now reading it through with those who are to translate it into German and French and by discussing various points we think it will enable them to make a better translation. We are finding some places where corrections should be made in the English and on some points Mother wishes to add. She is now writing about Huss, which will make chapter five a little larger. She is also writing about Zwingli. If you have noted any points in the book which are not clear, or where there should be correction, or if you have in mind subjects which especially need to be enlarged upon, I wish you would suggest at once what and where they are.”

~~~ W.C. White to J.H. Waggoner, April 15, 1887

“As we criticize the work for translation, we find places where it can be improved for the new English edition.”

~~~ W.C. White to C.H. Jones, April 15, 1887, WCW/A2/185.

## Page 16

“Marian has improved in health. She is deeply buried in Volume 1. That work is nearly completed. I stopped my work on that to put additions into Volume 4. I work early and constantly until dark, then retire early and generally rise between three and four. I see so much to be done to set things in order. I talk, I pray, I write, and then must leave it all with God. Many nights I have awakened between one and two and have been so burdened that I have dressed and commenced writing.”

~~~ E.G. White to J.E. White, April 18, 1887, W-82-1887.

Pages 19-20

“Please have Elders A.T. Jones and E.J. Waggoner give careful criticism to the corrections, and to the whole matter. If they detect passages that are still obscure, or anything that is apparently contradictory, or conflicting with the Scripture, there may be time to communicate with us before any of the new edition is printed.”

~~~ W.C. White to C.H. Jones, May 18, 1887.

## Page 22

“I think that Marion is getting along nicely with her work, and we trust that the next few weeks will be profitably spent on the work.

“Elder Waggoner preached last Sabbath. He spoke to the point, and it made a deep impression. He is now examining the msse. of Vol. 4.”

~~~ W.C. White to E.G. White [who was in Scandinavia], July 11, 1887, WCW/A2/282.

Page 23

“It was immediately after Chapter 4, that the largest additions were to be made, and while we were all together, it seemed advisable to devote our attention to the corrections and additions to be made in the other parts of the Book, leaving the manuscripts for Chapters 5, 6 and 7 to be prepared by Sr. Davis after Mother had gone from Basle. The work of preparing these is now nearly completed, and will soon be sent to her in England for examination.”

~~~ W.C. White to C.H. Jones, July 21, 1887, WCW/A2/307.

“Some progress is being made in the preparation of the Vol. 4 chapters, and I shall be able to bring you several chapters when I come.”

~~~ W.C. White to E.G. White, July 21, 1887, p. 310.

Page 24

“Marion is working pretty hard, and sometimes gets rather worn, but there is lots to encourage her, and she appears to be bearing up with the work real well. Vol. 4 is most done, and Eld. Waggoner has begun to read Vol. 1.”

~~~ W.C. White to E.G. White, Aug. 1, 1887, WCW/A2/337.

## Page 25

“Marion is working industriously on the chapters, and is making some progress ... I want to go to Paris, and can hardly give it up, and as Marion is not really ready to leave, I may take time to do so.”

~~~ W.C. White to Mary K. White, Aug. 11, 1887, WCW/A2/368.

★ ★ ★

Excerpts from the document, “Exhibits Relating to the Writing of The Desire of Ages,” The E.G. White Estate, May 23, 1979.

Page 2 — from *Introductory Statement to the document by Robert W. Olson.*

At times, however, a few other key individuals were given additional leeway to make improvements in her writings. For example, Mrs. White was quite willing to have J.H. Waggoner criticize her manuscript and offer suggestions for improvement... She, in fact, expressed displeasure with Waggoner when he failed to change or improve one of her manuscripts when given an opportunity to do so.

Dr. David Paulson was also called upon for this kind of service.

Page 32

In the order of chapters we followed Andrews’ Harmony, as given in his *Life of Christ*. He is generally regarded as the very best authority, and is quoted by leading writers. We know of no better arrangement than his. (The year between the first and second Passover seems to have been a period of comparative quiet and seclusion; that between the second and third, of activity and publicity.) Those who read the MS, Professor Prescott and Sister Burnham, agreed with our arrangement. We would not like to see this chapter transposed.

“Imprisonment and Death of John.” The place of this chapter is optional, of course. But no one has heretofore objected to its present position. As to the reference to John in Chapter 28, coming after the account of his death, this is not unusual in other books. See Geikie and many others. If the chapter were transposed, it would probably be best to omit the first paragraph. But not having the MS to refer to, I cannot speak with much positiveness. — W.C. White *Letter Book* 10-A, p. 17a. (Written from Ashfield, N.S.W., Australia, to C.H. Jones in Oakland, California).

~~~ Marian Davis to C.H. Jones, Nov. 23, 1896.

## Page 33

I see that neither in Brother Jones’ letter nor in yours have I stated definitely just what I am doing on the manuscript and why. In the first place, I have worked for a better opening to the chapters. As to the success of the effort, let any canvasser who examines the pages I have sent to Brother Jones bear testimony. The chapters of the old manuscript began too often with some notice of Jesus going here or there, until the book seemed almost like a diary. That has been corrected. Then I have tried to begin both chapters and paragraphs with short sentences, and indeed to simplify wherever possible, to drop out every needless word, and to make the work, as I have said, more compact and vigorous.

~~~ Marian Davis to W.C. White, April 11, 1897.

Page 40

In the preface, would it not be well to state, in some way, that this book is not a harmony of the gospels, that it does not attempt to teach chronology. Its purpose is to present the love of God, the divine beauty of the life of Christ, not to satisfy the questioning of critics. The above may not be the best way to put it. It is intended only as a suggestion. — W.C. White *Letter Book* 10-A, pp. 166-8.

~~~ Marian Davis to Miss E.J. Burnham, June 16, 1898.

## Page 45

With reference to the first chapter, I have a more vivid recollection. I remember that Sr. Davis was greatly worried about it. She did not seem to have sufficient material to fill it out sufficiently well. It was repeatedly revised, and I think that Elder W.W. Prescott and Br. E.R. Palmer were frequently consulted as to its composition. Finally it assumed the form in which it now appears in the *Desire of Ages*.

~~~ H. Camden Lacey to D.E. Robinson, Aug. 17, 1931, New York City.

★ ★ ★

Letter from W.A. Colcord [associate editor of R & H] to L.A. Smith, July 27, 1910, G.C. Archives.

Dear Brother Smith:

Every one who has examined them carefully knows that they are examples of what may be termed loose, ambiguous, and even incorrect expressions to be found in some of the writings of Sister White. In “*Special Testimony to Ministers*,” No. 7, page 5, occurs the following:

“Noah preached one hundred and twenty years to the people before the flood, and yet there were few who appreciated this precious, probationary time. Save Noah and his family, not one was numbered with the believers and entered the ark. **Out of all the population of the earth, only eight souls received the message?**”

Do you consider this exactly correct? The thought intended to be conveyed is, of course correct; but is the statement **just as it reads** exactly correct? How does it agree with the following from “*Spirit of Prophecy*,” Vol. 1, page 70?

“**Noah and his family were not alone in fearing and obeying God ...** Methuselah, the grandfather of Noah, lived until the very year of the flood; **and there were others who believed the preaching of Noah, and aided him in building the ark,**” etc.

Neither do I think that the comment on Matt. 24:20, found on page 620 of “*Desire of Ages*,” correctly represents the thought of the text. What is said there is true, but I am confident that it is not a correct exposition of the text. We pretty well know how some of these things have found their way into her writings. Her helpers have ransacked our leading works to get hold of what they thought were the best expositions of Scripture, and woven these things remodelled into the text.

★ ★ ★

Letter from W.W. Prescott to O.A. Johnson, Dec. 9, 1910, GC Archives.

Dear Brother:

On my return from the Northern Union Conference I find your letter of Nov. 20, in which you ask whether “some of Mrs. White’s statements in *Great Controversy*, and also in some of her other writings in regard to historical facts and dates are not to be considered reliable or correct, and that in some cases her statements must be corrected by other authorities.”

I think the best reply I can make will be to call your attention to changes which were actually made under Sister White’s direction in the revision of *Great Controversy*. I will therefore ask you to compare the statements made in the old edition with the statements made in the new edition on the following pages:

Page 50, the last paragraph on the page.

Page 52, at the bottom and page 53, toward the close of the first full paragraph.

Page 261, compare the reading of the second full paragraph in the old edition with the paragraph which takes its place in the new edition. Page 272, toward the end of the first full paragraph. You doubtless know that it was not **“the great bell of the palace”** which gave the signal for the massacre.

Page 306, note the difference in the reading, beginning with the eleventh line in the new edition. Observe that in the new edition there are no italics in the quotation, and that the wording following is so changed as not to teach that the darkening of the sun must come “between these two dates.”

Page 334, in the paragraph beginning, “In the year 1840,” you will find such changes made as conform to the fact, which was discovered before the revision was made, that in the pamphlet issued by Josiah Litch in 1838 the date for the fall of the Ottoman Empire was not given. Therefore it was necessary to omit the words, “specifying not only the year but the very day on which this would take place.”

Page 383, note that in the seventh line from the top of the page the word “alone” was added after the words “Roman Church” which as you will see, entirely changes the interpretation to be given to Babylon.

Page 441, note the changes in the early part of the first full paragraph.

Page 549, in the paragraph beginning, “The theory of the immortality of the soul,” note the change made in the words credited to Martin Luther.

Page 579, in the fourteenth line from the top, in the new edition, notice that the word “downfall” is substituted for the word “abolition”.

Page 580, note that the paragraph in the old edition commencing, “Protestants little know,” is entirely dropped out and another paragraph substituted. The reason for this is found in the wrong use of the quotation in the old edition which is omitted from the new edition.

I do not think it necessary to make any comment upon this matter, but leave the facts with you for your consideration.

I am glad to know that you are having a full school, and that the work is going on prosperously.

With best wishes,

(Signed) W.W. Prescott

★ ★ ★

1919 Bible Conference, GC Archives.

TAIT: There is an idea that I believe Satan himself is trying to press in upon this people, that the founders of this message never had in their heads at all in regard to the standing of Sister White's work. I understand that some of our younger men have taught — or have been taught — that Sister White's writings are on a par with Isaiah, Jeremiah and all the rest of the Bible writers. I heard Elder Butler and other elders stand up in our camp meetings and teach so earnestly that Sister White's writings were measured by the Bible, and the Bible was brought to show whether these writings were correct. And Elder White himself never spoke of the infallibility of Sister White's writings. But I do believe they are inspired; and if you allow Sister White herself to carry things along, and not a few men with extreme and fanatical ideas, we won't get into any trouble. But I have observed that the men who carried these extreme views have many of them left the faith. Sister White's teaching is always directing us to the infallibility of the Bible, and never to herself or her writings as a standard. She is so much different from these others who have come forward. (pp. 66-67)

W.G. WIRTH: I believe thoroughly in the spirit of prophecy, but I have believed it in the way it was brought out this afternoon. I have never believed that the history of the spirit of prophecy was to be taken as inspired. I have believed that the philosophy of the books was to be accepted, but have thought that the history was merely thrown in to substantiate the principles.

It is all very well to say that here, as brethren together, but I want to know what to do with my brethren out in the field and with the young men that want to know about some of these things. Because I did not teach that the history of "*Great Controversy*" was absolutely inspired, I got into trouble with some of the brethren out there. I think that is a real question for us to get information on as teachers. I would like to ask what Professor Prescott would do in a Bible class.

W.E. HOWELL: This whole question will be brought before the conference again, probably the coming week.

W.W. PRESCOTT: Will you let me state my position with reference to the matter of dates that Brother Prentiss has brought up? In view of what we have said here, my personal position is simply this, that the whole question of history in fulfilment of prophecy is a field for study. My study of this question has led me to the position that 533 is the primary date for the beginning of the 1260 years, and that 538 is the secondary date. I do not consider myself as disbelieving the spirit of prophecy because I take that position, and I do not condemn anybody as a heretic who does not believe that. (p. 71)

★ ★ ★

Excerpt from book by Denton R. Rebok, *Believe His Prophets* (Washington, D.C., 1956)

“Inspiration and Infallibility”

A very natural question may arise at this juncture: “If the Bible and Mrs. White’s writings are inspired, should we not expect them to be free from all errors or mistakes? Are they not infallible?”

We must answer, inspiration and infallibility are not identical. Ellen G. White never claimed verbal inspiration for either her own writings or the Bible itself. Neither did she claim infallibility for herself or the Bible writers.

On infallibility she said: “In regard to infallibility, I never claimed it; God alone is infallible. His word is true, and in Him is no variableness or shadow of turning.” (E.G. White Letter 10, 1895)

At another time she wrote: “God and heaven alone are infallible.” (*Review*, July 26, 1892)

Infallibility does not belong to Ellen G. White. She never claimed it. Infallibility does not belong to any **man** — only to God. Therefore even the authors of the Scriptures are subject to possible human error and inaccuracy. The remarkable thing is that there are so very few inaccuracies in all the twenty-five million words written by Mrs. White.

If you ever find anything in Mrs. White’s writings that to you seems without doubt to be a mistake — a historical inaccuracy, a mistake in geography, arithmetic, or chronology — just remember that Mrs. White never claimed infallibility, and that her inspiration is in no wise affected by such a slip of the pen. It might ever turn out that Mrs. White herself was not responsible for the mistake at all.

It thus becomes apparent that Ellen G. White:

1. Never claimed **infallibility** either for herself or for the writers of the Scriptures. “God alone is infallible.”
2. Never claimed **verbal inspiration** either for her own writings or for the Scriptures.
3. Did claim **thought inspiration** both for her own writings and for the Scriptures.
4. Did not look upon her writings as being comparable to the “commandments of God,” but saw them as “reproofs,” “counsels,” “warnings,” “encouragements,” “messages,” “testimonies,” “cautions.”

[See pages 194-197 and compare the chapter “No Claim to Infallibility” in *The Testimony of Jesus*, by F.M. Wilcox.]

★ ★ ★

Conclusion of W.W. Prescott’s 39-page Letter of Suggested Corrections for *The Great Controversy* of 1911, to W.C. White, April 26, 1910.

Allow me to say in closing, that it has been quite a shock to me to find in this book so many loose and inaccurate statements; and what I have submitted for your consideration will indicate how much of an undertaking it will be to revise this book so that it will be in harmony with historical facts, and with the interpretation of the prophecy concerning the 1260 days which we are now adopting.

If I can be of any assistance in locating any of the quotations, I will be willing to do what I can in this matter.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) W.W. Prescott

★ ★ ★

Excerpt from “A Reply to Dr. Weiss,” by F.E.J. Harder, *Spectrum*, 7(3), 1975 p. 54ff.

Weiss’s emphasis on human faculties involved in the communication of revelation suggests the need for fuller recognition of the important human elements in the process of receiving and recording revelatory disclosures. Caution is due in the tendency to take an all-or-nothing, black-or-white attitude toward any claim to divine guidance. Ellen White recognized the limitations on revelation inherent in the recipient’s imperfect understanding, in his lack of skill in expression, in his circumscribed experience, and in the limitations of human language and concepts. This surely implies a grey area in all revelatory experiences and in any records of them. “The Bible, perfect as it is in its simplicity, does not answer to the great ideas of God; for infinite ideas cannot be perfectly embodied in finite vehicles of thought.” It is likely that many of the problems which arise in regard to the use of Scripture or any other revelatory literature are attributable to our failure to recognize this principle.

Ongoing dialogue about the doctrine of revelation is an imperative for our church at this time. Likewise, an intensified and broadened study of Scripture is an absolute necessity in these days when research in all areas of knowledge is adding so enormously to humanity’s fund of information.

Traditionally, Seventh-day Adventists have tended toward the rather rigid position of John Calvin. Although official publications deny acceptance of the dogma of verbal inspiration, frequently there is a lack of understanding as to the full implication of this denial and a failure to replace it with a more consistent, realistic position. We cannot with impunity continue to ignore the problems involved. There needs to be a frank recognition of issues accompanied by courageous effort toward their solution.

★ ★ ★

Excerpt from “What Should We Expect From a Prophet?” by Fritz Guy, *Spectrum*, 8(2), Jan. 1977, p. 26

In the case of the “evangelicals” and the biblical documents, the discrepancies between the ideal and the actual have led to the invention of hypothetical “inerrant autographs,” which are supposed to have the required perfection that appears to be lacking in the extant biblical manuscripts. Adventists, however, need not resort to this kind of hypothesis. As Wood explains,

“Seventh-day Adventists do not draw up and seek to defend artificial battle lines in the area of inspiration. They do not make exaggerated claims for inspiration. They do not declare that inspired writings are “inerrant in the original autographs.” They know better. They have “original autographs”! They have Mrs. White’s original manuscripts, and they know that those autographs, though bearing infallible truth regarding the way of salvation, give evidence of having been produced by a fallible human being.

Thus, although occasional imperfections may appear in the life and ministry of the prophet and even in the verbal formulation of the prophetic messages, confidence in the overall validity and reliability of those messages is not thereby disturbed.

★ ★ ★

Letter from W.C. White to L.A. Beach, Feb. 21, 1909.

Dear Brother:

The most complete answer to your question that I am acquainted with is found in *Testimonies to the Church*, No. 31, pp. 58-79; in the bound volumes, Vol. 5, pp. 62-84. From the reading of this I think you will discern that Mother regards the Bible as the standard of authority in all things, including the position and work of the Spirit of Prophecy. You will also find that she teaches that the *Testimonies* are given us as a help to the understanding of the Scriptures.

(Signed) W.C. White

★ ★ ★

From “In the Shadow of the Daily: Background and Aftermath of the 1919 Bible and History Teachers Conference,” by Bert Haloviak. A paper presented at the meeting of SDA Biblical scholars in New York City, Nov. 14, 1979.

Although W.C. White recognized the fallibility of Mrs. White, even to the extent of her fallibility “in stating things revealed to her,” he seemed to studiously avoid stating that a specific published spirit of prophecy statement was in error. He no doubt feared that some might conclude that the statement in question was thus not to be taken as inspired. Concerning the conflicting statements published between 1864 and 1874 dealing with the question of whether God or Eve mentioned death as the consequence of merely touching the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, White stated:

It is reasonable to suppose that the statement found in the later writings gives the most correct expression to the views opened up to Sister White in vision. In her earliest writings there are found a few statements which indicate that the vision was imperfectly understood, or imperfectly described.

Regarding the revision in *Patriarchs and Prophets* as to whether there were nine or seven generations living contemporaneously for hundreds of years, he noted:

At one time mother’s attention was called to the fact that there were nine generations contemporaneous, and many of the nine generations contemporaneous for hundreds of years, but not every one of the nine generations contemporaneous for so long a time. Then she instructed us to change the statement to seven. What circumstance led to the less accurate statement in the early editions of the book, was never made known to me.

★ ★ ★

Excerpt from “An Appeal for the Use of the Telescope,” by W.C. White, May 24, 1932.

Again he asserted that that was what the letter called for and I replied that I would like to see the letter, and that if there was in it that which he had asserted, that I would ask the privilege of sending it to Sister White and ask her if there had been some error in copying. He asserted

that that would never do, that if there should be any change made in the message it would destroy all his confidence in the *Testimonies*. I said “that that need not be, — that Sister White was not infallible in stating things revealed to her, or there might have been error on the part of the copyist.”

★ ★ ★

From Question Number 8 of “The House Questions Answered,” by W.C. White, May 1932.

Dear Brother House:

In your letter of March 6, 1932, Question Number 8 reads as follows:

Which is right? “*Facts of Faith*,” page 35 of part 1, or “*Life of Christ*,” Section two, “Redemption or the Temptation of Christ in the Wilderness,” page 11:

Facts printed 1864 on page 35 says: “Of this tree the Lord commanded our first parents not to eat, neither to touch it, lest they die.”

Redemption printed in 1874 on page 11 says: “Eve had overstated the words of God’s command ... In Eve’s controversy with the serpent, she ADDED (neither shall ye touch it.)

Spirit of Prophecy, Volume 1, page 27 agree with which one? When was it printed? Which is right? Is this a contradiction in two inspired messages? Or is it a case where Sister White was mistaken in the first place and later got real true light on the question?

Was “*Spirit of Prophecy*” Volume 1 printed after “*Redemption*” contained the light on this question? If so, why was this not corrected in harmony with the light?

It is reasonable to suppose that the statement found in the later writings gives the most correct expression to the views opened up to Sister White in vision.

In her earliest writings there are found a few statements which indicate that the vision was imperfectly understood, or imperfectly described.

★ ★ ★

Letter from W.C. White to L.E. Froom, May 1, 1931.

Dear Brother Froom:

Can I favour a moment on the part of the leaders of our denomination which would force our young preachers carrying the message into territory where the people do not understand the value of the messages brought us through the spirit of prophecy, to present and stand by a position which they cannot prove outside of a statement made in “*Early Writings*” regarding the position ...

(Signed) W.C. White

★ ★ ★

Letter from R.A. Underwood to L.E. Froom, Nov. 26, 1930, GC Archives.

Dear Brother:

Your line of Nov. 16 at hand. If I get the idea of what you would like for **personal study** is how the various doctrines which the Seventh-day Adventists hold as fundamental truths were received? Did they come to us through the *Testimonies*, especially those not accepted by other denominations? Years ago I gave this subject some study and have tried at different times to correct some statements made by some of our ministers who want to give Sister White credit for being the one that has brought all the advance light we have as a denomination. A few citations from the *Testimonies* ought to settle that question. In Vol. 2, p. 605, she says: "The written Testimonies are **not to give new light**, but to impress vividly upon the heart the truths of inspiration **already revealed**." See also Vol. 5, p. 665; Vol. 3:327; "*Great Controversy*," Introduction, also by Mrs. E.G.W., p. 5-12; Vol. 5:663.

Many of the doctrines which we hold as important we received from the **various** churches, such as the Methodist, Baptists, etc., etc., such as conversion, baptism, etc., etc. Sister White endorsed all these. The doctrines of the second advent we **inherited** from the First Day Adventists, and quite largely our views of prophecy, although Elder U. Smith when he wrote "*Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation*" wrote the **best treatise** on the prophecies ever written up to that date. I do not claim perfection for Smith. The facts are we have **grown into the truth as we hold it today**.

Take the important doctrines that distinguish us from other professed Christians. First, the Sabbath, we received from the Seventh Day Baptist by the name of Rachel Preston. She brought it to a company of Adventists at Washington, N.H. See "*Rise and Progress*," p. 109. Light on the sanctuary first came by Hiram Edson and O.R.L. Crosier. See "*Second Advent Movement*," by J.N. Loughborough, p. 193.

Light on the immortality question, state of the dead, etc., by Geo. Storrs, in six sermons he published in a pamphlet on that subject. See "*Great Second Advent Movement*," p. 179. Light on our plan of the support of the ministry was **not** given by Sister White. Sister White endorsed a plan called "Systematic Benevolence."

★ ★ ★

Excerpt from "Denominational Finance" by R.A. Underwood, *Review* 96(18), May 1, 1919, p. 10.

The Tithing System

A few of the leading men of the General Conference began to see light in the tithing system of the Old and New Testaments. This was discussed at the General Conference at different times, yet no decided action was taken. The argument presented against the tithing system was that Sister White had indorsed the plan of systematic benevolence, as the quotations I have already given show; therefore we should make no change. However, some felt that the tithing system for the support of the gospel ministry could be clearly sustained from both the Old and New Testaments, and that the source from which we were to gather our instruction for the guidance of the church was primarily the Bible and not the *Testimonies*. From the *Testimonies* themselves, in Volume 11, page 605, the following instruction was obtained:

The written Testimonies are not to give new light, but to impress vividly upon the heart the truths of inspiration **already** revealed. Man's duty to God and to his fellow man has

been distinctly specified in God's Word; yet but few of you are obedient to the light given.

Other statements of a similar character were used to show that we should search the Scriptures most diligently to find the Bible plan for the support of the cause. While some of us felt that the tithing system for the support of the gospel ministry could clearly be sustained from both the Old and New Testaments, others favoured adhering to the plan of "systematic benevolence;" therefore no action was taken by the General Conference further than to discuss the matter for two or three years after it was introduced into the General Conference for consideration.



Excerpts from "Ellen G. White and the Law in Galatians: A Study in the Dynamics of Present Truth," by Timothy E. Crosby, Fall, 1979.

[In 1888] there had been rumours that Ellen White was under the influence of Waggoner, that she had "changed," that her words could not be wholly trusted as inspired. To this she replied:

Well, one says, "Your prayers and your talk run in the channel with Dr. Waggoner." I want to tell you, my brethren, that I have not taken any position; I have had no talk with the doctor nor with anyone on this subject, and am not prepared to take a position yet. By their fruits ye shall know them ...

God did not raise me up to come across the plains to speak to you and you sit here to question His message and question whether Sister White is the same as she used to be in years gone by. I have in many things gone way back and given you that which was given me in years past, because then you acknowledged that Sister White was right. But somehow it has changed now, and Sister White is different. Just like the Jewish nation.

Now, we did not intimate one word that we did not want that subject taken up. We did want an investigation, but I cannot take my position on either side until I have studied the question ...

Now, the words that were spoken here were that Elder Waggoner was running this meeting. Has he not presented to you the words of the Bible? **Why was it that I lost the manuscript and for two years could not find it? God has a purpose in this. He wants us to go to the Bible and get the Scripture evidence.** (p. 16)

Dr. Waggoner has spoken to us in a straightforward manner. There is precious light in what he has said. Some things presented in reference to the law in Galatians, if I fully understand his position, do not harmonize with the understanding I have had of this subject; but truth will lose nothing by investigation ... Some interpretations of scripture given by Dr. Waggoner I do not regard as correct. (pp. 17-18)

I have not changed my views in reference to the law in Galatians, but I hope that I shall never be left to entertain the spirit that was brought into the General Conference. I have not the least hesitancy in saying it was not the spirit of God. If every idea we have entertained in doctrine is truth, will not the truth bear to be investigated? Will it totter and fall if criticized? If so, let it fall, the sooner the better. The spirit that would close

the door to investigation of points of truth in a Christlike manner is not the Spirit from above ...

A.T. Jones and Dr. Waggoner held views upon some doctrinal points which all admit are not vital questions, different from those which some of the leading ones of our people have held. But it is a vital question whether we are Christians, whether we have a Christian spirit, and are true, open, and frank with one another... (p. 19)

Ellen G. White wrote to her son, Willie C. White:

Since I made the statement last Sabbath that the view of the covenants as it had been taught by Brother Waggoner was truth, it seems that great relief has come to many minds. (p. 24)

... One of the “new views” that Smith could not accept was Waggoner’s position on the covenants. The commonly accepted position among Adventists on the covenants, as stated in articles by D.T. Bourdeau, N.J. Bowers, and Uriah Smith in the 1880’s, was that the ceremonial law was part of the old covenant and the ten commandments were part of the new. Waggoner, however, had revived his father’s heterodox position on the covenants, not only at Minneapolis, but also in the Sabbath School lessons for the first quarter of 1890 which Waggoner wrote, which dealt with the covenant in the book of Hebrews. (pp. 21-22)

All doubt about the extent of Mrs. White’s endorsement of Waggoner’s position on the covenants was laid to rest in 1890 when she placed her stamp of approval on Waggoner’s covenant theology in *Patriarchs and Prophets* (PP), an expansion of volume one of the four-volume *Spirit of Prophecy* series (ISP).

On pages 370-73 of PP is a section on the two covenants, having no parallel in ISP, in which Ellen White presents what is essentially Waggoner’s view of the covenants and their relation to righteousness by faith. (p. 28)

So far Ellen White had repeatedly maintained that she had not changed her mind about the law in Galatians, and she had never explicitly endorsed Waggoner’s position on that point, although she was clearly leaning in that direction. But in February, 1897, she took the final step:

By failing to cherish the spirit of Christ, by taking wrong positions in the controversy over the law in Galatians — a question that many have not fully understood before taking a wrong position — the church has sustained a sad loss.

For five years there is no mention of the issue in Ellen White’s articles or private correspondence. During this time Uriah Smith made public confession of his opposition to Ellen White and promised to uphold her in the future. She stated that her confidence in him had been restored. In 1896 she wrote a letter to Smith in which she clarifies her position on the law in Galatians:

The law was our school master to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith (Gal. 3:24). In this scripture, the Holy Spirit through the apostle is speaking especially of the moral law. The law reveals sin to us, and causes us to feel our need of Christ and to flee unto Him for pardon and peace by exercising repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ.

An unwillingness to yield up preconceived opinions, and to accept this truth, lay at the foundation of a large share of the opposition manifested at Minneapolis against the Lord's message through Brethren Waggoner and Jones. (pp. 30-31)

Footnote #2. Ellen White: "For sixty years I have been in communication with heavenly messengers, and I have been constantly learning in reference to divine things" (*IT*, 86, 1906). One example of this learning process is found in certain statements about God's love in Ellen White's private letters to her children, written in 1858 and 1860: "God loves honest-hearted, truthful children, but cannot love those who are dishonest." "The Lord loves those little children who try to do right, and He has promised that they shall be in His kingdom. But wicked children God does not love ... When you feel tempted to speak impatient and fretful, remember the Lord sees you, and will not love you if you do wrong" (*An Appeal to the Youth* [Battle Creek, 1864], pp. 42, 62). Over thirty years later she wrote: "Do not teach your children that God does not love them when they do wrong; teach them that He loves them so that it grieves His tender Spirit to see them in transgression." (*ST*, Feb. 15, 1892). (p. 36)

In 1850 Ellen White placed the event described in Rev. 1:7 ("Every eye shall see Him, and they also which pierced Him") **after** the millennium, whereas she later placed it prior to the millennium. (p. 37)

During the Minneapolis conference there was attempt to pass a resolution to prevent teachers in Adventist colleges from teaching anything new unless it had been approved by the General Conference committee. The motion was defeated only because Ellen White was present and opposed it strongly. In one of her morning talks she made a comment on this attempted legislation that sheds light in her change of position in regards to Waggoner's theology:

Instructors in our schools should never be bound about by being told that they are to teach only what has been taught hitherto. Away with these restrictions. There is a God to give the message His people shall speak. Let not any minister feel under bonds or be gauged by men's measurement. The gospel must be fulfilled in accordance with the messages God sends. **That which God gives His servants to speak today would not perhaps have been present truth twenty years ago, but it is God's message for this time.** (p. 45)



Documents relating to the Writing of the Historical Chapters of *The Great Controversy*, prepared by Robert W. Olson, Sept. 13, 1978.

When writing out the chapters for *Great Controversy*, she sometimes gave a partial description of an important historical event, and when her copyist who was preparing the manuscripts for the printer, made inquiry regarding time and place, Mother would say that those things are recorded by conscientious historians. Let the dates used by those historians be inserted. At other times in writing out what had been presented to her, Mother found such perfect descriptions of events and presentations of facts and of doctrines written out in our denominational books, that she copied the words of these authorities.

When *Controversy* was written, Mother never thought that the readers would take it as authority on historical dates or use it to settle controversy regarding details of history, and she does not now feel that it should be used in that way. Mother regards with great respect the work of those faithful historians who devoted years of time to the study of God's great plan as presented in the prophecy, and the outworking of that plan as

recorded in history — W.C. White letter to W.W. Eastman, Nov. 4, 1912. (*The E.G.W. Writings*, pp. 33, 34.) (p. 13)

Regarding Mother's writings, I have overwhelming evidence and conviction that they are the description and delineation of what God has revealed to her in vision, and where she has followed the description of historians or the exposition of Adventist writers, I believe that God has given her discernment to use that which is correct and in harmony with truth regarding all matters essential to salvation. If it should be found by faithful study that she has followed some expositions of prophecy which in some detail regarding dates we cannot harmonize with our understanding of secular history, it does not influence my confidence in her writings as a whole any more than my confidence in the Bible is influenced by the fact that I cannot harmonize many of the statements regarding chronology. — W.C. White to W.W. Eastman, Nov. 4, 1912, Document File 52b. (p. 14)

★ ★ ★

APPENDIX THIRTY-THREE

The Major Sources Of The Great Controversy Sanctuary Chapters

The Major Sources Of The Great Controversy Sanctuary Chapters

| <p style="text-align: center;"><i>The Sanctuary and Its Cleansing</i>
Uriah Smith, 1877</p> | <p style="text-align: center;"><i>The Great Controversy</i>
Ellen White, 1888</p> |
|--|---|
| <p>“... a particular description of <i>the tabernacle</i>, as erected by <i>Moses</i>, is minutely set forth in Exodus, chapters 25-31. <i>It was a structure of extraordinary magnificence</i>; and was erected after the following plan: <i>Its walls on the north, west and south sides were formed of upright boards, set in sockets of silver.</i>” p. 113.</p> | <p>“... The sanctuary to which Paul here refers was <i>the tabernacle built by Moses ... it was a structure of great magnificence. Its walls consisted of upright boards, heavily plated with gold, and set in sockets of silver ...</i>” pp. 411-12.</p> |
| <p>“<i>In the holy place</i> were three objects worthy of notice: a candlestick, a table of show bread, and an altar of incense ... The position of the <i>candlestick</i> was <i>on the south side of the holy place ... On the north side ... stood the table of show bread ...</i>” pp. 123-4.</p> | <p>“<i>In the holy place</i> was the <i>candlestick on the south ... on the north stood the table of show bread ...</i>” p. 412.</p> |
| <p>“<i>In the most holy place... (was) the ark.</i> This was a coffer or <i>chest of precious wood overlaid within and without with the purest gold ...</i> In this ark were sacredly deposited <i>the two tables of stone</i> containing God’s <i>ten commandments ... the mercy seat ... was a magnificent and costly piece of workmanship.</i> It was beaten out of one solid piece of gold of the same length and width as the ark, and <i>two cherubims</i> were made, <i>one standing on each end</i>, beaten out of the same piece of gold.” pp. 125-6.</p> | <p>“<i>In the most holy place stood the ark, a chest of precious wood overlaid with gold,</i> the depository of <i>the two tables of stone</i> upon which God had inscribed the law of the <i>ten commandments.</i> Above the ark, and forming the cover of the sacred chest, was <i>the mercy-seat, a magnificent piece of workmanship,</i> surmounted by <i>two cherubim, one at each end</i>, and all wrought of solid gold ...” p. 412.</p> |
| <p>“... These <i>cherubim</i> were made <i>looking reverently down upon the upon the mercy-seat...</i>” p. 126.</p> | <p>“... The <i>cherubim</i> of the earthly sanctuary, <i>looking reverently down upon the mercy-seat...</i>” p. 415.</p> |
| <p>“... There were its <i>walls, having all the appearance of massive and solid gold, and reflecting in a thousand directions the light of the seven lamps of the golden candlesticks</i>; there were <i>the table of show bread and the altar of incense, glittering in its light like burnished gold</i>; and there was the <i>curtain that formed the gorgeous ceiling, with its mystic figures of cherubim in blue, and purple and scarlet, adding its beauty to the brilliant scene.</i>” pp. 127-8</p> | <p>“... The <i>walls had the appearance of massive gold, reflecting in every direction the light of the seven lamps of the golden candlestick. The table of show bread and the altar of incense glittered like burnished gold. The gorgeous curtain which formed the ceiling, inwrought with figures of angels in blue and purple and scarlet, added to the beauty of the scene.</i>” p. 414</p> |
| <p>“... While in, <i>beyond the shekinah, or visible manifestation of God’s glory</i>, into the awful presence of <i>which none except the high priest’s</i> entrance once every year, no man could venture <i>and live.</i>” pp. 127-8</p> | <p>“... And <i>beyond the second veil was the holy shekinah, the visible manifestation of God’s glory, before which none but the high priest could enter and live.</i>” p. 414</p> |

| <i>The Sanctuary and Its Cleansing</i>
Uriah Smith, 1877 | <i>The Great Controversy</i>
Ellen White, 1888 |
|--|---|
| “... <i>Beginning</i> according to the natural order, with the earliest <i>generations</i> , the work of examination passes on down through all the records of time, and closes with the living.” p. 261 | “ <i>Beginning</i> with those who first lived upon the earth, our Advocate presents the cases of each successive <i>generation</i> , and closes with the living.” p. 483 |
| “For nearly thirty-three years already <i>this</i> solemn work has been in progress. How much longer can it continue? Nearly thirty-three years of this decisive work of investigative <i>Judgment</i> ...” p. 261 | “... <i>The judgment</i> is now passing in the sanctuary above. For many years <i>this</i> work has been in progress. Soon — none know how soon — it will pass to the cases of the living.” p. 490 |
| “... as each individual case is taken up and passed on, <i>his probation</i> will end and his <i>destiny</i> be fixed. This is the scene our Lord brings to view just before his coming ... „He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still; and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still; and he that is holy, let him be holy still.” p. 295 | “... In the awful presence of God our lives are to come up in review... the work of the investigative judgment closes, the <i>destiny</i> of all will have been decided for life or death. <i>Probation</i> is ended a short time before the appearing of the Lord ... “He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he that is filthy, let him be filthy still; and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still; and he that is holy, let him be holy still”...” p. 490 |
| “... the declaration of <i>Dan. 8:14</i> : „Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed”; has its application in this dispensation, and hence refers to the sanctuary in heaven ...” pp. 197-8 | “... the prophecy of <i>Daniel 8:14</i> is fulfilled in this dispensation ... Thus the prophecy, „Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed,” unquestionably points to the sanctuary in heaven.” p. 417 |
| “... and Paul testifies that such a <i>cleansing</i> does pertain to both the earthly and the heavenly building. He says, <i>Heb. 9:23</i> , „It was therefore necessary that the pattern of things in the Heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these ... because there is no remission or forgiveness of sin without the shedding of blood ... the true sanctuary in Heaven, should be cleansed with better sacrifices than these (,even with the precious blood of Christ.”) ... Paul affirms in the clearest manner that the sanctuary in heaven must be cleansed ... for Paul says that <i>the priests who</i> here ministered served „unto the example and shadow of heavenly things.” <i>Heb. 8:5</i> ” pp. 201-2 | “... In <i>Hebrews 9</i> the <i>cleansing</i> of both the earthly and the heavenly sanctuary is plainly taught ... It was therefore necessary that the pattern of things in the heavens should be purified with these (the blood of animals); but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these, even „the precious blood of Christ.”... The real service must be accomplished with blood; in the former, with the blood of animals; in the latter, with the blood of Christ. Paul states, as the reason why this cleansing just be performed with blood, that without shedding of blood is no remission. <i>The priests who</i> officiated on earth, served, unto the example and shadow of heavenly things.” <i>Heb. 8:5</i> ” pp. 417-8 |
| “... <i>The ministration of the earthly sanctuary</i> was accomplished by the Levitical order of <i>priesthood</i> , and consisted of two great divisions: first, the <i>daily ministration in the first apartment</i> , or <i>holy place</i> ...” p. 202. | “ <i>The ministration of the earthly sanctuary</i> consisted of two divisions: the <i>priests ministered daily in the holy place</i> ...” p. 418 |

| <i>The Sanctuary and Its Cleansing</i>
Uriah Smith, 1877 | <i>The Great Controversy</i>
Ellen White, 1888 |
|--|---|
| “... This victim he <i>brought</i> to the priest to <i>the door of the tabernacle</i> . He then laid <i>his hand upon the head of the victim</i> , and <i>confessed over him his sin</i> , through which act his <i>sin</i> was considered as <i>transferred</i> to the victim and then through its blood <i>to the sanctuary itself</i> ...” p. 204 | “... the repentant sinner <i>brought</i> his offering to <i>the door of the tabernacle</i> , and placing <i>his hand upon the victim’s head</i> , <i>confessed his sins</i> , thus in figure <i>transferring</i> them from himself to the innocent sacrifice... Such was the work that went on day by day, throughout the year. The <i>sins</i> of Israel were thus <i>transferred to the sanctuary</i> ...” p. 418 |
| “... This work was performed only once a year... This work itself was called <i>the cleansing of the sanctuary</i> , or the atonement; and the upon which it was performed was called <i>the day of atonement</i> .. .” p. 205 | “... <i>Once a year, on the great day of atonement</i> , the priest entered the most holy place for <i>the cleansing of the sanctuary</i> ...” p. 419. |
| “... When this was accomplished, a <i>complete round of service</i> in the sanctuary had been completed ...” p. 206 | “... The work there performed <i>completed</i> the yearly <i>round of ministration</i> ...” p. 419 |
| “He was then to take of the congregation of the children of Israel <i>two kids of the goats</i> , and present them before the Lord <i>at the door of the tabernacle</i> of the congregation. V. 5. One of these goats was to be slain, and his blood ministered in the most holy place, <i>the other</i> was to be <i>the scapegoat</i> . But which of these it should be was not left to Aaron to decide; the Lord determined that by the <i>lot</i> which Aaron was to <i>cast</i> for this purpose. v.8. This being decided, he was to slay <i>the goat upon which the lot fell for the Lord, for a sin-offering for the people</i> , and bear <i>his blood within the veil; and sprinkle it with his finger upon the mercy-seat eastward, and before the mercy-seat eastward, and before the mercy-seat</i> ...” pp. 207-8 | “... On the day of atonement, <i>two kids of the goats</i> were brought to <i>the door of the tabernacle</i> , and <i>lots were cast</i> upon them. „One lot for the Lord, <i>and the other for the scapegoat</i> ., (Lev. 16:8, 21, 22) <i>The goat upon which fell the lot for the Lord was to be slain as a sin-offering for the people</i> . And the priest was to bring <i>his blood within the veil, and sprinkle it upon the mercy-seat, and before the mercy-seat</i> ...” p. 419 |
| “... This goat was separated from the people. He <i>came no more into the camp</i> ...” p. 209 | “... The scapegoat <i>came no more</i> into the camp ...” p. 419 |
| “... <i>The man who led away the goat</i> was obliged to wash both <i>himself and his clothes with water before returning into the camp</i> ...” p. 210 | “... <i>the man who led him away</i> was required to wash <i>himself and his clothing with water before returning to the camp</i> ...” p. 419 |
| “... <i>The whole service</i> was calculated to <i>impress the Israelites with the holiness of God and his abhorrence of sin, and to show them that they could have no contact with it without becoming greatly defiled</i>” p. 210 | “... <i>The whole ceremony</i> was designed to <i>impress the Israelites with the holiness of God and His abhorrence of sin; and, further, to show them that they could not come in contact with sin without becoming polluted</i> ...” p. 419 |

| <i>The Sanctuary and Its Cleansing</i>
Uriah Smith, 1877 | <i>The Great Controversy</i>
Ellen White, 1888 |
|---|--|
| “... For every man was to afflict his soul while the work of atonement was going forward...” p. 210 | “... Every man was required to afflict his soul while this work of atonement was going forward...” p. 419 |
| “... The pouring out of the blood of that victim was not to cancel the sin but to provide a means of its transfer to still some other object or party. Through the blood of the victim, the sin was transferred to the sanctuary ...” p. 211 | “... the sin was not cancelled by the blood of the victim. A means was thus provided by which it was transferred to the sanctuary ...” p. 420 |
| “... On the day of atonement, the priest, taking an offering from the people, appeared with the blood of this general offering for the people, and sprinkled it upon the mercy-seat directly over the law, to make full satisfaction for its claims ...” p. 212 | “... On the day of atonement the high priest having taken an offering from the congregation, went into the most holy place with the blood of this offering, and sprinkled it upon the mercy-seat, directly over the law, to make satisfaction for its claims ...” p. 420 |
| “... Placing his hands upon the head of the scapegoat, he confessed over him all these sins, thus transferring them from himself to the goat. The goat then bore them away ...” p. 212 | “... Placing his hands upon the head of the scapegoat, he confessed over them all these sins, thus in figure transferring them from himself to the goat. The goat then bore them away ...” p. 420 |
| “... The work of the priest in the earthly tabernacle meets its antitype in the ministry of our Lord in the sanctuary above ... he has ascended to Heaven, there to minister for us ...” p. 215 | “... And what was done in type in the ministration of the earthly sanctuary, is done in reality in the ministrations of the heavenly sanctuary. After His ascension our Saviour began His work as our High Priest...” p. 420 |
| “... The ministration in the most holy place is the cleansing of the sanctuary ... the cleansing of the sanctuary commenced when Christ ascended to Heaven, and he has been doing no other work for these 1800 years past...” p. 216 | “... The ministration of the priest throughout the years in the first apartment of the sanctuary ... represents the work of ministration upon which Christ entered at His ascension ... For eighteen centuries this work of ministration continued in the first apartment of the sanctuary ...” p. 420-421 |

For other sources, compare U. Smith’s *The Visions of Mrs. E.G. White* (Battle Creek), (1868), pp. 23-25, with *The Great Controversy*, pp. 428-431. And, J.N. Andrews’ *The Three Angels Messages of Rev. 14:6-12* (Battle Creek, 1892), pp. 15-16 with *The Great Controversy*, p. 356.

APPENDIX THIRTY-FOUR

Ellen G. White And Exegesis

Ellen G. White And Exegesis

Article by Joseph J. Battistone, “Ellen White’s Authority as Bible Commentator,” *Spectrum* 8(2), Jan. 1977, pp. 37-39.

Two of the most vexing questions concerning Ellen White’s writings concern her interpretation and use of Scripture and our interpretation and the use of her writings. The two questions are related. For example, there is Ellen White’s interpretation of the story of Jesus’ transfiguration (Mat. 17:1-8). The glorious appearance of Moses and Elijah with Christ on the mount is understood as a miniature representation of the second coming of Christ. Moses typifies the saints who will be resurrected at that time; Elijah represents those who will be translated. The credibility of this interpretation is enhanced when we consider the preceding passage (Matt. 16:21-28). At its end is the problematic text, “Truly, I say to you, there are some standing here who will not taste death before they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom” (Matt. 16:28 RSV). By interpreting the transfiguration as a symbolic portrayal of the second advent of Christ, Ellen White resolves the difficulty.

Nevertheless, there are commentators who interpret the figures in the transfiguration scene directly. For them, Moses represents the law, and Elijah the prophets. Instead of the second coming of Christ they see in the transfiguration the atoning work of Jesus. Support for this interpretation can be found in the New Testament.

Some persons in the church view these two interpretations as complementary rather than contradictory. Others, however, find difficulty in accepting an interpretation of Scripture that differs from one advanced by Ellen White. This difficulty arises, to some extent, from the fact that Ellen White’s writings are viewed by Seventh-day Adventists as an inspired — and hence authoritative — commentary on the Bible. But the problem may also develop from a failure to understand in a precise way the purpose of Ellen White’s writings. And if we do misunderstand the nature of her commentary, we will inevitably misinterpret and misuse her work.

It is important to distinguish between belief in the inspiration of Ellen White, and the theory of how inspiration functions. I may believe her writings are inspired and, at the same time, fail to understand and use them correctly. This is why faith cannot be a substitute for skills in thinking and reading.

We need also to clarify the functional difference between contemporary biblical commentaries and the writings of Ellen White. Commentators today often use tools and techniques in their Bible study that Ellen White did not use. Moreover, their approach to Bible study involves techniques that fall outside the scope of Ellen White’s concern. Questions relating to the study of ancient manuscripts, the linguistic and literary character of words in the Bible, the authorship, date and place of a particular writing, or the various literary forms of the material in the Gospels — these are raised from a perspective much different from that of Ellen White’s.

To be sure, the truth of the Bible — the knowledge of God’s saving grace through faith in Jesus Christ — is not dependent upon our ability to answer such questions. Still, the knowledge gained through such inquiry will enhance and render more precise our understanding of saving truth. So, we cannot dismiss the word of biblical scholars as unimportant for a practical approach to Bible study. While biblical scholarship is not

necessary to grasp a knowledge of God's saving power in Jesus Christ, it is indispensable for understanding the historical process by which God's revelation has come to us.

If Ellen White's approach to the Bible, then, is different from that of contemporary scholarship, how are we to understand her contribution to the church? I believe that Ellen White's genius — that is, her divine inspiration — is revealed in her understanding and presentation of the great controversy between Christ and Satan. Here lies the uniqueness of her work. She takes a profound and abstract theological problem — the problem of evil — and discloses in a sublime way its practical significance for each individual. Consequently, her writings assume a sense of urgency akin to that of the Scriptures. Indeed, her keen sensitivity to sin and her profound awareness of the forces of evil operative in the world, have given her ministry prophetic significance for the church. Her works enjoy a unique status in the church, second in importance only to that of the Scriptures.

Without question, the theme of the great controversy is the most important in her writings. It constitutes the basic perspective from which she interprets the Bible.

As a case in point, consider her commentary on the prophet Elijah. Ellen White devotes more space to his life and ministry than to that of any other prophet. Upon reading what she says, two points of emphasis emerge which explain her keen interest in Elijah. First, she refers repeatedly to his character — his unflinching loyalty, dauntless courage and admirable faith. Second, she refers, by way of contrast, to the striking condition of the society of Elijah's time — its alarming apostasy, gross immorality and rampant lawlessness.

The contrast between the character of the prophet and the society of his time are important to Ellen White because of their typological significance in the scheme of the great controversy. This becomes clear in Chapter 14 of *Prophets and Kings*. The entire chapter is a homily on the poverty of spiritual leadership in the modern world, the widespread infidelity and apostasy, and the alarming indifference to the Decalogue resulting from the impoverished leadership. Such abysmal apathy, she argues, is the reason for violence and crime in the world.

One of her major concerns in this chapter is the seventh-day Sabbath. Modern-day Baalism — the counterpart or antitype of Israelite apostasy — comes to surface in the "well-nigh universal disregard of the Sabbath commandment." While men and women pursue riches, fame and pleasure, she notes, they neglect Bible study, reject God's law, despise His love and ignore His messages. But God has a faithful remnant who will not bend their knee in false worship.

In the chapters on Elijah's ministry, references and allusions to the great controversy abound in the form of brief homilies, object lessons and general counsel. According to Ellen White, Elijah typifies the saints living at the time of Christ's return. The crisis Israel faced on Mount Carmel represents the great test awaiting the church in the last days. Baal worship in ancient Israel corresponds to apostate Protestantism today. Thus, the message to be proclaimed by the remnant church — the "Elijah message" — is essentially a message of judgment.

One further observation is important. In her study of the Old Testament prophets, including Elijah, Ellen White focuses more attention on their actions than on their words. She is more interested in relating the practical results of the prophetic preaching than in explaining the theological significance of the actual messages. Consequently, **her writings tend to be more homiletical than exegetical**. This becomes more apparent in the frequent parallels she draws between the time of the prophets and the period of the church today. These parallels enable

her to draw lessons from the biblical material which relate to the theme of the great controversy.

This points to a fundamental feature of her writings — an interest in the practical nature and value of Bible study. To her way of thinking, Bible study is more than a matter of learning facts or concepts. It is an exercise that generates from an attitude of prayer, faith and humility, culminating in the spiritual edification or enrichment of the student. In other words, there is an inseparable relation between Bible study and character development. The study of the Bible, Ellen White believes, will eventually lead to a dynamic change in the thinking and behaviour of the student.

The tendency of Ellen White to draw attention to the controversy between Christ and Satan, particularly as it relates to the individual, clearly demonstrates her own understanding of the practical significance of Bible study. At the same time, it offers insights into the uniqueness of her prophetic ministry. Through her inspired writings, we gain a better understanding of the role of Seventh-day Adventists, collectively as well as individually, in the closing stage of the great controversy.

The very nature and purpose of her work, then, determine the uniqueness and, hence, the value of her writings. These writings abound with insights into the crafty schemes which Satan employs against the world to counteract the redemptive purpose of God in Jesus Christ. She wishes, first, to alert her readers to the reality of Satan's presence in the world, to his cunning influence in the church, and to the subtle temptations he employs against individuals. She wishes, second, to clarify the nature and consequences of the great controversy between Christ and Satan in order to persuade her readers to choose the way of righteousness and truth. While this takes her over many topics and fields of study — history, religion, theology, science, health, education and others — the basic framework throughout is the theme of the great controversy. What, then, do we mean when we affirm a unique place — a place second only to the Bible — for her writings in the church? We mean that we cannot simply place them on the same level of importance and authority as that of other commentaries. Such a high view of her writings, can be easily misunderstood and misapplied, however. It would be inappropriate to use her writings to settle questions relating to the reading of a text, the meaning of a word, the authorship or date of a biblical book, etc. We would consider it quite strange, for example, to defend the use of the King James Version against modern translations on the grounds that Ellen White used the former and gave no explicit instruction for the need of the latter. And yet, an "all-purpose approach" to her writings leaves us vulnerable to such reasoning.

On the basis of the observations advanced above **it seems more accurate to describe her interpretation of Scripture as primarily a religious exposition of the great controversy theme on a cosmic, historical and personal level, than to characterize it as scientific exegesis in a technical sense.** In no way is such a classification denigratory. To the contrary! It may help prevent further misunderstanding and misuse of her writings. If her writings were designed to answer questions of a scholarly nature, their significance would be restricted to a relatively small group, and would in time become dated. Such is the nature of scholarship. But her writings have a deeper purpose and a wider scope.



**Excerpt from article by Harold D. Weiss, “Are Adventists Protestants?”
Spectrum, Vol. 4 (Spring, 1972), pp. 75-77**

There is no question that Ellen G. White stands squarely in agreement with this classic Protestant understanding of “Scripture alone.” Her appreciation of the Scriptures as the only source of Christian access to the word of God is well documented throughout her writings. Her understanding that the Scriptures are their own best interpreter is amply demonstrated. It would be preposterous to suggest that she considered herself the one called upon to exercise hermeneutical control over Scripture. Never did she wish to become the one who stands over the word of God and judges it as to what it means. Her words in these matters are quite explicit. In no way did she envision becoming a distraction from the study of the word of God. She never claimed that her writings were a shortcut to the meaning of Scripture.

Thoughtful investigation and earnest, taxing study are required in order for this word to be understood. ... The evidence of the truth of God’s word is in the word itself. Scripture is the key that unlocks scripture. The deep meaning of the truths of God’s word is unfolded to our minds by His Spirit. (8T, 157)

Mrs. White did not see herself as a guarantor of the meaning of Scripture, in this way drawing people away from Scripture to her own writings, where the meaning of Scripture, supposedly, could be obtained more easily. On the contrary, she insisted on the necessity to study the Bible, because only there are the treasures of God available. She said, “There are truths in the word which, like veins of precious ore, are hidden beneath the surface.” (8T, 157) “These Scriptures are a treasure-house of precious pearls, and all need them.” (CT, 456) “Precious treasure will be secured by those who study God’s Word with earnestness, for heavenly angels will direct the search.” (Ev, 214-215)

Anyone familiar with her writings knows Mrs. White’s position on the principle of “Scripture alone.” It is ironic, therefore, that her writings have come to be used by some as a means of drawing students away from the Scriptures and of establishing the meaning of a certain passage. “Scripture alone” demands, rather, that the meaning of the writings of Mrs. White be determined by the biblical word.

There is no shortage of people who feel that if Mrs. White has interpreted a text of Scripture in a particular way, that is the **only** meaning of the text, and that anyone who interprets the text differently is thereby challenging the authority of Mrs. White. Nothing could be more contrary to her own spirit and practice, and nothing could paralyse Seventh-day Adventism more effectively. At no time did Mrs. White think that when she commented on a passage of Scripture she was declaring its meaning once and for all. This is clear from the fact that she gave different interpretations to the same passage on different occasions. An example of this practice is her interpretation of the parable of the ten virgins (Matt. 25:1-13): in *Christ’s Object Lessons* she interprets it in terms of the Second Coming of Christ; but in *The Great Controversy* she applies it to the period before the 1844 disappointment, saying that it “illustrates the experience of the Adventist people.” (GC, 393) This indicates that as far as she was concerned the application of a passage of Scripture she had made at one time in no way was to be considered the **only** meaning of the passage.

Mrs. White repeatedly encouraged students of the Scriptures to dig deeper in order to find further meaning. She promised that earnest students would be further illumined by the Holy Spirit and given a deeper view into the mysteries of God.

Those who dig beneath the surface discover the hidden gems of truth. The Holy Spirit is present with the earnest searcher. Its illumination shines upon the Word, stamping the truth upon the mind with a new, fresh importance. . . . The preciousness of truth is realized as never before. A new, heavenly light shines upon the Word, illuminating it as though every letter were tinged in gold. God Himself has spoken to the mind and heart, making the Word spirit and life. (2SM, 39)

The worship of the living God is to be continually assisted by an ear that is open to the words “Holy, Holy, Holy,” when these are spoken in a new voice. The Scriptures themselves already said it well: “Every scribe who has been trained for the kingdom of heaven is like a householder who brings out of his treasure what is new and what is old” (Matt. 13:52). This means that there can be no conflict between what Mrs. White may have brought out of a passage of Scripture in her time and what an earnest student of the Scriptures may bring out today. And if with the tools of scholarly research a biblical student establishes the meaning of a passage of Scripture in its original setting, he is in no way contradicting or challenging the meaning that Mrs. White may have given to the same passage. Nor was Mrs. White contradicting herself when she gave a second meaning to a passage of Scripture by considering it from a different perspective.

It is imperative for the church that wishes to carry the Protestant Reformation to its logical limits to strictly enforce in its practice the principle of “Scripture alone”. The Adventist church must therefore insist that Mrs. White is to play the legitimate role for which she was called of God. She was not called to draw people away from an earnest study of the Scriptures, nor to offer herself as a shortcut to its meaning. Rather she was a witness to the necessity of earnest and prayerful Bible study so that new meaning, new veins of precious ore, may be tapped to the glory of God. She is in no way to be considered the guarantor of the meaning of Scripture that makes all further searching unnecessary, and that exercises hermeneutical control over the Bible. No book, in either black covers or red covers, can control the word of God.

The Holy Spirit is still active to energize the mind and the heart of one who diligently searches the mysteries of God’s word. The Spirit alone can guide a man to the presence of the Eternal. As Mrs. White herself said it: “Only by the aid of the divine Teacher can we understand the truths of God’s Word.” (SD, 68)



Excerpt from book by Jack Provonsa, *God is With Us* (Washington, 1974), pp. 17-18

The prophet is best described by contrasting him with what he usually is not, a systematic theologian. (And what a history of doubt and conflict can be attributed to the failure to make this distinction!) The thrusts, not to say the roles, of these two figures sometimes stand out in sharpest contrast in the literature they leave us.

A skilled systematic theologian is by training a careful, if sometimes dull, architect of ideas. He writes like a constitutional lawyer, constantly aware of the host of eagle-eyed colleagues present and yet unborn peering intently over his shoulder, ready to pounce on every show of ineptitude and careless employment of logic. He strains for factual and defensible formulations that can endure the searching scrutiny of his fellows.

By contrast, the concerns of the prophet usually carry him beyond hair-splitting details. His is a message to proclaim and a cause to defend. His tools are poetry, invective, exhortation, and

diatribe — shock weapons, not the instruments of scholarly dissection. His is usually the heat of anguished concern rather than the calculating logic of analysis and synthesis. For this reason his illustrations may at times seem overdrawn and his utterances distorted by overemphasis. The prophet often shouts where the theologian speaks in more measured tones. Prophets usually proclaim and exhort rather than write books on Bible doctrines.

And of course each has his proper time and place. Some things need to be shouted about. Nothing may happen when there is no one with the courage to speak up as vigorously as may be necessary. But because of this the prophetic figure has to be listened to in the immediate and larger context out of which he speaks — certainly if one is attempting to transmute his exhortations into theology. Statements made in one setting must be compensated for by statements made in another if systematic truth is to be realized.



Excerpts from article by Raoul Dederen, “Ellen White’s Doctrine of Scripture,” *Ministry Supplement*, pp. 24F-24I

What was Ellen White’s doctrine of Scripture? Did she place her writings on a par with the Bible, or even above it? Did she claim to have given Adventists another Bible? How did she relate to the Scriptures? (p. 24f)

It is impossible to understand Ellen White’s view of the Bible apart from her understanding of inspiration. The method of inspiration as outlined in her writings has hardly anything to do with direct dictation by God to the prophet or Biblical writer. True, she indicates that “the scribes of God wrote as they were dictated by the Holy Spirit,” and that “these men were inspired of the Holy Spirit.” Yet, it is a peculiar kind of dictation that she finds in Scripture. She refers, for instance, to the Bible writers as expressing their ideas in human language, thus presenting in the Bible “a union of the divine and the human” similar to that which existed in the person of Christ. God, by His Spirit, shed light “into the minds and hearts of His servants,” who in turn embodied the thoughts in human language.

Hence, for instance, each of the Gospel writers, though going over the same history, “under the guidance of the Holy Spirit” presented what most strongly impressed his mind. Different aspects of the same truth, but a perfect whole, “adapted to meet the wants of men in all the circumstances and experiences of life.”

At times the prophets learned by natural means the facts that they set down in Scripture. They gleaned their information through experience and observation. But in each instance God sharpened their memory, enabling them to record the Scriptures. Having thus been written by human instruments, the Bible, obviously, “is not God’s mode of thought and expression,” yet though entrusted to earthen vessels, it is nonetheless from heaven, “the testimony of God.”

Ellen White’s view of inspiration seems quite clear. Yet some Seventh-day Adventists in common with other Christians have given the impression that they consider the Bible as having been verbally inspired, and its original autographs inerrant. Certainly, Ellen White’s understanding of the issue gives no support to such a view. Though she referred to the prophet as God’s penman, this by no means suggests that he is to be regarded as a passive instrument submissively passing on words mechanically dictated to him. Rather the whole man is inspired, not just his words. Under the guidance of the Spirit he is a human agency whose whole personality is called upon to convey the word of God in “just the way He wanted it to come.”

It would be irresponsible to deny that there are literary problems, as well as apparent historical discrepancies, such as the differences between the parallel passages in the books of Kings and Chronicles, in the Scriptures, (pp. 24G-24H)

Having determined that Scripture constitutes a major category of divine revelation, we are now in a position to consider another important dimension of Ellen White's doctrine of Scripture, namely the dimension that characterizes her role as interpreter of the Word.

As interpreter of the Bible, Ellen White's most characteristic role was that of an evangelist — not an exegete, nor a theologian, as such, but a preacher and an evangelist. It was not her custom to take a Bible book, for instance, and expound it systematically. She describes her work as not unlike that of the Bible prophets, as that of a messenger, called by God to receive His word and to give a clear message in His name, as well as to give God's people a clearer understanding of the Bible, urging them back to God's Word.

No wonder, therefore, that the prophetic and hortatory mode was more characteristic of her than the exegetical. Though she did not ignore the historical context, she did not always make use of it (cf. *Prophets and Kings*, etc.). The people to whom she was preaching — or writing — were more the object of her attention than the specific people to whom the individual Bible writers addressed themselves. Although quite often elucidating the historical setting of a scriptural passage and the original intent of the author, she was, in the typical prophetic attitude, primarily desirous to press the text into service for the immediate objective, that of the spiritual quickening of her hearers or readers. She lived in a century of evangelistic revival, and her main purpose was to arrest attention and to bring conviction and repentance more than merely to relay information.

In all her counsels, Ellen White is in fact more than an interpreter of Scripture; she never fails to emphasize the **relevancy** of the passage to her readers, and the **importance** of a proper response to the Word of God. Very generally uppermost are the inner spiritual needs of her audience. All is subordinate to the objective of confronting her public with the demands and promises of God. This approach has a way of creating a directness and an urgency so that even more didactic pages are evangelistic in the best sense of the term. (p. 24H)

... by no means did she claim that her writings ought to be received as being in a class with the Bible, and thus an addition to the Biblical canon. „In His word,” she writes, “God has committed to men the knowledge necessary for salvation. The Holy Scriptures are to be accepted as an authoritative, infallible revelation of His will. They are the standard of character, the revealer of doctrines, and the test of experience.” Still, the fact that God has revealed His will to men through the Scriptures has not rendered superfluous the continued presence and guidance of the Spirit. In the Bible we have “the unerring counsel of God,” “all that is needful for the saving of the soul,” and Ellen White's testimonies should not be “carried to the front,” nor are they “to take the place of the Word.” But since little heed has been given to the Bible, “the Lord has given a lesser light to lead men and women to the greater light [the Scriptures].” (p. 241)



APPENDIX THIRTY-FIVE

An Analysis Of “Prophetic Tension” In The Eschatology Of E.G. White

**A Term Paper presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the course G531,
Writings of Ellen G. White, by B.H. Brinsmead, December, 1975.**

An Analysis Of “Prophetic Tension” In The Eschatology Of E.G. White

Introduction

It appears significant that Ellen White wrote of the last things first; and that she wrote of these last things as though they were imminent. And yet, she lived and wrote mainly in the nineteenth century, whereas we now live in the twentieth. Her particular perspective therefore raises certain questions for us today. This essay attempts to deal with some of these questions.

The tendency of Ellen White to see last things as being imminent is here given the designation “prophetic tension”. The first chapter attempts to show briefly that this is a Biblical characteristic, and that it is created by certain principles of prophetic insight. Then this characteristic is documented from Ellen White’s earliest writings, and the problems that it raises are more clearly stated.

In the second chapter, a practical explanation of the “prophetic tension” is offered in the phenomenon of local and complete fulfilments of prophecy. It is suggested that Ellen White has painted two pictures using prophetic language, not just one. Some tentative reasons for the partial fulfilment being described in terms of the whole are offered. However, in the third chapter it is shown that the “tension” in Mrs. White’s writings is genuine, and that from the earliest she expected the final consummation to be imminent.

The fourth chapter establishes that there has in fact been a delay in the Advent, because eschatology is “ethically conditioned:” there is a dynamic relationship between eschatology and soteriology. The nature of the ethical reason for the delay, the failure to reflect Christ’s character fully, is briefly discussed. Now it is seen that, although there are now two pictures described in eschatological terms, there was originally intended to be only one. The church’s failure has made the two out of the one.

Lastly, the two major conclusions that can be drawn from this analysis are briefly stated. It is there noted that the essay does not claim to be definitive: conclusions are more of the nature of suggestions, and the questions raised may be more valuable than the answers. It is hoped that this exercise may help at least the writer to know that “it is full time ... to wake from sleep. For salvation is nearer to us now than when we first believed” (Rom. 13:11).

I. The Question Stated

The Nature of Biblical Eschatology

More recent eschatological studies have found a unique element in the teachings of Jesus. Having been previously presented as an apocalyptic visionary on the one hand, or the teacher of a purely earthly eschatology on the other, it is now seen that “Jesus stands apart from the apocalyptists in his recovery of the prophetic tension between history and eschatology” (G.E. Ladd, *The Presence of the Future* [Grand Rapids, 1974] 146). The meaning of the term “prophetic tension” is that the eschatological activity of God “is seen to be both present and future.” “By the kingdom of God He (Jesus) designated both the fulfilment of the prophetic hope in the historical present in His own person and mission and the eschatological consummation of the prophetic hope at the end of the age” (*Ibid.*, 146,147). That the prophetic view was able to retain a tension between history and eschatology means primarily two things. Firstly, redemption history is not only eschatology but also ethics (*Ibid.*, 70ff, this

feature is discussed). There is no determinism in which man is a passive unimportant actor, but rather, "eschatology is ethically conditioned" (*Ibid.*, 72). Secondly, the ultimate, eschatological future is typically presented as imminent. "The prophets usually saw in the background the final eschatological visitation of God; but since they primarily concerned themselves with God's will for His people in the present, they viewed the immediate future in terms of the ultimate future without strict chronological differentiation and thus proclaimed the ultimate will of God for His people here and now" (*Ibid.*, 65).

The result is that the Biblical prophet can talk of imminence without determinism, and ethics without delay. There is a dynamic relationship of Now and Not Yet in which the Now is crucial for the Not Yet, and the Not Yet impinges on the Now. The Consummation is conditional, "ethically conditioned," because the ethical imperative is meaningful and not a pretence. And yet, at the same time, the Consummation is imminent, and it is God's work: there is a real eschatology as well as real ethics, and God will bring the Kingdom that is the annihilation of the present forces of history. Both God and man are real actors in the drama between good and evil: the Kingdom of God is both imminent, and conditional.

Imminence in E.G. White's Writings

It was in 1844 that Ellen G. White (then Harmon) had her first vision (this vision can be found in E.G. White, *Life Sketches* [Mountain View, 1915] 64-68). One thing stands out about this vision — it is dominated by a view of the Second Coming, the apocalyptic end of all things: "Soon our eyes were drawn to the east, for a small black cloud had appeared, about half as large as a man's hand, which all knew was the sign of the Son of Man" (*Ibid.*, 65). Then follow descriptions of the apocalyptic events of the Second Coming. But there is another thing which stands out equally clearly: these apocalyptic events are dynamically related to the experience through which Ellen Harmon and the Millerites had just passed: "They had a bright light set up behind them at the beginning of the path, which an angel told me was the Midnight Cry" (*Ibid.*, 64). The impression gained from the vision is one of dynamic relationship between the Millerite experience and the imminent Second Coming.

This first vision establishes a theme that occurs constantly in those that follow. A quick glance at the contents of the first part of the book *Early Writings*, containing her earliest productions, is impressive: "the sealing," "shaking of the powers of heaven," "the last plagues and the judgment," "mark of the beast," "preparation for the end," "the gathering time." Here at the beginning of her writings is a concern for the very last events. The contents of her chapters confirm the impression:

"I saw four angels who had a work to do on the earth, and were on their way to accomplish it" (*EW*, 38).

"I saw that Satan was at work in these ways to distract, deceive, and draw away God's people, just now in this sealing time" (*Ibid.*, 44).

"I saw that the time for Jesus to be in the Most Holy Place was nearly finished, and that time can last but a very little longer. ... The sealing time is very short, and will soon be over. Now is the time, while the four angels are holding the four winds, to make our calling and election sure" (*Ibid.*, 58).

The Question Stated

It is apparent that, in the years following 1844, Ellen White saw the Millerite experience as being directly related to the last events of Biblical eschatology, which were seen to be

imminent. The heavenly judgment had commenced in 1844; the saints were presently living in the sealing time which was to issue directly in the reception of either the seal of God or the mark of the beast, and to be followed by the close of probation, and the final coming of Jesus.

What is to be made of this, one hundred and thirty years later? Was Mrs. White wrong? Is it valid to adopt the sceptical attitude that her early writing was a failure, a misjudgement? It is interesting that the same verdict has been levelled at Christ as a teacher, because of some of his eschatological sayings. This conclusion solves the dilemma by removing the credibility, eventually, of the very basis of Christianity. It has been shown above that Biblical prophets habitually saw a dynamic relationship between their present and the eschatological future. What we have in Ellen White's writings is apparently another example of "prophetic tension". To discredit one prophet will then be to discredit all.

But if the visions were not in error, in what sense are they right? Is the only other solution the one of human failure — that man failed to meet the conditions inherent in the prophecies? If this is so, is there any assurance that man will not go on failing? Is it true that man has always failed?

"The commission Christ gave to the disciples, they fulfilled. As these messengers of the cross went forth to proclaim the gospel, there was such a revelation of the glory of God as had never before been witnessed by mortal man. ... To every nation was the gospel carried in a single generation" (*AA*, 593).

Then why did not the consummation occur then? And if, following 1844, man did fail God, then what becomes of the relevance of Mrs. White's early prophecies? Are they made void by default, or do they continue to have significance? These questions are enough to suggest that there may be certain perspectives that will help us to deal with the "prophetic tension" in the eschatology of Ellen G. White.

II. The Gathering Time

It is a widely agreed-upon principle of Biblical interpretation that a prophecy may have a limited local fulfilment as well as a final complete fulfilment. Joel portrays the day of the Lord as both a local plague of locusts (1:4-12) and a universal eschatological judgment (3:11-15). Zech. 12:10 is applied by the one New Testament writer to both the cross (John 19:37) and the second coming (Rev. 1:7). Ellen White writes of the fall of Jerusalem:

"The Saviour's prophecy concerning the vision of judgments upon Jerusalem is to have another fulfilment, of which that terrible desolation was but a faint shadow" (*GC*, 36. Other instances of this application of the prophecy are *MB*, 120, 121, and *DA*, 628.).

Because the principle factors in the great controversy are constant — God, man, and Satan — various events in history that are focal points for this controversy are often spoken of in similar language.

Ellen White apparently uses three methods of interpretation in dealing with Seven Churches of Revelation. The first is the so-called "historicist" method:

"The names of the seven churches are symbolic of the church in different periods of the Christian era. ... The symbols used reveal the condition of the church at different periods in the history of the world" (*AA*, 585).

The second may be called the "preterist" method, where the various passages are made to apply to the actual first-century churches known at the time as Ephesus (E.G. White, *Manuscript 11*, 1906), Sardis (E.G. White, *Review*, Aug. 10, 1905), etc. And thirdly, the passages are applied to the present experience of Christians: "Who is so favoured as to be among these few in Sardis? Are You? Am I?" (E.G. White, *Manuscript 881*, 1900). "To the church of the present day this message is sent. I call upon our church members to read the whole of the third chapter of Revelation, and to make an application of it. ..." (This and several of the above references are in the *SDABC*, 7:962ff. See further in *AA*, 524, 543.). The tentative conclusion to be drawn is that the prophecy is considered to be fulfilled, not only at a particular point in a prophetic timetable, but also wherever the ethical and spiritual specifications are met.

A corollary of this principle of local final fulfilments is that a local fulfilment may be spoken of in terms of the yet future, universal consummation. Do we have some instances of this in Ellen White's eschatology?

There are in her writings apparently two understandings of the "midnight cry". She can say that the midnight cry was given "near the close of the second angel's message" (*EW*, 238), i.e., in 1844. And yet she can say that "the coming of the bridegroom was at midnight. ... So the coming of Christ will take place in the darkest period of this earth's history" (E.G. White, *Positive Christian Living* [Washington, D.C., 1952], 374). The two major treatments of the bridegroom parable, in *Great Controversy* and *Christ's Object Lessons*, elaborate on these two senses of the coming of the Bridegroom. In *Great Controversy* the coming of the Bridegroom is applied to Christ's coming into the Most Holy Place to commence the investigative judgment in 1844 (*GC*, 427); in *Christ's Object Lessons* it is "... Christ's return to the earth at the close of human probation" (*Living*, 374-375).

There seems to be a similar understanding of the three angels' messages. *Early Writings* says that the second angel's message closed just before Oct. 22, 1844 (*EW*, 238, and Appendix 304). Of the third angel's message she says it was given "at that time," i.e., in 1844 (*Ibid.*, 75). In *Great Controversy* she gives a full statement of her understanding of these messages:

"The second angel's message of Revelation 14 was first preached in the summer of 1844, and it then had a more direct application to the churches of the United States ..."

Note that the suggestion is of a local application. Then she continues,

"But the message of the second angel did not reach its complete fulfilment in 1844. ... Not yet ... can it be said that „Babylon is fallen“" (*GC*, 389ff)

And then the reason is given. This cannot be said until apostasy fills the churches "in all the countries of Christendom" — that is, when there is, not a local fulfilment in the United States only, but a universal fulfilment. She goes on to say, "The perfect fulfilment of Rev. 14:8 is yet future" (*Ibid.*, 390). In other words, in the fullest sense the second angel's message has not been fulfilled. If this is so, the third message has not been fully given either, for she says that this last has its final application when the second has been fully given, accompanied by the message of Rev. 18:1-4 (*Ibid.*, 603-605).

One of the chapters in *Early Writings* is titled "The Gathering Time." In it Mrs. White says, "Sept. 23, the Lord showed me that He had stretched out His hand the second time to recover the remnant of His people, and that efforts must be redoubled in this gathering time," (*EW*, 74). "Gathering" is a weighty word in prophetic expectation. In the Old Testament it referred

to the eschatological gathering of a Hebrew remnant under the Messiah to establish the Kingdom of God (Ezek. 39:25-29, etc.). In the New Testament, Christ speaks of the time when He will "... send His angels ... and they will gather His elect ..." (Matt. 24:31). Ellen White is here using consummation language. To what is she referring? Who are "His people"? A footnote refers to page 86, where "His people" are those who, in 1844, were "looking for Christ," and were "scattered" by the Disappointment: now they were to be gathered again. In other words, a local experience of God's people is spoken of in terms of the whole.

There are other instances of this use of eschatological terms. The "latter rain" is spoken of as both present (*SDABC*, 7:984) and future (*EW*, 51); the "sifting" is both present (*4T*, 51) and future (*5T*, 80). Ellen White can speak of "this sealing time" (*EW*, 44) and can also speak of the final, future sealing (*GC*, 605).

What conclusions can be drawn? Ellen White appears to paint two pictures with eschatological language: the local picture of the Millerite awakening and the beginnings of the Seventh-day Adventist church; and the consummative picture of the end of the global conflict between good and evil. Each picture has a three angels' messages, a midnight cry and coming of the Bridegroom, a former and latter rain, a sifting and a gathering.

Why should the events around 1844 be spoken of in such significant terms? Perhaps Ellen White herself suggests the answer:

"This time (that of Rev. 10) ... is not the end of this world's history, neither of probationary time, but of prophetic time, which should precede the advent of our Lord. That is, the people will not have another message upon definite time. After this period of time reaching from 1842-1844, there can be no definite tracing of the prophetic time" (*SDABC*, 6:971).

The period around 1844 was what some have spoken of as an "axial" period of expectancy of the return of Christ. God intended that it should have great significance, as it would from this time on be a fixed point of reference for the remainder of time. Further, the events of this period reveal more clearly the nature of the very final events:

"Such subjects as the sanctuary, in connection with the 2300 days, the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus, are perfectly calculated to explain the past advent movement and show what our present position is, establish the faith of the doubting, and give certainty to the glorious future" (*EW*, 63).

The "prophetic perspective," with its tension between history and eschatology, typically sees a part in terms of the whole. This is not a failure of the whole picture to be fulfilled, but a partial fulfilment that is itself a prophecy and a promise of what is to come. Therefore, when we find a consummative description of a local experience in Ellen White's writings, it is not a failure of prophecy, but a prophecy of God's final success.

III. The Great Controversy

Ellen White received her first "*Great Controversy*" vision in 1858, in which she was shown the conflict between Christ and Satan from its inception to its conclusion. The content of this vision is now set down in the latter part of the book *Early Writings*, and here is found the same continuum between the Millerite experience and the final consummation that was noted above.

"As the ministry of Jesus closed in the holy place, and He passed into the holiest, ... He sent another mighty angel with a third message to the world. ... This message was designed to put the children of God on their guard. ... They will be brought into close conflict with the beast and his image" (*EW*, 254).

This same 1853 vision, though subsequently expanded by further revelations, was still the basis of Ellen White's picture of the final struggle when she produced *The Great Controversy* in 1888. It is striking that God revealed to her the last events first; and that the earliest things that she saw are still her framework when, near the end of her writing career, she sketches last-day events. In the light of the matters that have been raised so far, it may be profitable to compare these two pictures of last events. So far it has been shown that she painted both a local and a consummative picture in last-day language. Now a further question must be raised. Do both pictures refer to the same consummation? Or were her early visions only alluding to a local picture, and was the impression of imminence of the consummation only a literary device, another way of looking at local events? Or was the imminence really there?

Because *Great Controversy* is the later production, we would naturally expect some development of Ellen White's views. One unmistakable development is a strong universal perspective:

"Not one is made to suffer the wrath of God until the truth has been brought home to his mind and conscience. ... Everyone is to have sufficient light to make his decision intelligently" (*GC*, 605).

"The angel who unites in the proclamation of the third angel's message is to lighten the whole earth with his glory. A work of worldwide extent and unwonted power is here foretold. The advent movement of 1840-44 was a glorious manifestation of the power of God ... to be exceeded by the mighty movement under the last warning of the third angel" (*Ibid.*, 611).

Is this a widening vision in which the whole of the first picture is seen to be only local? Specific and local designations appear to be left behind. In the chapter, "God's People Delivered," all men are finally in two groups, designated by very general terms, "people of God," "true Israel," "evil men," "enemies of God's law," etc. (*Ibid.*, 635ff)

In comparison, the prophet's earlier outlook contains some local expressions. The last call will be carried "even to the poor slaves" (*EW*, 278). Is the extremity of this work to be the southern states of the United States? There is no question that, as time passed, the prophet became aware more and more of the extent of the church's mission. And yet from the earliest, the universal view is there in embryo. For instance, even then she saw clearly what she stated specifically in her later work: "I saw that this message (the third angel's) will close with power and strength far exceeding the midnight cry" (*Ibid.*, 278). The chapter, "God's People Delivered" in the later book is paralleled by the earlier chapter, "Deliverance of the Saints." There is no mistaking the universal perspective of the whole chapter. There are the same two generally defined groups of men as in *Great Controversy*, the same overwhelming, cosmic picture of the return of Christ. The conclusion is very clear: the consummation is the same in both views. Briefer, more simply stated in the earlier account; graphically developed in the later one. But essentially, the last events that Ellen White was first shown are still the last events.

This continuum between 1844 and the consummation, this "prophetic tension," encompassed the apocalyptic end in the fullest sense. She may have spoken of a local event in terms of the

last events; but she was not only speaking of a local event. We are now ready to sketch the exact relationship between the two pictures — and to see what has been left out of the later picture, and why.

IV. Hastening The Coming

Throughout Scripture, the tension between the present and the future has a basis in the imperative to God's covenant people to cooperate in the purposes of the Kingdom of God on earth. Thus, in Matthew, the imperative to preach the gospel to all nations (28:19), and the promise that Christ shall come when the gospel shall have been preached (24:14) are dynamically related. Ellen White is very clear: "It is the privilege of every Christian, not only to look for, but to hasten the coming of the Saviour" (*AA*, 600). There can be no real privilege without responsibility. If this honour extended to the church has real meaning, its converse must be true: an inadequate response on the part of the church will delay the advent. This is where ethics and eschatology meet; and ethics reach a climax in the commission to the Christian to bear the fruit of other Christians, to become a saving instrumentality through the presence of the indwelling, saving Christ.

Ellen White specifically deals with this question. Commenting on one of the very passages quoted above (*ISM*, 67): "I saw that the time for Jesus to be in the Most Holy Place was nearly finished, and that time can last but a very little longer," she says. "Am I accused of falsehood because time has continued longer than my testimonies seemed to indicate?" She then cites early examples of Biblical writers who gave the impression of the shortness of time, and whose predictions did not come to pass (1 Cor. 7:29; Rom. 13:12; Rev. 1:3; etc.). Then she says:

"The angels of God in their messages to men represent time as very short. Thus it has always been presented to me. It is true that time has continued longer than we expected in the early days of this message. Our Saviour did not appear as soon as we had hoped. But has the word of the Lord failed! Never! It should be remembered that the Lord promises and threatenings of God are alike conditional.

She continues:

"Had Adventists, after the Great Disappointment in 1844, held fast to their faith, ... Christ would have come ere this to receive His people to their reward" (*ISM*, 68).

Making a comparison between Adventists and Israel in the wilderness, she says, "The same sins (unbelief, murmuring, rebellion, worldliness, unconsecration, strife), have delayed the entrance of modern Israel into the heavenly Canaan" (*Ibid.*, 69).

L.E. Froom has made an exhaustive collection of statements of E.G. White regarding the delay of the Advent and the reasons for it (*Movement of Destiny*, [Washington, DC, 1971], 561-602). Unquestionably the primary reason for the delay is the inadequate response of God's church. It becomes apparent that the study of eschatology leads to the study of soteriology — God's work for and in man. Apparently, man has been able to confute the purposes of God. One of the keys to the understanding of the "prophetic tension" in Ellen White's writings becomes the question of the saving relationship between God and man.

What is the precise nature of the reason for the delay? "When the character of Christ shall be perfectly reproduced in His people, then He will come to claim them as His own" (*COL*, 69). This is a very searching statement. What is meant by the term "character of Christ"? Is it a duplication of the perfection of Christ that is here demanded? Ellen White says further, "The

last rays of merciful light, the last message of mercy to be given to the world, is a revelation of His (God’s) character of love” (*Ibid.*, 416). Here it is not the character of Christ, but the character of God, that is the model to be reproduced.

Ellen White may be referring to the New Testament doctrine of the “*imitatio Christi*,” the imitation of Christ. Christ is clearly upheld as an example to the Christian: “Christ also suffered for you, leaving you an example, that you should follow in His steps (1 Peter 2:21). But there is something else that is important about this theme: it calls the Christian to do as Christ has done, on the basis of the fact that Christ has done for him what he could never do for himself. We are to die to sin because He has already died for sin (1 Peter 2:24). We are to follow Christ as sheep follow a shepherd, not as sheep follow another sheep (1 Peter 2:25). The identity between the Christian and Christ is always in the context of the radical difference between the Christian and Christ. The motif of “*imitatio*” reaches its peak in Eph. 5:1, where the Christian is told, “Be imitators of God.” The same is in Matt. 5:48, where the Christian is to be as perfect as the Father. Obviously, a difference must also be implied. In the Old Testament, the true Israelite was to pattern his life on God, as He had revealed Himself, because only here is a true and unerring standard of ethical conduct with the inherent right to be the model for man (Lev. 19:2, etc.). In the New Testament, the revelation of Christ is the equivalent of that revelation of God to Israel: and in imitating Christ, the Christian is imitating God.

Thus the Christian is called to be the same as Christ — constantly remembering that he is different to Christ. His imitation is always in the context of dependence. “With our limited powers we are to be as holy in our sphere as God is holy in His sphere” (*ISM*, 337). And at the same time, “The closer you come to Jesus, the more faulty you will appear in your own eyes. ... The less we see to esteem in ourselves, the more we shall see to esteem in the infinite purity and loveliness of our Saviour ... and the more fully we shall reflect His image” (*SC*, 64, 65). When we have conquered every known sin, the closeness to Christ implied in that victory will reveal in us a sinfulness we had not before seen.

Where is the church’s failure most clearly delineated? Ellen White again and again pointed us to Rev. 3:14-22, which pictures a people full of “pride,” “rebellion, ingratitude, and forgetfulness of God” on the one hand, and the “great Redeemer, the heavenly merchantman laden with riches,” “gold of faith and love, white raiment of Christ’s righteousness, eyesalve of spiritual discernment” on the other (*ISM*, 357). It is a call for an imitation of Christ in the context of total dependence upon Him.



There is one thing that is present in *Early Writings* and not in *Great Controversy*: the striking continuum between the Millerite experience and the apocalyptic consummation. Instead, there is a contrasting of a local Millerite fulfilment and a yet-awaited “perfect fulfilment” (*GC*, 389-390). And it is clear from Mrs. White’s own words that the early impression of time being “very short” was as she intended (*ISM*, 67). It is the failure of “modern Israel” that has made the two pictures out of the one, with a period of delay in between.

Does this make the Consummation forever uncertain? Will the church ever reflect Christ fully? Is the Advent no nearer for us than for the Millerites? Not necessarily. It appears that, if man does not hasten the Advent by his acceptance of the gospel, he may hasten it by his rejection.

"Time will last a little longer until the inhabitants of the earth have filled up the cup of their iniquity, and then the wrath of God, which has slumbered so long, will awake. ... (17, 363. Froom has a collection of similar statements in *Movement of Destiny*, 598ff.)

Since 1844, man's freedom to reject moves in a shrinking circle of time. One thing is clear from *Great Controversy*: the note of imminence and urgency is not lessened. The "prophetic tension" always remains. But Ellen White says what no other prophet before her has said: there is no more prophetic time to be fulfilled, and though probation of modern man may stretch, the events of 1844 continue to remind him that the limit of God's forbearance is breathtakingly close.

Conclusions

Perhaps two brief conclusions can be drawn from the material that has been presented. The first is that we must attempt to avoid confusion. What was one eschatological picture has become two. The apocalyptic "signs" of the Millerite experience could have been signs of the consummation: but there has been a delay, and that experience has become a local fulfilment. Signs that once indicated that Christ was soon to come, now indicate that the last prophetic time-period has passed. Those signs still have significance for us, but now they have a different significance. The Millerites could say that the churches, in rejecting their message, became Babylon; we cannot. Nor can we use the signs they used and make them mean the same thing. Ellen White made a statement in 1888 that may relate to this question:

"Some things must be torn down. Some things must be built up. The old treasures must be reset in the framework of truth. They (Adventist preachers) are to preach God's word; their testimony must not be molded by the opinions and ideas that have been regarded as sound, but by the word of God which liveth and abideth for ever."

She says again,

"I have been shown that Jesus will reveal to us precious old truths in a new light, if we are ready to receive them" (E.G. White, *Minneapolis Talks*, mimeo copy, E.G. White vault. Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 89, 88).

The second conclusion is that we must be filled with humility and vigilance. Eschatology cannot be separated from soteriology, nor prophecy from ethics. The fault of God's people appears to be, not that they do not know enough prophecy, but that they do not know Jesus. If our spiritual eyesight is too dull to be able to compare ourselves to Jesus, at least our temporal predicament may lead us to compare ourselves with our spiritual forefathers; and thus the broken vase of prophecy, which was one piece and now is two, will jolt us into realizing that what they had, and therefore what we have, is not sufficient. There is a portion of prophecy, above all others, to which we must turn: the last verses of Revelation three.

APPENDIX THIRTY-SIX

Ellen G. White And The Charge Of Plagiarism

Ellen G. White And The Charge Of Plagiarism

Here is a volatile subject worthy of our careful thought. Not yet is the research of this issue complete. But some suggestions may be offered.

1. It is quite correct that E.G. White drew upon scores of sources to aid her in her writing. *Great Controversy* alone cites about ninety of such. *Desire of Ages* drew upon **at least** the greater part of a dozen well-known commentators on the life of Christ. Her health works reflect such writers as L.B. Coles, Trail, and Jackson, and her educational volumes incorporate much from Pestalozzi, Herbart, Froebel, Horace Mann and others.
2. This fact need not, in itself, be disconcerting for those who recognize:
 - a. The biblical dictum that God never does supernaturally what can be done naturally. This is often called the law of the economy of miracle. We see it frequently in Scripture which records how Christ chose to ask questions instead of drawing upon His omniscience, and how He chose to use human rather than miraculous effort in many situations such as removing the stone from the tomb of Lazarus and filling the water pots of Cana with water.
 - b. Other prophets, even Biblical ones, were led of God to incorporate sections of the writings of others. Matthew and Luke used approximately 99% of Mark, 2 Peter and Jude reflect similar practice, and so do some Old Testament passages. The list of intertestamental names in Christ's genealogical table indicates that Luke drew upon temple records. The Bible's closing book contains almost 500 allusions to previous writings. There is hardly an original image in the entire Apocalypse.
3. Ellen White made it very clear that she herself did read other writers. Through the pages of the church papers she made known her evaluation of Conybeare and Howson's classic work on Paul, as well as her appreciation and study of D'Aubigné.

She recommended such works to the study of church members apparently without any concern that the most intelligent of them would recognize that she had borrowed liberally from such sources. Thus there does not seem to be any intention on her part to deceive by such usage. Wylie's *The History of the Waldenses* was being offered for sale in the same church offices selling her own works, but this particular volume was certainly one of her *Great Controversy* sources.

4. We have from Ellen White the clear statement that she herself had to provide the words to clothe the concepts given her from heaven.

"Although I am as dependent upon the Spirit of the Lord in writing my views as I am in receiving them, yet the words I employ in describing what I have seen are my own" (*Review and Herald*, Oct. 8, 1867).

We know also that she felt her own inadequacy in this area. Thus she wrote, and wrote most beautifully, on this awareness of her insufficiency:

"Oh, how inefficient, how incapable I am of expressing the things which burn in my soul in reference to the mission of Christ. ... I know not how to speak or trace with pen the large subject of the atoning sacrifice, I know not how to present subjects in the living power in which they stand before me. I tremble for fear lest I shall belittle the great plan of salvation by cheap words" (Letter 40, 1892).

“I am but a poor writer, and cannot with pen or voice express the great and deep mysteries of God” (Letter 67, 1894).

Inasmuch as it was necessary for her to find words to express the ideas she was commissioned to proclaim there is nothing inherently strange in the fact that where she found valuable summaries of truth it appealed to her to use such. This helped her in her own lack and also was a considerable saving of time and effort.

5. A major reason why Ellen White never gave credit is intimated in her sole statement about her use of quotations from others. In *Great Controversy* 13 we read that she had no wish to represent the writers she used as authoritative. That is, she did not feel free to endorse all that was written by such writers and was not recommending that others should either. Elsewhere we read her counsel to gather up the scattered gems of truth and put them in right settings. This is precisely what she did herself — winnowing much of literature and providing the gems for a church which tragically read very little. Her metaphor of “gems” for quality literary fragments suggests that she looked upon them as God’s gifts intended to bless all, like the rich treasures of earth, rather than contrived artefacts to which individuals could claim ownership. Thus in *Education*, she clearly states that every brilliant flash of thought “is from the Light of the world” (p. 14). In the same paragraph she uses the illustration of the moon and stars which “shine by the reflected light of the sun” to represent the teachings of “the world’s great thinkers” wherever they are true, and therefore belong to all. When with the passing of time and the increasing rigor of literary standards she was urged to give credit there is no evidence of any reluctance on her part to comply. This was not done for paraphrasing any more than it was customary for popular literature so to do at that time.
6. Most of those who have been scandalized by Ellen White’s use of sources reveal:
 - a. They have a superstitious view of inspiration which is not supportable from either Scripture or Ellen White.
 - b. They know little about writing or preaching. In these areas, all practitioners of note have stood on the shoulders of their predecessors. It is a well-known dictum that “he who never reads will never be read; he who never quotes will never be quoted; and he who does not use other men’s brains reveals he has no brains of his own.” One of the evidences that a prophet spoke from God was his **lack of originality**, by which we mean that true prophets ever drew from the existing well of acknowledged truth, and applied their drawings to current needs. Even the teachings of Jesus contain little that cannot be found in the Old Testament in root form.
 - c. They are not well aware of the literary practices by authors of **popular** [non-academic] works in the 19th century.
7. It is very significant that when Ellen White chose a source which most nearly reflected her own view of inspiration she chose C.B. Stowe, whose summary on the matter was a far cry from the beliefs of the fundamentalists of his day, and similarly a far cry from the views of most Seventh-day Adventists today. He could say that the Bible writers were God’s penmen not his pen, and that God as a writer was not represented in Scripture, that the logic and rhetoric employed by Scripture writers was not faultless, that the manuscripts were imperfect, that chronology in Scripture and scientific expression were defective, and that the Bible was given for practical purposes and revealed a union of the human and divine. With all this Ellen G. White agreed, having this advantage, that she personally had experienced divine inspiration for many years.

8. It has been pointed out that nineteenth century works do often give credit to their sources, and that the evil of plagiarism was recognized. This, however, is only a half truth, it is certainly correct to acknowledge that copyright laws were far less stringent in the nineteenth century (thus American publishers could reproduce the works of Dickens without his consent, and without paying him a cent), and the incorporation of sources **in popular works** without credit was a recognized phenomenon. We quote Dr. Olson's excellent article on this subject.

“The Ethics of Nineteenth-Century Literary Borrowing”

Apparently no one, even among Ellen White's secretarial staff, questioned the propriety of her use of the works of other writers before the mid-1880's. When, at that time, she was criticized for this practice she at first disregarded the criticisms, probably feeling as John Wesley did, that a series of credit lines would interfere with the flow of the message being portrayed. W.C. White explains her attitude:

In many of her manuscripts as they came from her hand quotation marks were used. In other cases they were not used; and her habit of using parts of sentences found in the writings of others and filling in a part of her own composition, was not based upon any definite plan nor was it questioned by her copyists and copy writers until about 1885 and onward.

When critics pointed out this feature of her work as a reason for questioning the gift which had enabled her to write, she paid little attention to it. Later on when complaint was made that this was an injustice to other publishers and writers, she made a decided change — a change which you are familiar with. — W.C. White to L.E. Froom, Jan. 8, 1928.

When *Sketches from the Life of Paul* and *The Great Controversy* were published she was advised to leave out the quotation marks and did so. But afterward when presented with the fact that this was considered unfair to the people from whom she had made quotations she said to have them in by all means.

In her desire to get the best possible description for the benefit of her readers she overlooked the importance of that which has been the subject of severe criticism. — W.C. White to J.C. Stevens, July 25, 1919, W.C. White Letter-book #129.

As to the propriety of copying from others, it appears that this was a common practice in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. John Wesley (1703-1791) frankly stated his attitude toward using the works of others:

It was a doubt with me for some time, whether I should not subjoin to every note I received from them the name of the author from whom it was taken; especially considering I had transcribed some, and abridged many more, almost in the words of the author. But upon further consideration, I resolved to name none, that nothing might divert the mind of the reader from keeping close to the point of view, and receiving what was spoken only according to its own intrinsic value. — *Explanatory Notes Upon the New Testament*, Preface, quoted by F.D. Nichol, *Ellen G. White and Her Critics*, p. 406.

Another Bible commentator notes that borrowing has long been a common practice among theological writers:

All the commentators have drawn largely from the fathers, especially from St. Augustine; and most of them have made general property of Patrick, Lowth, and Whitby. Poole has exhausted the old continental writers; Henry had made very free with Bishop Hall and others; Scott and Benson have enriched their pages abundantly from Henry: Gill has translated the spirit of Poole's "Synopsis," but he most generally gives this authorities; Adam Clarke and Davidson have been much indebted to all the best critics, though the former does not always mention his obligations, and the latter never; but his preface to his admirable "*Pocket Commentary*" is an honest confession that he pretends to be more than a compiler. — Ingram Cobbin, quoted by F.D. Nichol, *E.G. White and Her Critics*, p. 406.

In defending John the Revelator's use of other sources, Preston and Hanson state:

In fact, of course, every great writer has materials and sources which he uses (Aeschylus and Shakespeare are admirable examples). The important question is not, What sources does he use? but What use does he make of them? Indeed, if we once get some idea of John's technique, the masterly way in which he adapts and combines his various sources will make us pay more, and not less, attention to what he is using those sources to express. — *The Revelation of St. John the Divine*, p. 93.

Conybeare and Howson borrowed from other writers without giving credit or using quotation marks (See Nichol, pp. 424-425). D.M. Canright, who in 1887 condemned Mrs. White for this practice, borrowed extensively himself in an 1878 publication of his own, with no indication in the preface or anywhere else in the book that he was doing so (See Nichol, p. 408).

Ellen White made no attempt to hide her borrowing. She even called special attention to Conybeare and Howson's work in the same year that she was drawing extracts from it. In support of an advertisement for the book in the *Signs of the Times* of February 22, 1883, she wrote, "*The Life of St. Paul* by Conybeare and Howson I regard as a book of great merit, and one of rare usefulness to the earnest student of the New Testament history" (*ST*, Feb. 22, 1883, p. 96). Four months later, in June, 1883, her own volume on Paul was published. She must have known that the relationship between *Sketches from the Life of Paul* and the Conybeare and Howson book would soon become apparent to her readers, but this obviously was of no concern to her.

She also recommended d'Aubigné's *History of the Reformation*, from which she borrowed extensively, as an ideal holiday gift (*RH*, 12-26-1882).

Raymond Cottrell states that when he was working on the *SDA Bible Commentary*, he had occasion to compare thirty commentaries on 1 Corinthians with one another. To his amazement he discovered that many of these respected commentators had "copied significant amounts of material from one another without once giving credit." Cottrell concluded that "nineteenth-century literary ethics, even among best writers, approved of, or at least did not seriously question, generous literary borrowing without giving credit" ("The Literary

Relationship Between the *Desire of Ages*, by Ellen G. White and *The Life of Christ*, by William Hanna.” p. 6).

Since Ellen White lived most of her life in the nineteenth century, it is not surprising that she should conduct most of her literary activities according to nineteenth-century literary standards. (“*Ellen G. White’s Use of Uninspired Sources*,” by Robert W. Olson, pp. 13-15)

9. The main error responsible for the current perplexity is not Ellen White’s use of sources, a practice followed by every good writer since the first quill was invented, but the non-biblical view of inspiration that has been current among the majority of Seventh-day Adventists, as well as non-Adventist fundamentalists and evangelicals in general.
10. God does not require that all should be literary critics before they can discern His voice as echoed by His messengers. The texts, “he who is willing to do His will, he shall know of the doctrine” and “by their fruits ye shall know them” offer conditions that can be fulfilled simply so that “the labouring man, though a fool, need not err” Isa. 35:8.

★ ★ ★

APPENDIX THIRTY-SEVEN

Dr. K. Strand's "Philosophy Of History" And
The Apotelesmatic Principle

DR. K. STRAND'S "PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY" AND THE APOTELESMATIC PRINCIPLE

I wish to point out that my use of Dr. Strand's "philosophy of history" approach in support of the apotelesmatic principle may be in error. Dr. Strand has kindly sent me some observations on the matter, and to these our attention must be briefly directed.

Says Dr. Strand:

You have rightly noted in an earlier chapter as well as on page 490 of the present chapter that there is a similarity between what I refer to as "philosophy of history" and what you call the "apotelesmatic principle;" but the two are in reality far from the same, and I should not be cited (*ibid.*) as an example of one "who would affirm the validity" of your apotelesmatic approach.

The "philosophy-of-history" principle which I have in mind, and as illustrated by Ellen White in *AA*, 585-589 and other places, "may be considered," as you correctly quote me on page 419, as "essentially a variation of the continuous-historical mode of interpreting the book of Revelation." Actually — whether applied to Daniel or to Revelation — this sort of philosophy-of-history approach is grounded in the Bible's own view of history: it is a projection forward of the **historical demonstration** of God's **sovereignty and activity in history** as already illustrated in the past history of God's people as recorded in the books of Judges, Kings, and Chronicles. In the ongoing **continuum** of history (I noted in our last session that apocalyptic views history as a continuum), it is a further outworking of the "blessings-and-curses" formulation of Deuteronomy and a depiction of recurring patterns in the developments and processes within the great controversy. In its recurring patterns it bears witness to the realistic "ups and downs" of history and especially to God's constant care for, and work in behalf of, His people in His conquest and defeat of the powers of evil, leading up to the final culmination in the setting up of His own everlasting Kingdom.

Thus "philosophy of history", as I see the principle, is rooted squarely in the Bible's own "philosophy of history", and is fully in accord with the apocalyptic view of history as a continuum. It highlights repetitive patterns within that continuum, demonstrating the sovereignty of God, who "removes kings and sets up kings" (Dan. 2:21). (Letter to Desmond Ford, June 6, 1980.)

Let us observe that Dr. Strand defines the "philosophy of history" principle as involving "a depiction of recurring patterns in the developments and processes within the great controversy." "It highlights repetitive patterns within that continuum." Thus there is a similarity between what I refer to as "philosophy of history" and what you call the "apotelesmatic principle." The former is "illustrated by Ellen White in *AA*, 585-589, and other places."

Now, while Dr. Strand has difficulty in accepting what he thinks I mean by the apotelesmatic principle, I wish to stress that I have no difficulty whatever in accepting his "philosophy of history" approach as here defined. It is essentially this "depiction of recurring patterns" for which I am contending.

However, Dr. Strand has proceeded to delineate where he feels "the great divide" exists. He points out that to his understanding "dual fulfilment is not a characteristic of apocalyptic," that the concept that "Christ could have come here this" is not "a key for interpreting

apocalyptic," that there is no "evidence of any kind within the book that demands [Ford's] sort of apotelesmatic interpretation," that such a view would "repeatedly tantalize His people with the hope of Christ's coming," that such a view also rejects "the sovereignty of God — an essential element in the apocalyptic perspective", that it would destroy "the essential matter of hope and assurance," and that it misdirects "our focus concerning man's role in relationship to the setting up of God's Kingdom as depicted in Biblical apocalyptic." "Where in either Daniel or Revelation is there any indication that the faithfulness or faithlessness of God's people is a dominant factor in determining when Christ shall usher in the Kingdom?" Letter to Desmond Ford from Dr. K. Strand, June 6, 1980.

These objections have been clearly and fairly stated, and are worthy of close attention. First, we should observe that most of the objections are comprehended in the last one. My own discussion of prophecy, including apocalyptic prophecy, has stressed the conditional element which, if negatively fulfilled by God's people, delays the Kingdom, and therefore permits time to unfold a similar crisis or crises, to which God's people are called to respond aright. (See *Daniel*, pp. 48-54; 208-13.) Dr. Strand has reached for the "jugular vein," as he makes his several objections revolve around this one.

In reply, it should be first observed that Dr. Strand is not finding fault with a peculiar position set forth solely by myself. When Ellen White thought of prophecy and the advent it was particularly the apocalyptic prophecies of Daniel and Revelation which concerned her, and she very definitely made the point that such are conditional as to the fact of fulfilment and the timing of such. When the *SDABC* sets forth the characteristics of apocalyptic, and turns to its interpretation, it does not have the reservation about the apotelesmatic principle that Dr. Strand has. Note that it applies Rev. 2 and 3 to the first century, specific eras, and every age. Observe also that it sees that the apocalyptic prophecies could all have been fulfilled centuries ago. (See *SDABC*, 4:725-26; 7:729.)

In the first of the last two references, as the commentary discusses the interpretation of apocalyptic, another article is recommended — "The Role of Israel in O. T. Prophecy." (See particularly pages 25-37 of that article in volume 4.) This splendid treatise is undoubtedly the most accurate and comprehensive statement on the nature of prophecy to be found in our literature, and we recommend it to every reader. It makes it clear that the promises of Dan. 9:24-27 could all have been fulfilled in such a way as to have brought the kingdom of **glory** within the seventy weeks of years — had ancient Israel been faithful.

Dr. Strand, unlike the *SDABC*, appears to reject both the idea that apocalyptic prophecy can have more than one fulfilment, and that it has a conditional element. However, from talking with Dr. Strand, we believe he is actually denying not the fact of contingency, but its overt and obvious presence in apocalyptic. But it must be pointed out that the conditional element even in other prophecies (those not apocalyptic) is rarely overt. Jonah gave no hint of a condition when he cried, "Yet forty days and Nineveh will be overthrown."

Let us enquire as to how our Lord applied apocalyptic prophecy.

His title of "Son of Man" which He used as recorded over eighty times, was taken from Dan. 7:13. The fact that He not only used that title, but placed it in the same setting as Dan. 7, makes it quite clear that it is the latter passage which was the source of the title. See Mt. 24:30; Lu. 22:69. But let us note that throughout the Gospels, Christ is not using it solely of His second coming, but chiefly of His first. And He saw, not only a dual application of Dan. 7:13 prophecy, but a repeated one. Thus Lu. 22:69 is correctly translated in the RSV "**From**

now on ye shall see. ..." Repeatedly the Son of Man comes in judgment as He came to Jerusalem in AD 70. Notice also that Mt. 28:18 applies Dan. 7:13, 14 to the first advent.

Furthermore, Christ's reference to "the kingdom of heaven" is also taken from the apocalyptic prophecies of Daniel. The phrase is derived from Dan. 2:44 where the final kingdom is said to be that brought in by the God of heaven. In Dan. 7:27, it is "the kingdom under the whole heaven" which is given to the saints. Again when we compare Mt. 21:33-45 and Lu. 20:9-18, we find Christ drawing upon Daniel 2 as he speaks of the kingdom to be taken from Israel and given to the church. What makes it absolutely certain that Daniel 2 is His source is the reference to the stone.

The Greek expression translated in most Bibles as "grinding to powder" is a rare one and is borrowed from the Septuagint's translation of Dan. 2 regarding the stone that smote the image. *The Pulpit Commentary*, for example, comments on Matt. 21:44: "The idea is repeated from Dan. 2:34, 35, 44, 45. Christ in His humiliation is the Stone against which men fall, Christ in His glory and exaltation is the Stone which falls on them." Plummer's *Commentary on Matt*, 299, says, "It is from Daniel 2:44 that „shattered into fragments“ or „scatter as dust“ comes."

Note particularly the words of Lohmeyer:

What Daniel says of the Rock is here in Luke (20:17, 18 parallel to Matt. 21:44) described also as the Corner Stone. It is cut out of its place and breaks in pieces all upon whom it falls. And again, this Corner Stone is as immovably set in position as the Rock that holds up the temple; none of its assailants ... will prevail against it; "they will be dashed in pieces." *Lord of the Temple*, p. 46.

Wordsworth's Commentary states:

Our blessed Lord in adopting this phrase from the prophet Daniel, gives a tacit approval to the interpretation which had been given to this prophecy, and which was prevalent in the Hebrew church in his day. "Ask the Jews, what is meant by the Stone? They answer as one man, the Messiah."

The interesting fact is that the Hebrew word for Stone is almost identical with the Hebrew word for Son. As the stone and the mountain conclude the symbolism of chapter 2, and the sanctuary in chapter 8, so does "the Son of Man" in chapter 7. The Hebrews were very familiar with *paronomasia* in connection with the words "stone" ("eben"), "sons" ("banim"), and "to build" ("bana"). Matthew Black says, "The "eben-ben word-play is one of the oldest and best-known in the Old Testament". "Christological use of Old Testament in New Testament," *New Testament Studies*, 18:12 (1971-72). For examples of this word-play see Ex. 28:29. Joshua 4:6, 7, 8, 20, 21; 1 Kings 18:31; Lam. 4:1, 2; Isa. 54:11-13.

Dr. Phillip Carrington discussing Mark 12:10 in his commentary on that book, declares the same word-play is present. Thus we would have the Rejected Son (12:6) paralleling the rejected Corner Stone. Luke's Gospel links with these two symbols of the Son and the Corner Stone yet another, namely the stone of Dan. 2. And Carrington makes the illuminating suggestion that "already in Daniel the Stone conceals the word for „Son“; it is a cryptogram for Israel corresponding to the „Son of Man“ at chapter 7." *Ibid*. Matthew Black gives several examples from rabbinical sources of this recognized relationship between "stone" and "son," and concludes his article with the view that "the Christological stone *testimonia* presuppose an exegetical tradition interpreting Dan. 2:34, 35; 7:13 of Israel, as the

Son-Son of Man, which may already have been messianically interpreted in pre-Christian Judaism; it supplied the second strand in the Son of God Christology of the New Testament. *Ibid.*, p. 14.

Thus Dan. 2, in its symbolic portrayal of the coming of the kingdom of God, applies first to the building of the church temple (Matt. 16:18), and ultimately to the sacred temple of a new world wherein God Himself visibly dwells (Rev. 21:3).

DA, 600 should also be studied in this connection. When Ellen White comments on the words "On whomsoever it shall fall, to grind him to powder" she proceeds to make reference to "Christ their Rock of offence will then appear to them as an avenging mountain." Here in the one sentence Ellen White unites two symbols in Dan. 2, the Stone or Rock and the Mountain. It seems that anyone who will closely study this passage in Matt. 21 and the parallel passage in Lu. 20, will find it easy to distinguish between Christ's references to the corner stone as found in Psalms and his reference to the Stone of Dan. 2, which is referred to in Mt. 21:44 and Lu. 20:18. See also the footnote and marginal reference in the Jerusalem Bible for Dan. 2:28, 45, which are emphatic that Christ's statement does reflect Daniel's.

The evidence to most writers seems overwhelming that Christ applied the kingdom of heaven of the apocalyptic prophecies of Daniel to the first advent as well as the second — in short, He gave these prophecies a dual application.

Let us next ask, "Did Christ also see a conditional element in the apocalyptic prophecies? Mt. 24:34 compared with 24:14 (the condition for the coming) suggests that it was even so. But let us consider a more obvious example. What means the plaintive cry recorded in Lu. 19:42? If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace! But now they are hid from thine eyes."

In *DA*, 576-578, Ellen G. White has summarized our usual understanding of this passage. She emphasizes that Jerusalem could even then have received Christ and stood forever. But what does Lu. 19:42 have to do with apocalyptic? The following verses foretell the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans in harmony with Daniel's predictions. "The time of trouble," "the times of the Gentiles," "the end," "the abomination of desolation," "the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven" — all concepts employed by Christ in connection with Jerusalem's fall — all have their original statement in the apocalyptic visions of the seer of Babylon. Mt. 24:15 and Mk. 13:14 are direct references to Dan. 9:27 and 8:13.

Was Dan. 9:26, regarding the destruction of the city and the sanctuary, conditional? See the SPA commentary *Daniel*, pp. 211-213. It is certain from Lu. 19:42; Mt. 23:37 and Jer. 17:24-18:10, that had Israel been faithful to the Sabbath of the Lord, and the Lord of the Sabbath, the prophecies from Daniel regarding Jerusalem's destruction would have never been fulfilled.

Is there anything strangely heretical in the foregoing? The *SDABC* said it all over a score of years ago. Furthermore, the Sabbath School quarterly on Daniel in the 1960s took the same position. See our appendix on this manuscript.

In his letter commenting on this chapter of the manuscript Dr. Strand repeatedly speaks of apocalyptic prophecy as setting forth a continuum, and contrasts this with "dual fulfilment" which he suggests "is not a characteristic of apocalyptic." Subsequently he inquires, "Where can you find evidence of any message within the book that demands your sort of apotelesmatic interpretations?" Dr. Strand points out that "Daniel 8 parallels Daniel 2 and

Daniel 7" and "portrays the historical continuum culminating in the Messianic victory and establishment of God's Kingdom." The letter advised me to read chapter four of his *Perspectives in the Book of Revelation*, which has bearing on the same issue. There I read, "Both Daniel and the Synoptic Apocalypse give evidence of treating history as a continuum; they do not treat history as simply jumping from the contemporary scene directly to the end-time, with intermediate time left unaccounted for." (p. 35)

Previously we have fulfilled the request to furnish evidence of apotelesmatic messages in Daniel by referring to Christ's use of the fourth kingdom of Dan. 2 and Dan. 7 for both the kingdom of grace and the kingdom of glory, and His employment of Daniel's "Son of Man" in connection with both advents and the times between. But we wish to speak more now to the issue of the "continuum" which Dr. Strand suggests is contrary to what the *SDABC* calls "dual fulfilment."

Let us take Daniel 8, as Dr. Strand suggests, and enquire whether it really gives us a continuum, or does it jump from one scene to the end-time, "with intermediate time left unaccounted for."

Dan. 8 speaks first of Medo-Persia, then of Greece. From the Greek beast comes four horns, and from one of these four Greek horns another little horn. It is typical of Daniel to refer to major empires as beasts and to subsidiary kingdoms as horns. The Roman empire in chapter 7 is presented as a beast, not as a horn. We are distinctly told in the chapter that the four horns represent four kings to spring out of Greece, and then we are told that from one of these will come another king. Observe that according to the symbolism all these subsequent kings belong to the Greek beast. The Roman empire did not spring up from the midst of Greece, it came from Italy. Neither does this little horn power of chapter eight spring up in the midst of the others as the papacy is pictured in the preceding chapter. In this case, the horn springs up "out of one of them" — i.e. it comes from one of the four kingdoms of the Greek world. While Rome existed before the divisions of the Greek world, that is not the case with the power here represented by a horn that follows and originates with the Greek horns. Uriah Smith has the little horn begin by an eastward move to Syria, but the prophecy of Daniel eight has the little horn power first move southwards to Egypt. We stress here the original application to Antiochus, not because we think **that** the application which is relevant to us, but because it demonstrates that an apocalyptic prophecy is not always a direct continuum, but rather can offer a near typical fulfilment which must later be made the mirror of a subsequent, widely separated fulfilment.

It is not a matter of which interpreter shall we follow, but whether we will accept God's own interpretation. Daniel 11 and 12 cover the same ground as Daniel 8 as any cursory survey will show, and they interpret the Dan. 8 vision for us. Medo-Persia, Greece, the first great king of Greece, the four-fold division, the emerging from one of these four of one who would attack the south, and the pleasant land with its sanctuary prior to his fall in the east — all this is found in both prophecies. The scope of eleven and twelve is thus identical with the scope of eight. And the key pronouns which dominate 11:21-45 are "he," "him," and "his." **In at least thirty of the approximately thirty-five usages of these pronouns, it is the same power under consideration.** Thus only by interpreting the chapter apotelesmatically can we create our own continuum embracing successive "antichrists" like pagan and Papal Rome, doing the same work, but in different eras.

Antichrist is the one that springs from the kingdoms of the north (as made clear in vv. 15-21), and is himself called "the king" (v. 36) or "the king of the north" (v. 40). Observe the parallel

in Dan. 8, where the same pronouns are found about ten times after the introduction of the little horn. Note their prominence in vv. 22-25. Observe also that the description found in Dan. 11:21-45 pictures "him," "the king of the north" as doing precisely what the little horn does, and being in character exactly what the little horn was. Cf. 8:9-13 with 11:29-33.

In each instance a power from one of the Grecian divisions attacks the south and then the holy land. The sanctuary is profaned, the daily is taken away, and a desolating abomination is placed. See also the comparison between 8:23-25 and 11:36, 45. In both cases, this Antichrist is called "a king" — one who magnifies himself, does unholy work, and then is brought to his end by God.

Having gone through this background material, we wish again to ask,

"Is it true that we have in Daniel 8 and 11 a continuum rather than an apotelesmatic application of prophecy? **Does Dan. 8 picture the war of pagan Rome against literal Israel and its literal sanctuary and sacrifices, and then continue with a description of the rise of spiritual Rome and its attack on a spiritual sanctuary and spiritual sacrifice!** Is there any hint of such a succession, or is every Adventist interpreter forced to grant at least a dual application of the prophecy of Antichrist and to affirm that what happened with pagan Rome also happened again spiritually with spiritual Rome? While we grant with other Adventist expositors [see our quotations from the 1919 Bible Conference on this] an initial application to Antiochus, we see in him but a shadow of recurring applications of Antichrist, particularly Rome, but the vital question for us at this time is whether we have given here a continuum, or a prophecy that requires at least a double application? Furthermore, **if we deny the conditional element** to this apocalyptic forecast, how do we drop Israel from the picture and introduce the church? Are we still to look for events in the middle east to fulfil the last verses of chapter eleven? Is the glorious holy mountain that unholy den of warring nationalists that is Jerusalem today? And if so, on what grounds can we suddenly switch from this description of Daniel's literal "holy" city, to his spiritual people — Christian believers in the next verse? (Dan. 12:1 speaks of "thy people" — Daniel's people. Compare Dan. 9:24, where the phrase means literal Jews.)

We submit that to make sense of this prophecy and to relate it to the Christian church, we must grant both the apotelesmatic principle, and the conditional nature of the forecast. And this approach agrees with that of our Protestant forebears. They believed that both Dan. 8 and 11 pointed first to the typical Antichrist, Antiochus Epiphanes, who desolated the sanctuary and reared an abomination, and secondly to pagan Rome which destroyed Jerusalem, and thirdly to papal Rome which warred against the spiritual sanctuary.

It is of great interest to learn that E.G. White did not so much see a continuum in this prophecy of Dan. 11 as a case of recurring fulfilment. We quote her letter 103, 1904, which after citing verses from the last portion of the Daniel chapter, declared, "Much of the history that has taken place in fulfilment of this prophecy will be repeated." See *RH*, July 8, 1976. What we have in Daniel 11 is not so much an uninterrupted continuum, but a presentation of an ancient typical crisis which applies again with greater force to eschatological events and intervening crises.

If Dr. Strand insists that all apocalyptic offers a continuum, we would ask, where in Dan. 7, on his principles, **does the first advent of Christ appear on the continuum"? And where does that advent appear on the continuum of Dan. 2**, if we reject the dual application here of "the kingdom of heaven"?

Is Mt. 24 a continuum as *Perspectives* (p. 35) suggests, or does it pass from the terrible tribulation of AD 70 to the final tribulation — the “time of trouble” forecast in Dan. 12:1? Let us perceive that immediately after speaking of the Roman armies around Jerusalem (v. 15), Christ spoke of the Judean flight (vv. 16-20), and then quoted Dan. 12:1 regarding the time of trouble such as had never been since the world began. The context of Dan. 12:2 as well as its wording, makes it certain that this prophecy particularly applies to the end of the world, and can only be projected back to the Middle Ages on the principle of apotelesmatic fulfilment. As with Dan. 8 and 11, it is not possible to find a continuum here in the Olivet discourse. Like the Daniel chapters, having introduced a great crisis which applied to literal Israel, our Lord passed direct to the crisis at the end of the world typified by Jerusalem’s terrible siege.

Must we really insist on an uninterrupted “continuum” rather than recurring fulfilment (in principle) of ancient crises? Ellen White found no difficulty in applying the concept of “the time of trouble” to AD 70, the Middle Ages, and the end of time. Just as she could affirm that many of the events foretold in Daniel 11 had been fulfilled and would be fulfilled again. See also *DA*, 628, where she says that the deceptions predicted by Christ came to pass before the fall of Jerusalem, again during the middle ages, and will finally occur in the last days.

Is it not on this same principle that our commentary can apply Paul’s use of Dan. 9:27 (first fulfilled in AD 70) in 2 Thess. 2:3, 4 to Paul’s own day, the middle ages, and the last crisis? See vol. 7:270. If, as the Adventist commentary contends, all of Revelation could have been fulfilled in the first century, must it not have been so written that crises which would have occurred in the apostolic decades would mirror similar crises throughout the centuries of the delay? We submit that the evidence for the apotelesmatic application of prophecy, even apocalyptic prophecy, is abundant.

It is possible, even yet, that I have misunderstood Dr. Strand. May I therefore in paying tribute to him as a Christian gentleman and a great scholar urge all to read his excellent studies on apocalyptic, including *Interpreting the Book of Revelation* (Ann Arbor, 1976), which has been of great interest and help to the present writer. One thing I am sure of — both Dr. Strand and myself would urge upon others the truthfulness of the following quotation from E.G. White as a valuable aid in the study of prophecy:

God’s work is the same in all time, although there are different degrees of development and different manifestations of His power, to meet the wants of men in the different ages. *PP*, 388.

Because of the nature of God, of Satan, and of men, which remains the same throughout all time, prophecy of a special crisis may find fulfilment on more than one occasion. Seventh-day Adventists, in seeing the little horn of Dan. 8 as representing at least two historical fulfilments (pagan and papal Rome), and likewise Mt. 24 (A.D. 70 and the end of the world), and Joel 2:28 (Pentecost and the latter rain), and the Day of the Lord prophecies, have thereby always acknowledged the apotelesmatic principle.

★ ★ ★ ★ ★