

**A THEOLOGICAL EXAMINATION OF ADVENTIST PRE-ADVENT
INVESTIGATIVE JUDGMENT**

BY

PHUMLANI LUCKY MAJOLA

A THESIS SUBMITTED FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF THEOLOGY

IN

SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY

AT THE

SOUTH AFRICAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

SEPTEMBER 2010

SUPERVISOR: PROF SW KUNHIYOP

DECLARATION

I, the undersigned, hereby declare that the work contained in this thesis is my own original work and has not previously in its entirety or in part been submitted to any institution for a degree.

Signed:  Date: 2010-09-10

DEDICATION

I dedicate this thesis to my wife, Mbalenhle, for her inspiration to complete this project. Many difficult times have come our way during the progress of this work, yet she has been a constant source of strength.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Under God, I first of all want to thank my wife and acknowledge her encouragement and support throughout the completion of this thesis.

Second, I express appreciation for my parents who have motivated me by their faith and belief in the potential entrusted to me by God as an intended blessing to the Body of Christ.

Last, but very significant, is Prof. Samuel Waje Kunhiyop who has been my patient, insightful and inspiring supervisor throughout this project. His professionalism has had a profound effect on me.

ABSTRACT

This research analyses and evaluates the Seventh-day Adventist (SDA) theology of Pre-Advent Investigative Judgment (PAIJ), based on Scripture.

This research begins with a historical analysis of the SDA church and the development of its theology of PAIJ. The research finds that the SDA church was born out of the Great Advent movement (Millerite movement) of the 19th century in the United States of America. This movement, with its emphasis on a premillennial advent of Christ, underwent a Great Disappointment which resulted in the re-evaluation of its theology of the Second Coming (and other theologies) through a long process of decades that produced the SDA church.

Furthermore, the SDA church has shown evidence of *change in its understanding* and *revision in its expression* of its theology of PAIJ. There is a change that shows increasing emphasis on “righteousness by faith” and the vindication of God’s character.

This research also investigates the theological presuppositions to the PAIJ. Results, amongst many, show that the SDA movement derived much of its teaching from Biblical apocalyptic, which is interpreted largely from a historicist approach and the concept termed the “year-day equivalency” or “year-day principle”.

This research also analyses the actual theology of PAIJ. It may be briefly described in this way: (1) “pre-advent” – it occurs before the Second Coming of Christ, beginning from 1844 AD/CE to the close of human probation; and (2) “investigative” – the records of the believers’ lives are *investigated* (from the *heavenly beings’ perspective*) and *revealed* (from *God’s perspective*). The greater objective of this

judgment is understood to be the revelation/vindication of God's justice and grace in his dealings with mankind and sin.

This research analyses Biblical evidences, through exegesis (from the books of Daniel and Hebrews in particular), which this research finds compatible with Adventist theology on this topic. However, much more research would have to be done, by the researcher, on other aspects of this topic so as to produce a holistic verdict on the Adventist theology of Pre-Advent Investigative Judgment.

ABBREVIATIONS

- BDB - Brown F, Driver R and Briggs A
- ESV - English Standard Version
- LXX - The Septuagint Bible
- PAIJ - Pre-Advent Investigative Judgment
- SDA - Seventh-day Adventist

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Chapter 1: Introduction	
1.1 The Research Problem	1
1.1.1 The background to the problem	1
1.1.2 The statement of the problem	5
1.1.3 The elucidation of the problem	6
1.1.4 The value of the study	7
1.2 The Research Plan	8
1.2.1 The research design	8
1.2.2 The research methodology	9
2. Chapter 2: The Formation of Seventh-day Adventism	
2.1 Introduction	11
2.2 William Miller and the Millerite Movement	11
2.3 The Great Disappointment	15
2.4 The Great Disappointment Explained	18
2.5 The Formation of Seventh-day Adventist Theological Distinctives	20
2.6 The Founders of the Seventh-day Adventist church	23
2.7 The Remnant Concept and Ecumenism	27
2.8 Organization	29
2.9 Conclusion	30
3. Chapter 3: The Theological Development of Pre-Advent Investigative Judgment	
3.1 Introduction	31
3.2 The Early Development	31
3.3 Developing Trends	35

3.4 Dissenters and Church Responses	36
3.4.1 Dudley Marvin Canright (1840-1919)	36
3.4.2 Albion Fox Ballenger (1861-1921)	37
3.4.3 William Warde Fletcher (1879-1947)	38
3.4.4 Louis Richard Conradi	38
3.4.5 E.B. Jones	39
3.4.6 Desmond Ford	40
3.5 The Publication of <i>Questions on Doctrine</i>	43
3.6 Historic Adventism	45
3.7 Progressive Adventism	48
3.8 Mainstream Adventism	50
3.9 Basic Shifts in Mainstream Understanding and Expression	50
3.10 Conclusion	52
4. Chapter 4: Theological Presuppositions to Pre-Advent Investigative Judgment	
4.1 Introduction	54
4.2 Divine Authority	54
4.3 The Authority of Scripture	55
4.4 The Inspiration of Scripture	56
4.4.1 Definition	56
4.4.2 Theories	56
4.4.3 Verbal Inspiration	58
4.4.4 Inerrancy	60
4.4.5 Method of Interpretation	61
4.5 Biblical Apocalyptic	62
4.5.1 Apocalyptic Genre	63
4.5.2 Apocalyptic Interpretation	65
4.6 Christology	68
4.6.1 Christ's Death	68
4.6.2 Christ as High Priest	69
4.6.3 Christ as King	69
4.7 Anthropology	70
4.8 Soteriology	71
4.8.1 Predestination	72

4.8.2	Justification	72
4.8.3	Sanctification	73
4.9	Cosmic Controversy	74
4.10	Judgment	76
4.11	Heavenly Books of Record	78
4.11.1	The Book of Life	79
4.11.2	The Book(s) of Deeds	80
4.12	Conclusion	81
5.	Chapter 5: The Pre-Advent Investigative Judgment	
5:1	Introduction	83
5.2	Sanctuary Typology	83
5.2.1	The Atonement Sacrifice of the Heavenly Sanctuary	84
5.2.2	The Inauguration of the Heavenly Sanctuary	85
5.2.3	The Nature of the Heavenly Sanctuary	86
5.3	The Typical Day of Atonement	89
5.3.1	The Final Cleansing/Vindication of the Sanctuary/People	89
5.3.2	The Judgment of Israel by God	90
5.3.3	The Vindication of God and His Sanctuary	90
5.4	The Eschatological Day of Atonement: The time of this judgment	92
5.4.1	The Time According to the Book of Revelation	92
5.4.2	The Time According to the Book of Daniel	93
5.4.3	The Time According to the Typology of the Earthly Sanctuary Services	100
5.5	The Eschatological Antitypical Day of Atonement: The location of this judgment	101
5.6	The Eschatological Antitypical Day of Atonement: The Judge of this judgment	102
5.7	The Eschatological Antitypical Day of Atonement: The objects of this judgment	103
5.8	The Eschatological Antitypical Day of Atonement: The objectives of this judgment	103
5.9	“Righteousness by Faith” and “Judgment According to Works”	105
5.10	Conclusion	106
6.	Chapter 6: An Exegetical and Theological Study of Key Texts	

6.1 Introduction	108
6.2 Biblical Evidence (Daniel)	108
6.2.1 Introduction	108
6.2.2 Context of the Book	112
6.2.3 Exegesis of the Passages	117
6.3 Biblical Evidence (Hebrews)	137
6.3.1 Introduction	137
6.3.2 Context of the Book	138
6.3.3 Exegesis of the Passages	141
6.4 Retroduction of Biblical Evidence	147
6.5 Conclusion	148
7. Chapter 7: Conclusion	
7.1 Review of the Research	150
7.1.1 The objectives of the study	150
7.1.2 The methodology of the study	150
7.2 Conclusions of the research	151
7.2.1 The Conclusion on the Formation of Seventh-day Adventism	151
7.2.2 The Conclusion on the Theological Development of the Pre-Advent Investigative Judgment	151
7.2.3 The Conclusion on the Theological Presuppositions of Pre-Advent Investigative Judgment	152
7.2.4 The Conclusion on the Pre-Advent Investigative Judgment	152
7.2.5 The Conclusion on the Exegetical and Theological Study of Key Texts	153
7.3 The Validity of the Conclusions	153
7.4 The Significance of the Conclusions	154
8. Bibliography	155
9. Appendix	181

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Research Problem

1.1.1 The background to the problem

The PAIJ, according to Adventist understanding, is God's judgment of believers (the eschatological judgment of *unbelievers* is understood as being *separate* and *occurring after* this one) prior to Christ's Second Coming. This work is *revelatory* from *God's perspective* but *investigative* from *the perspective of heavenly beings*. It is understood that God *reveals* from the detailed records (books of life and remembrance) of every believer what *He* has done *for* (and consequently *in*) the believer. Based on what is written therein, each name is either shown to be acceptable or unacceptable according to the standard of divine law. This standard is met only by faith in Christ (Dederen 2000:180; Hasel 2000:833, 841; LaRondelle 2000:887; White¹ 1911:480, 486).

This judgment is *not* designed to inform God about anything, but its greater purpose is to *reveal* to heavenly beings God's *justice* and *grace* in dealing with mankind and sin; in the process it *reveals* the identity of those who have *stayed by faith in* Christ,

¹ Ellen G White

and thus qualify for the resurrection and immortality (Blazen 2000:307, 308; Gulley 2003:447, 448).

It is held in Adventism that this work of judgment began in the year 1844 and that it will continue till the close of probation just prior to the Second Coming of Christ (General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists 2005:18).

An important issue raised by this doctrine is that of the typology of the “atonement”. Adventists believe that the “atonement” occurs in two phases or stages: (1) *at the Cross* (2) and through *Christ’s priestly ministry* in the heavenly sanctuary. Christ’s ministry (itself two-phased) in the heavenly sanctuary culminates in the PAIJ, typified by the second-apartment ministry of the Day of Atonement in the old Levitical system. In this way, the theology of the PAIJ is inseparably intertwined with the theology of the sanctuary, and develops from it (Hasel 2000:842; Rodriguez 2000:391). Blazen (2000:307; cf. Duffie 1989:346; cf. Gane 2007:2; cf. Rodriguez 2000:375) asserts this when he says, “Adventist thinking on the atonement sees it as containing two stages: Christ’s sacrifice for sin on the cross and His priestly ministry in the heavenly sanctuary. There He applies for believers the salvific benefits of His death”.

The hermeneutic used by Adventism in interpreting apocalyptic literature is “historicism”. This is a perspective that understands biblical apocalyptic predictions as sometimes spanning the whole timeline of human history, from the time of the writer till the end of time and the eschatological kingdom of God (Dederen 2000:xx; Johnsson 2000:797; Paulien 2003:15-20; 2006:249, 250, 268; Strand 1992:5).

The importance of the preceding point is understood when one considers the fact that Adventists base a significant part of the doctrine, particularly the “time” element, on the books of Daniel and Revelation which are apocalyptic (Johnsson 2000:784, 797; Paulien 2003:15, 26, 27).

Another foundational apocalyptic hermeneutic used is the “year-day principle” or “year-day equivalency”. Adventists believe that a “day” in apocalyptic contexts (those that demand space of time beyond ordinary days) should be interpreted as a

“year” in literal fulfillment. This becomes a key to the 1844-date concluded in Adventist theology for the beginning of the PAIJ (Johnsson 2000:798; Schwantes 1986:463; Shea 1992:67-110, 139; 2001:89).

This doctrine is unique to SDA theology (Rodriguez 2000:405, 406). This may be particularly due to the fact that the SDA Church was born out of the Millerite Movement which taught that the Second Coming of Christ was to occur in 1844 October 22, based on prophetic interpretation of the book of Daniel 8:14. Seventh-day Adventism developed this doctrine of the Sanctuary and the PAIJ as an explanation of Jesus’ non-appearance on the expected date (Bates 1868:301; White² 1868:308; White³ 1915:422).

This topic of the PAIJ has been a particular bone of contention within the Adventist church, by thought-leaders in the minority, throughout various periods of its history. Characters and scholars like Albion Fox Ballenger (1861-1921), WW Fletcher (1879-1947), Louis Richard Conradi (1856-1939), EB Jones (1919-1949), and during the 1980s Desmond Ford, all of them represent a group within the church that has sought to or still does seek to challenge the historical position of the Adventist church on this topic (Wallenkampf 1989:198-208; Rodriguez 2000:405, 406).

It appears that the internal debate over this topic is closely related to the debate in the area of “inspiration” and “hermeneutics”. An Adventist-African theologian Samuel Koranteng-Pipim in his book *Receiving the Word* highlights a connection between the concept of “inspiration” and the consequential challenges to the Adventist doctrine of the sanctuary and all that it entails (Koranteng-Pipim 1996:8). Based on the fact that the issue of “biblical inspiration” is central to all theology, I perceive a justification for its minor inclusion in this research, especially as it relates to the Judgment (Davidson⁴ 2000:59).

² James White

³ Ellen G White

⁴ Richard M Davidson

Special research on this topic and on those closely connected to it has been done by various theologians of the Adventist community – by both independent and organized research. During the 1980s, the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, through a committee called the “Daniel and Revelation Committee”, developed a special series of scholarly works in elucidation of this topic in eschatology. These works are: *Selected Studies on Prophetic Interpretation* vol. 1, *Symposium on Daniel* vol. 2, *70 Weeks, Leviticus, and the Nature of Prophecy* vol. 3, *Issues in the Book of Hebrews* vol. 4, *Doctrine of the Sanctuary* vol. 5, *Symposium on Revelation-Book I* vol. 6, *Symposium on Revelation-Book II* vol. 7. These works argue in favour of the Adventist position. As shall be seen in this thesis, there are more scholarly articles and books that have been written on this topic.

Another research product is the *Seventh-day Adventist Handbook of Theology* edited by Raoul Dederen (2000) which has been an attempt to express Adventist fundamental doctrines. This book contains various articles that are relevant to our topic, such as *Biblical Apocalyptic* by William G Johnsson and *Divine Judgment* by Gerhard F Hasel. Johnsson (2000:784) speaking about the book of Daniel says, “Daniel foresees a judgment preceding the eschaton.” And Gerhard F Hasel (2000:833) agrees with him about the judgment-prediction in Daniel as he writes about the “time” of the PAIJ: “The timing of this first phase of the universal last judgment can be established on the basis of explicit statements in the books of Daniel and Revelation”.

Another important contributor to the Adventist theological understanding of the PAIJ is Ellen G White, especially through her book *The Great Controversy between Christ and Satan* (1911). Ellen G White (1911:423) considers the topic of the sanctuary and the PAIJ as central to Adventist theology: “The subject of the sanctuary was the key... It opened to view a complete system of truth, connected and harmonious.”

Adventists believe that Ellen G White’s writings are infallible and that they carry authority equal to Scripture (Rice 2000:627). It is however necessary, in all fairness to Adventists, to also point out their claim that although the authority is considered equal, a distinction is made between the Canon and her writings in terms of

“purpose” – Ellen G White’s writings are not to be used as a basis of any doctrine (White⁵ 1911:9).

This particular research will explore the issues of the PAIJ in close consideration of the Adventist church’s doctrinal presuppositions which cannot be disconnected from the topic without its nullification.

1.1.2 The statement of the problem

The main problem

The burden of this thesis is to weight the PAIJ theology, using Scripture as the standard and basis of evaluation.

The key objectives

This is a broad topic, and due to that I shall limit myself to a few fundamental concerns within its scope.

The first concern is to accurately locate and describe the origins and development of the Adventist church and the teaching of the PAIJ. This needs to be done by historical investigation. This is critical in this research because the PAIJ theology is not held in a vacuum, but is an important belief uniquely held by the SDA Church, and is foundational to its existence.

A crucial element in the grasping of any doctrine is the proper and thorough understanding of its presuppositions and foundational issues. Therefore, this research needs to also look into the hermeneutic and doctrinal presuppositions that may inevitably lead to this theology.

An analytical study of Adventist thought on the eschatological judgment as a whole is necessary prior to a particular search on the PAIJ. The theology of the PAIJ needs

⁵ Ellen G White

to be understood through various questions like “When does the Judgment begin?” “How is the Judgment conducted?” “Where is the Judgment held?” “Who is the Judge?” “Why is the Judgment necessary” etc.

A biblical and theological study needs to be conducted of the crucial texts that may credit or discredit this teaching.

I believe that one cannot do justice to the doctrine without the concerns outlined above.

The hypotheses

My hypotheses are: (1) The PAIJ doctrine is more than a mere “face-saving” device resulting from shame and imagination; it is a real theological-historical conviction in Adventism; (2) It is inconsistent to hold on to the foundational premise of “historicism”, the “year-day” principle and typology and not reach the conclusion of the Adventist PAIJ.

1.1.3 The elucidation of the problem

Delimitations of the study

Based on the space limitations of this study, there are certain limitations that need to be deliberately set in place: (1) not all of the Scriptural texts relating to the topic of this research will be have an exegetical report in this paper; (2) in testing the truthfulness of the Adventist teaching on this paper’s topic, it will not be possible to conduct a historical analysis of the prophetic timeline dates and events constituting it.

Presuppositions of the researcher

Since the author's presuppositions will definitely "influence" and "govern" this exegesis, it is necessary to specify them prior to beginning this exegetical study (Smith⁶ 2008:169).

(1) The author believes that the Bible of the Old and New Testaments is the inspired Word of God. As such, it is without error in the autographs.

(2) The author believes that each text has only one primary meaning intended by the author. Consequently, each text carries only one correct interpretation which is the main goal to find through exegesis.

(3) The author believes that a single-meaning text may have multi-applications derived from its principle(s).

(4) The author believes that Scripture should be interpreted literally according to the principles of the grammatical-historical exegesis (see chapter on "Theological Presuppositions to Pre-Advent Investigative Judgment").

(5) The author believes that the task of exegesis goes beyond finding textual meaning; it moves to showing relevance and value of the text to today's multi-contexts.

1.1.4 The value of the study

The theological and ethical value and necessity of this study is seen in light of the following: (1) this is a highly debated teaching, and therefore will be relevant to current thinking.

(2) It is unique to one Christian denomination (the SDA Church) and as thus it stands out like a sore thumb.

(3) This teaching seems to imply, at least from a distance, legalism in that it involves a work of "investigation" of the lives of the saints in judgment. At the same time, the

⁶ Kevin G Smith

Adventist church professes that salvation is only by grace, and not by works. Therefore, there seems to be an inherent inconsistency in Adventist theology.

(4) From the surface, it appears that the Adventist church developed this doctrine of the “sanctuary” and the “investigative” judgment as a *face-saving device* due to the “Great Disappointment” of 1844 when Jesus did not come to earth as was expected by the Millerite Movement, the *parent* movement to the SDA Church (White⁷ 1915:410, 411). It is necessary to determine whether that is really so, or that there is actual biblical support for their notion of the Judgment.

(5) Should this teaching not stand in light of Scripture, my work as a minister in the Adventist church will have to be reformative; it will be necessary for me to engage in discussions with others and share my findings, based on Scripture.

1.2 The research plan

1.2.1 The research design

Chapter 2 will be entitled “The Formation of Seventh-day Adventism”. This will be a brief Adventist background, a summary of the key doctrines and a brief statement on the church’s relationship with other Protestant faiths.

Chapter 3 will be entitled “Theological Development of Pre-Advent Investigative Judgment”. This will be an investigation into the historical origins and development of the PAIJ teaching within the Adventist Church.

Chapter 4 will be entitled “Theological Presuppositions to Pre-Advent Investigative Judgment”. This part of the research will delve into the presuppositional aspects of the PAIJ. These aspects are both hermeneutical and doctrinal. These shall be touched only as they directly connect with our topic.

Chapter 5 will be entitled “The Pre-Advent Investigative Judgment”. This section will deal most directly with the topic through answering the questions of “When does the

⁷ Ellen G White

PAIJ begin?” “How is the PAIJ carried out?” “Where is the PAIJ held?” “Who is the Judge in the PAIJ?” “Why does God do this PAIJ?”

Chapter 6 will be entitled “The Exegetical and Theological Study of Key Texts”. The key biblical texts that will be examined here are Daniel 7:9, 10, 13, 14; 8:9-14; 9:24-27 and also Hebrews 9:6-14, 18-26. These texts are regarded as foundational to the Adventist PAIJ.

Chapter 7 will be entitled “Conclusion”. I shall herein make a summary of the key points made or discovered throughout the research, an acknowledgement of further areas of study and a spiritual-ethical challenge to the reader.

1.1.2 The research methodology

Since this is a Systematic Theology research that is to examine the Adventist theology of the PAIJ, it is imperative that Adventist theologians speak for themselves. This calls for an analysis of Adventist sources. There is need to also analyze the Biblical texts (see below) *directly* since Scriptural support is claimed in Adventist theology. Therefore, this research has an Empirical (Textual Analysis) Design, described by Johann Mouton (2001:167) as the “analysis of texts (religious or literary) in order to understand the meaning of such texts.”

Chapters 2 and 3: This is a historical phase. I will start of by exploring a brief history of the Adventist church and also trace the development of the PAIJ theology throughout its history. Some sections will be comparative (analysing various views) as regards internal debate.

Chapters 4 and 5: This phase will be more theological. The researcher will do an analytical study of Adventist literature so as to produce a balanced representation of Adventist views. Some sections will once again be comparative reflecting internal debate.

Chapter 6: This phase simply conducts an *exegetical* and *theological* study of key texts identified as foundational to the teaching of PAIJ. The data is derived from Scripture. As part of the exegetical study, a *synthetic* (formulating a theory to account for the evidence) study will also be conducted. Some sections will have a

dialogical approach in interaction will various viewpoints on the specified Scriptural texts.

The resources for this research will be books and journal articles. The Adventist positions on various issues will primarily originate from the official publications of the Adventist Church, examples being *Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology* (2000) and the *Seventh-day Adventist Church Manual* (2005 edition). Other Adventist sources will serve mainly to support and elucidate official positions. Non-Adventist scholarship will also be sparingly cited in support or opposition at various points of this thesis as it develops.

Chapter 2

THE FORMATION OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISM

2.1 Introduction

In order to get a balanced understanding of SDA theology of the Judgment, particularly the PAIJ, it is of great necessity to trace the historical development of the church itself. Therefore, it is my intention to trace the historical development of the SDA church beginning with the precursor movement (the Millerite Movement) to the phase of the fully established SDA church. I will herein include a summary of the distinctive beliefs and the historical relationship of the church to other Christian denominations and churches, in light of the Adventist historical concept of the “remnant”.

2.2 William Miller and the Millerite Movement

A historical overview of the life and ministry of a man by the name of William Miller is in order based on the fact that he was the father of the Millerite Movement that was the precursor to the SDA church. James White (1868:27, 28; cf. Gordon 2000:11, 12), one of the founders of the SDA church, considers William Miller as one of the prominent reformers in Christian history that was raised by God: “William Miller, in the hands of God, was the man for his time.... [He was] the man whom God raised up to lead off in the great advent movement”.

William Miller, sharing his father’s and grandfather’s name, was born on February 15th of 1782 in Pittsfield, Massachusetts. He was the oldest of sixteen children.

Four of those were his brothers and eleven of them were his sisters. He became married on June the 29th, 1803 to a Miss Lucy Smith and shortly after settled in Poultney, Vermont (Bliss 1853:2).

Miller experienced bad influences from associates in Poultney who, though not immoral, were deists. He familiarized himself with the writings of Voltaire, Hume, Volney, Paine, Ethan Allen, and others and lived as a deist for about 12 years, beginning in 1804. Having received a captain's commission and joining the army in 1810, in 1812 he returned from the army and moved his family to Low Hampton, New York, to embark on farming as an occupation. Miller renounced deism and embraced the Christian faith in 1816, after struggling with issues like death, eternity, amongst others, and after experiencing an attraction towards the character and relevance of the biblical Savior (Bliss 1853:17, 24, 65; cf. White⁸ 1911:318, 319).

Immediately after accepting the Christian faith, he was challenged by his former associates, who pointed to alleged biblical inconsistencies and mysteries. He could not then respond effectively, but requested time for himself to prove the Bible's self-consistency. Bliss (1853:68) notes William Miller's words to his interrogators: "Give me time, and I will harmonize all those apparent contradictions to my own satisfaction, or I will be a deist still." He reasoned that if Scripture is of divine revelation, it must self-harmonize and be adapted to mankind's understanding. Based on the preceding conviction, he set out on his goal, putting away all commentaries and using the marginal references and a concordance as his only aids. He formulated particular "rules of interpretation" (see *Appendum*) for himself (Bliss 1853:69-71; cf. White⁹ 1911:319, 320).

As a result of his study, William Miller renounced many previously held theories, one of which is the teaching of a "spiritual reign of Christ – a temporal millennium before the end of the world, and the Jews' return" (Bliss 1853:72; cf. White¹⁰ 1911:321,

⁸ Ellen G White

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Ibid.

323). William Miller embraced what may be termed “*Biblical* premillennialism” as distinguished from “*Dispensational* premillennialism”. “*Biblical* premillennialism” teaches that the millennium is to occur after the Second Coming, and that God’s people will spend the millennium in heaven, while there will be desolation on earth. And “*Dispensational* premillennialism” teaches that the millennium will be spent on earth, and that the OT prophecies to the Israelite nation will be literally fulfilled; it is also a time during which there will be “evangelism and testing” (Bliss 1853:74; Timm 2006:5; Webster 2000:936).

It is crucial that we, however, consider briefly at least two more things: his particular teaching on 1843 and 1844, and secondly the extent of the Millerite Movement.

William Miller felt a necessity to study the prophetic or apocalyptic sections of Scripture, being convinced of it as his duty to do so as a Bible-student (Bliss 1853:75; cf. White¹¹ 1911:320). In his study of the prophecies (especially the 2300 days of Daniel 8), applying his rules of interpretation, he came to the conclusion that this period began in 457 BC/BCE and would end in 1844 AD/CE. This conclusion was reached in 1818 AD/CE. Bliss (1853:76; cf. White¹² 1911:327-329) records Miller’s words at this time: “I was thus brought, in 1818, at the close of my two years’ study of the Scriptures, to the solemn conclusion, that in about twenty five years from that time all the affairs of our present state would be wound up.”

Although he was delighted of the results of his study, William Miller was initially reluctant to preach-out his conviction in public. It caused an inner struggle and a loss of peace, in view of what he saw as sufficient and conclusive evidence. There was a long period of about 12 to 14 years from the time of his established faith to the resolution to engage in public ministry, although he was already engaged in personal evangelism. Based on the best evidence, the commencement date of William

¹¹ Ellen G White

¹² Ibid.

Miller's public ministry, in which he would attract thousands, was in the autumn of 1831 (Bliss 1853:80-82, 92, 98; cf. White¹³ 1911:329-331).

William Miller did not set any specific date for the coming of Christ, but this was the work of other proponents of the 1844 message. Bliss (1853:180) notes Miller's words: "I have never, for the space of more than twenty-three years, had *any other time preached or published by me*; I have never fixed on any month, day, or hour, during that period; I have never found any mistake in reckoning, summing up, or miscalculation." But it looks like he was expecting Christ to come at some time between 21st March 1843 and 21st March 1844 (Bliss 1853:172; cf. White¹⁴ 1911:328, 329).

The time passed but Miller and at least the majority of the Millerites did not lose their faith, instead they studied further and another *unofficial* date was set, 17th April (other sources say 18th), after which they were again disappointed. This spring-season period constitutes the *first disappointment* (Bates 1868:293, 294; Bliss 1853:254; Gordon 2000:12).

The last and final date was set to be 22 October 1844 (Tuesday) by Samuel S Snow, based on typology that implicated the tenth day of the seventh month, according to the Jewish calendar. This time was not conclusive to William Miller, at least initially, but it appears to have been accepted by the majority of followers and leaders. In fact, this second date created greater revival amongst the Millerites (Bates 1868:299; Bliss 1853:270, 271; Knight 2000:52, 53; Timm 2006:5).

The day preceding the 22nd was special and filled with calmness amongst the Millerite believers. There were some cases of extravagance, but these were in the minority, although false and exaggerated reports were made that the Millerites wore "ascension robes" (Bliss 1853:275; White¹⁵ 1868:181).

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ James White

The extent of the Millerite Movement was far reaching, particularly in the United States. It was in the United States where it had the greatest effect. Although proponents of this movement published many tracts and pamphlets to be sent throughout the world, there were other similar advent preachers and movements in other parts of the globe that were independently concurrent with the Millerite Movement (Gordon 2000:11; Loughborough 1905:101-105; White¹⁶ 1911:357).

An example of this would be that of Dr. Joseph Wolff: he was a German who travelled throughout much of Europe proclaiming the soon appearing of Christ, to be just a few years different from the expectation-date set by William Miller. Another example was in England where the coming of Christ was preached from as early as 1826. Many ministers proclaimed the same message of the soon coming of Christ, one of whom was Robert Winter, who returned to England in 1842 to preach. In South America, a man by the name of Lacunza echoed the advent message (White¹⁷ 1911:359-362).

2.3 The Great Disappointment

The passing of the set date of October 22, 1844, for the Second Coming was a big disappointment to the Millerites. Arthur L White (1985:53), a grandson to Ellen G White, in his book *The Early Years Volume 1*, estimates the number of Millerites who expected Christ on this date: “no less than *fifty thousand and probably nearer one hundred thousand* scattered largely across the northeastern portion of North America”. This was the only *specific* day that was “positively” endorsed by “intelligent” Millerites, all others were not official (Bliss 1853:276; Gordon 2000:12).

¹⁶ Ellen G White

¹⁷ Ibid.

William Miller had confessed his error after the “first disappointment”, but had stood firm on his faith in the Second Coming of Christ; Bliss (1853:256; cf. White¹⁸ 1911:405-407) recorded Miller’s words: “I confess my error, and acknowledge my disappointment; yet I still believe that the day of the Lord is near, even at the door; and I exhort you, my brethren, to be watchful, and not let that day come upon you unawares”. William Miller also stated that if he were to live again with the same evidences that he had, before the disappointment, he would have had no choice but to do as he had done (Bliss 1853:256).

This time around, after October 22, he once again affirmed his unwavering faith in Scripture. Bliss (1853:277; cf. White¹⁹ 1911:407) records: “although I have been twice disappointed, I am not yet cast down or discouraged. God has been with me in spirit, and has comforted me. I have now much more evidence that I do believe in God's word. My mind is perfectly calm, and my hope in the coming of Christ is as strong as ever.” Miller died on December 20th, 1869 (in his 68th year of age), happy in the Lord, still in the hope of the Coming of Christ. Miller never accepted any more proposed dates for the Second Coming (Bliss 1853:384, 379).

Before I focus on the effect of the disappointment on the Millerite believers, I think I should just briefly mention its effect on the unbelievers, both Christian and non-Christian. Prior to the *Great Disappointment*, many unbelievers were mocking the Millerites, but on the 22nd of October, there was a significant number that had ceased to mock, out of fear that the expectation of the Millerites might in fact be legitimate. However, the failing of the prediction of Christ’s coming revived their mockery, *gradually*. The scoffers did win over to their side quite a significant number of

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Ibid.

Millerites, who thereafter began to mock their former brethren (White²⁰ 1911:403, 404; White²¹ 1868:182).

The adherents of the Millerite Movement experienced struggle with doubt and uncertainty. Joseph Bates (1868:300; cf. Gordon 2000:12), who is recognized as one of the three principal founders of the SDA church, records that words are insufficient to explain the depth of the disappointment: “The effect of this disappointment can be realized only by those who experienced it.”

There were at least 6 *basic* groups that developed from the Millerites, in response and reaction to the disappointment:

(1) The first group was of those who gave up everything altogether, Scripture and religion (Bates 1868:300; Bliss 1853:293; Gordon 2000:12);

(2) The second group is of those who denounced the *whole* movement and declared that it had been of the devil, some of whom seem to have continued as Christians in their regular churches (Bliss 1853:293; Gordon 2000:12; White²² 1911:407; White²³ 1868:182, 265);

(3) The third group asserted that they were correct about the calculations and the event to take place – Jesus had come “spiritually” in the life of the believers (Bliss 1853:293; Gordon 2000:12; Vyhmeister 2000:3, 4);

(4) The fourth group was the largest. It was those who considered the mathematical calculations leading to October 22nd 1844 as in error, but that God did lead the movement and that he was coming soon. It appears that William Miller was in this group (Bates 1868:300; Bliss 1853:293; White²⁴ 1868:194, 199);

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ James White

²² Ellen G White

²³ James White

²⁴ Ibid.

(5) The fifth group was of those who considered the calculations as erroneous and proceeded with further date-setting only to be disappointed again. Groups 4 and 5 are sometimes considered as one, but are here considered different since not all continued date setting (Bates 1868:300; Gordon 2000:12);

(6) The sixth group were those who considered the calculations as correct, but the expected event as wrong. From among these grew the SDA church (Bates 1868:300, 301; Gordon 2000:12; White²⁵ 1868:141).

Ellen G White suggests a parallel between the disappointment-experience of the Millerites and that of Christ's disciples at His first advent, although she considers that of the disciples greater in depth. Christ's disciples were convinced that Jesus was about to ascend the throne of David and deliver Israel from its oppressors. They rejoiced greatly when he rode into Jerusalem on a donkey. Although the disciples were fulfilling God's will and purpose, they were destined for disappointment because of their misconception of a particular truth. They became bitterly disappointed when and after seeing Jesus die. They only understood after the resurrection of Christ that all had been foretold by prophecy. "In like manner Miller and his associates fulfilled prophecy and gave a message which Inspiration had foretold should be given to the world" (White²⁶ 1911:404, 405).

2.4 The Great Disappointment Explained

The sixth basic group (see preceding section) that developed from the *Great Disappointment* considered the Millerite Movement as led by the hand of God, although God allegedly allowed a mistake in their interpretation of the *event* to take place, and not the *time*. James White (1868:229, 230) wrote: "Disappointment by no means proves that God has no hand in the guidance of his people. It should lead them to correct their errors, but it should not lead them to cast away their confidence in God."

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Ellen G White

As they could not locate any miscalculation in the time leading to 1844, October 22nd, they looked more closely at the *event*, to discover what they considered to be the problem: they had ‘wrongly’ assumed, as generally held at that time by many Christians, that the *sanctuary* that is the subject of Daniel 8:14, was the earth or some part of it. Therefore, they had concluded that the *cleansing* of the *sanctuary* must be its *cleansing* by fire at the end of the world, meaning the Second Coming (Bates 1868:301; Crosier 1850:42-47, 57-64; White²⁷ 1911:409).

It does not fall within the objective of this chapter to do a theological discussion of the sanctuary and its cleansing; that will be done later in this research. However, it is of necessity to trace the historical *origin* of the explanation. The historical *development* of the doctrine will also be discussed later in this thesis.

It appears that the theological conviction about the cleansing of the sanctuary was first *triggered* by an experience of a Millerite called Hiram Edson. On October 23, 1844, he was on his way to encourage other disappointed believers when, after praying as he walked, a sudden flash of insight entered his mind; he then comprehended that the sanctuary to be cleansed was not on earth but in heaven. This alleged insight triggered an examination of the Scriptures by Hiram Edson, Owen RL Crosier and Dr. FB Kahn. This examination had taken place in Hiram Edson’s home in New York. Interestingly, Ellen G White claimed to have received a vision from God while at Maine in mid-February 1845, explaining the same conclusion that was reached by Edson and his friends, without any communication between her and Hiram Edson’s friends. Ellen G White had written for a journal published on March 14, 1846, when she became aware of the existence of the study at the Edson home. Edson and Dr. Kahn shared the expense for Crosier to publish their findings in the *Day Dawn*. Then they turned to the *Day-Star* for publication on February 7, 1846, since the other periodical’s dissemination was poor. Ellen G White’s publication was viewed by some as a confirmation of Edson’s and Crosier’s

²⁷ Ibid.

biblical study (Knight 2000:63; Maxwell 1989:132; Vyhmeister 2000:4; White²⁸ 1985:107, 108; White²⁹ 1868:267).

Joseph Bates (1868:301) clearly identifies the above-mentioned understanding of the sanctuary and its cleansing as key to the explanation of the Millerite disappointment: “Light began to shine...as never before, and...a...well-defined position was obtained on the subject of the sanctuary and its cleansing, by means of which we were enabled to satisfactorily explain the passing of the time, and the disappointment following.” James White (1868:308) supports this notion: “The subject of the cleansing of this sanctuary... is the key to the great Advent movement, making all plain. Without it the movement is inexplicable.”

It appears that another explanation, secondary to the preceding one given, was given through a conviction that the Christian church had been given more missionary work symbolized through the three angels of Revelation 14:6-12. Early Adventists soon came to an understanding that they had been preaching the first and second of these, and that they now needed to examine and preach the third message (Andrews 1873:503; Bates 1868:302). It is beyond the objective of this chapter to do a theological analysis of this understanding, but it is enough to say that that view appears to have provided encouragement and hope necessary to their survival within various challenges they faced.

2.5 The Formation of Seventh-day Adventist Theological Distinctives

It is imperative that we locate the origins and circumstances of the SDA theological distinctives because that would help us to understand the Adventist theology of the PAIJ.

I will herein focus on three elements: identifying the distinctives, locating their origins, and the clarifying of the historical role of Ellen G White in the development of Adventist theology.

²⁸ Arthur L White

²⁹ James White

Nancy J Vyhmeister seems to *identify* the “pillar” teachings of SDA theology as: (1) the heavenly sanctuary, (2) the Second Coming, (3) the Saturday-Sabbath and (4) the conditional immortality of the soul (Vyhmeister 2000:4, 5). However, given the church’s conviction and faith in the permanence of “spiritual gifts”, particularly the prophetic gift as manifested through the ‘prophetic’ ministry of Ellen G White, I perceive an inclusion of this teaching as in order (Rice 2000:617, 620; cf. Timm 2006:7; White³⁰ 1868:324;).

Two of the above-mentioned “pillar” teachings are no longer due for discussion here since they have been already and sufficiently dealt with in terms of their origin (the heavenly sanctuary and the Second Coming). But the other three are due.

The SDA theology of the *Sabbath* had its roots with a *Seventh-day Baptist* lady, Rachel Oakes Preston. Being a Millerite herself, she, as early as 1844, introduced the Saturday-Sabbath teaching to some Millerites in Washington, New Hampshire. At about that time, a minister named Elder TM Preble embraced the doctrine and commenced to preach it. This minister called the attention of the Millerites to this matter in a pamphlet dated February, 1845. Some ministers like Elder JB Cook accepted the doctrine but, like Elder Preble who lost interest in it, they later abandoned it. However, many believers embraced it through his labors and did not turn back from it (Andrews 1873:502-504; White³¹ 1868:268, 269).

Another avenue through which the Saturday-Sabbath teaching was promulgated was a Methodist minister Frederick Wheeler, also a Millerite, who was influenced by Rachel Oakes Preston. His congregation began to observe the Saturday-Sabbath about March of 1844. This became the first group of Sabbath-keeping Millerites. By 1850, they had joined the SDA church which was officially organized in 1863 (Gordon 2000:12, 13; Strand 2000:526).

Elder Joseph Bates began to teach this teaching by May 1845, after Elder TB Preble’s tract influenced him from March of that year. James and Ellen G White

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Ibid.

received an 1846-August pamphlet by Elder Bates and through it embraced the teaching that same year. Ellen G White claims to have had a vision the following May which confirmed her then-understanding of the Sabbath (Strand 2000:526, 527; White³² 1882:32; White³³ 1868:75; White³⁴ 1868:268, 269).

The SDA theology of the *conditional (or non-inherent) immortality of the soul* had introduction to them through a Millerite George Storrs, a former Methodist minister. It was in 1841 when he first accepted the belief by reading a tract that was published six years prior by Henry Grew. Storrs accepted the Millerite teaching of Christ's return in 1842. Although this teaching of *conditional immortality* was opposed by William Miller and other leaders, it took deep root within the movement, such that *all agreed* that believers receive their "inheritance" at their bodily resurrection during Christ's Second Coming. The "intermediate state" was deliberately not defined whether it is conscious or unconscious in the statement of fundamental beliefs of the Millerites, spelt out at a conference in 1845 (Bliss 1853:305, 323; Cairus 2000:225).

I could not trace the specific time when Joseph Bates first accepted the view that man is unconscious at death till the bodily resurrection; but it is one that he supported (Bates 1868:310). Knight suggests that Joseph Bates and James White brought the conviction of conditional immortality and annihilationism (the belief that the lost will perish in hell and not suffer endless torture) from their influence of the Christian Connexion (a Christian movement) (Knight 2000:73).

The SDA theology on *spiritual gifts*, particularly the prophetic gift, traces its trigger or introduction to them through the experiences and ministries of various Millerites who claimed the prophetic gift (see *Appendum*): William Ellis Foy, Hazen Foss and Ellen G White. It is Ellen G White who was involved as one of the founders of the SDA

³² Ellen G White

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ James White

church (see section 2.6) (Bates 1868:305; White³⁵ 1868:271, 327, 328; White³⁶ 1860:30-34).

Ellen G White's ministry in relation to SDA theology seems to have been crucial. Early Adventists were inharmonious on many theological topics due to their varying denominational and religious backgrounds, despite their common commitment to the infallibility and reliability of Scripture and on a few other matters, including the doctrine of the Second Coming. At pivotal conferences (the first of which had less than 30 attendants and the second between 35 and 40) of Sabbath-keeping Millerites (later to be named Seventh-day Adventists) where the early Adventists were searching the Scriptures and attempting to unite the church in truth, there would frequently be disagreement. At such times when there would seem to be *no hope of unity*, reportedly, God would visit them by visions through Ellen G White. These visions would point them to the 'correct' points *in* Scripture which explained and removed their dilemma. Sometimes a vision would be merely for confirmation of conclusions already reached through study (Rice 2000:628, 643; Vyhmeister 2000:7; White³⁷ 1868:274, 328, 336).

2.6 The Founders of the Seventh-day Adventist Church

I perceive a necessity for an identification and life-outline of the founders of the SDA church since their experiences and ministries are logically foundational to the Adventist church.

The founders of the SDA church have been largely identified as (1) Joseph Bates, (2) James and (3) Ellen G White. These three would probably not entitle themselves in this fashion, but their co-workers and succeeding generations have done so of them (Bates 1868:305; Neufeld 1976:132, 1584, 1598; Vyhmeister 2000:5).

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ Ellen G White

³⁷ James White

(1) *Joseph Bates* was born on July 8 1792 in Rochester, Massachussetts. His family moved to New Bedford the following year. From school-boy age he desired to become a sailor, and he experienced sea travelling at the age of 15, travelling to Europe. After returning home on June 1815, he continued life as a merchant seaman, married in 1818 to Prudence Nye, a childhood friend, and became a captain in 1820. They had five children, a son who died while an infant, another who died while at sea at the age of thirty-five and three daughters who survived to maturity. He gave up drinking ardent spirits in 1821, and the following year he stopped drinking wine and soon after gave up smoking and chewing tobacco (Bates 1868; Neufeld 1976:132-134).

Bates converted into Christianity in the middle 1820's around 1824. His conversion was prompted by a New Testament placed by his wife into his trunk. He was also sobered by the death of a fellow crew member and gave himself to Christ. He became baptized and joined the Fairhaven Christian Church in 1827. He accepted William Miller's views about the Second Coming in 1839 and eventually committed himself to the movement as a minister. He did not lose his faith by the disappointment (Bates 1868; Neufeld 1976:132-134).

He is the one who apparently introduced the Sabbath teaching to James and Ellen G White. He played a leading part in the general Sabbath-keeping conferences (see section 2.5) that began in 1848. He was also called upon to chair conferences of church leaders when the Adventist church moved toward formal organization which came in May 1863. His wife died in 1871 and he died in 1872, and was buried next to his wife (Bates 1868; Neufeld 1976:132-134; Strand 2000:527; White³⁸ 1868:269).

(2) *James White* was born in Palmyra, Maine on August 4th, 1821. He was born very feeble and had a condition that doctors called "worm fever". He did not enjoy the advantages of school till he was 19 years old due to health difficulties and the inability to read without resting his eyes. However, as he thirsted for knowledge, he entered the Academy at St. Albans at the age of 19. Knowing nothing of English

³⁸ Ibid.

grammar or arithmetic, his friends discouraged him from studying and recommended farming. That advice fell on deaf ears. At the close of a term of 12 weeks, he received a certificate to teach the common branches. He again applied himself for 17 weeks, and this constituted his whole formal education (Neufeld 1976:1598-1604; Vyhmeister 2000:6; White³⁹ 1868:2-25).

He was baptized into the Christian Connection at age 15. After his second year of teaching he learned of the Millerite teachings from his mother, and he heard William Miller preach for the first time in 1842. He soon after devoted himself to the ministry and the Millerite message and was ordained to the ministry of the Christian Connection in 1843. He met Ellen Gould Harmon (later White) before the disappointment, but their relationship developed after they had worked together combating fanaticism in eastern Maine in 1845. They were married on August 30, 1846 and shortly after began to observe the Sabbath (Neufeld 1976:1598-1604; Vyhmeister 2000:6; White³⁶1868:2-25).

James began to publish a paper *The Present Truth* in July 1849, focusing on the Sabbath teaching and their view of the Sanctuary. James White became the editor of a second paper *Advent Review* in 1850, and that year saw the combination of both papers into one *Second Advent Review and Sabbath Herald*, the precursor to today's *Adventist Review*. James White was president of the General Conference from 1865 to 1867, from 1869 to 1871, and again from 1874 to 1880. He also began the journal *Signs of the Times* in Oakland, California. He was attacked by malaria in August of 1881 and died on the 6th (Neufeld 1976:1598-1604; Vyhmeister 2000:6; White⁴⁰1868:2-25).

(3) *Ellen G White* was born on November 26, 1827, in a farm home in Maine, west of the city of Portland. Her parents, Robert Harmon and Eunice Gould Harmon had British ancestry. Ellen had a non-identical twin sister named Elizabeth. At the age of nine, while returning from school, running home apparently to evade trouble, a

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

classmate threw a stone on her which broke her nose. She eventually lost consciousness for three weeks and woke up to realize her facial-disfigurement and physical weakness that afterward affected her whole life. Wishing to die, in the Lord, she would pray for God to prepare her, and this experience proved beneficial to her in her walk with God (Neufeld 1976:1584, 1585; White⁴¹ 1860:7-11).

She could not breathe through her nose for two years, could not attend school consistently and could not hold her hand steadily enough to write. She could and would never again engage in formal education, therefore her education may be said to have closed at the age of nine. Her parents taught her practical education like hat-making, and her later education was gained through reading and contact with others (Neufeld 1976:1585; White⁴²1860:11).

Her family belonged to the Methodist Christian tradition, and her father was a deacon at Pine Street Methodist church. She and her family heard William Miller for the first time in 1839, when he visited Portland. Miller's preaching affected her profoundly; at twelve years of age, she decided to be baptized by immersion although the Methodist minister sprinkled other baptismal candidates. She listened to William Miller again in 1841 when he arrived the second time to lecture in Portland. Her whole family was ousted from the Methodist church because of their commitment to the Millerite message (White⁴³1860:12-14, 22-25).

Ellen G White neither lost her faith in God nor Scripture, although the time of Christ's coming passed. However, her health did deteriorate, having some kind of lung sickness that led to great discomfort; she was not able to breathe well while lying down, so she had to sleep much of the time sitting up (White³⁷1860:28-30).

It was around this time that she, at this time 17 years old, visited a fellow Millerite. There were about five females engaged in a season of prayer, when, reportedly, she was suddenly overpowered by the Spirit of God and immediately realized the first of

⁴¹ Ellen G White

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ Ibid.

hundreds of visions that she would experience in her lifetime. The first vision was of encouragement to the Millerite believers. When she related her vision, many believed it to be of God (cf. Neufeld 176:1558, 1585; White⁴⁴1860:30-35).

I have already discussed her role in ministry to the SDA church (see section 2.5). The many schools, hospitals, and publishing ministries of the SDA church owe their origin to the direction and inspiration that the church received through her ministry. Although the SDA church does on base its theology on her writings, her writings are regarded with special consideration (Neufeld 1976:1586-1598).

2.7 The Remnant Concept and Ecumenism

Without doing a theological discussion of the “remnant” concept in Adventist theology, I believe the historical facts of how they related to other Christian traditions deserve our attention and mention in this chapter. I will not provide the theological reasoning behind the *remnant thinking* except to outline the conclusions reached and how they affected and still affect the church’s relationship with other denominations.

Initially, the early SDA church-to-be had understood, prior to the sanctuary doctrine, that the Lord had ‘shut the door’ on the unbelieving world. This view was *quickly* rejected as they grasped the *cleansing of the sanctuary* view. James White (1868:184, 185 [emphasis mine]; cf. Gordon 2000:13) said: “according to the best light they then had, there was a general agreement that...the door was shut.” “The view, however, that the harvest of the earth was ripe, and that the door was shut, was soon abandoned.” Hence, they did not engage in any evangelistic activities prior to the rejection of the *shut-door* theory.

After developing a connection between the Millerite message (including the pre-eminent ‘truths’ Seventh-day Adventists grasped) and Revelation 14:6-12, they recognized what they termed “the present truth”. This basically meant to them that the Adventists (not as an organization) are identified in Scripture as a people, symbolized by those three angels, having a responsibility to preach the cross of

⁴⁴ Ibid.

Christ in a *context* provided by the message of those three angels – *The Three Angels' Message*. This consequently, together with other passages of Scripture, led to the conviction that Adventists were particularly entrusted with a special message for the last days of this earth (Knight 2000:74; LaRondelle 2000:874-878; Neufeld 1976:1034-1036, 1484; White⁴⁵ 1868:216-268).

Seventh-day Adventists did not, however, see themselves as special in the sense of moral superiority. They regarded other churches, though partially fallen in doctrine, as co-workers in God's work of salvation; they recognized that God had many saved-children in those denominations, and that membership and baptism into the SDA faith alone did not guarantee salvation. They saw a need to 'evangelize' non-Christians *and* those who were fellow children of God by sharing with them the special light entrusted to them particularly in the *Three Angels' Message(s)*. They developed an eschatological system that indicated that the Lord will ultimately gather, prior to the Second Coming, all the saved into *similar truth* (self-consistent and Bible-based doctrine; this is different from the theory that all humanity will be saved; it is only those who exercise faith in Christ that will be saved), but *not necessarily into one denomination*. They did not see themselves as a church to be infallible, but as just like the chosen Israel of the Old Testament; as a people with capability to fall, but that God will always bring them back into the correct path of truth (LaRondelle 2000:887; White⁴⁶ 1868:234-240, 254, 255; White⁴⁷ 1958:390).

This self-identity of the *remnant concept* is rooted deep into their theology such that it affected and continues to affect their relationship with other denominations and Christian traditions. The SDA church has no official position with regard to membership in ecumenical organizations such as the World Council of Churches. They currently have an *observer status*, and they contribute in discussions whenever they can and cooperate, without being 'entangled' with such organizations. The

⁴⁵ James White

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Ellen G White

basis for this situation is the incompatibility that they perceive in the priorities and strategies between themselves and such organizations.

2.8 Organization

The importance of understanding the organization of the SDA church is existent based on the simple fact that any kind of structure influences the quality and nature of theological unity of any church.

It was a long struggle for the infant Adventist church to accommodate consideration and discussion of forming an organization. Foundational to antagonism by some against any form of organization was a fear of stagnancy and corporate apostasy which Adventists ascribed to Christendom in general. However, those fears gradually subsided as need presented itself, so that Adventists could legally own houses of worship, publishing houses etc. Adventists also perceived a need for some form of organization for the purpose of encouraging theological unity in ‘truth’ (White⁴⁸ 1868:299).

Taking the name *Seventh-day Adventist*, in 1860, covenanting to keep the commandments of God and faith in Jesus, they organized local conferences in 1861 and finally established the General Conference, which is the highest corporate authority of the church, in 1863 (Vyhmeister 2000:9; White⁴⁹ 1868:300).

The SDA church administrative structure may be considered a *Representative model* in contrast to the *Independent/Congregational model*, the *Episcopal model*, and the *Papal model*. The *Representative Model* of church governance is based on the principle of “equal ordination” of the entire ministry and the principle of “delegated” “authority” through representation. The official manual of the church (General Conference 2005:26) defines the Representative Model in this way: “This model recognizes that authority in the church rests in the church membership, with executive responsibility delegated to representative bodies and officers for the

⁴⁸ James White

⁴⁹ Ibid.

governing of the church. This form of church government recognizes also the equality of the ordination of the entire ministry. The representative form of church government is that which prevails in the Seventh-day Adventist Church.”

2.9 Conclusion

The objective of this chapter was to trace the origin and development of the Adventist church in a way that connects its theology and its existence.

William Miller was the forerunner and predecessor of SDA theology with respect to the Second Coming of Christ. The SDA church was born from a group of Millerites who perceived an error in the expected event at the termination of the 2300 days prophecy, in 1844. These Adventists developed an understanding that on October 22 1844 Jesus did not “come to earth” but was to come to the “Ancient of Days” (Daniel 7:13) and begin a process of cleaning the sanctuary, culminating to His receiving of the kingdom at His Coming.

No singular individual was responsible for introducing the distinctive teachings of Adventism to the early church; but rather, studies were conducted in which various teachings were ‘sieved’ and eventually formulated Adventist theology; Ellen G White’s ‘prophetic’ ministry served to confirm results of study, and introduced some missionary *strategies* for the church such as the establishment of publishing houses, hospitals and schools.

The theological system developed by Adventists resulted in limited association with other Christian denominations, without arrogance being the necessary attitude.

Much more may be observed about the growth and life of the SDA church, but sufficient has been noted in this research to serve the purpose of the research topic.

Chapter 3

THE THEOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT OF PRE-ADVENT INVESTIGATIVE JUDGMENT

3.1 Introduction

The history of the SDA church significantly overlaps the history of the PAIJ theology. This is greatly due to at least two facts: firstly, the Adventist church originated on the understanding that the 2300 prophecy of Daniel 8, ended in 1844, but that the termination of that period was signified by Christ's change of phase in his priestly ministry; secondly based on the fact that this teaching is unique to SDA theology, it can never be justly discussed in isolation to Adventist history.

Since this research has already discussed the origins of the Adventist theology of the Investigative Judgment, I shall herein focus mainly on the development and challenges of this teaching throughout its history from 1844 till year 2009 AD/CE. I do not, however, intend to be exhaustive.

3.2 The Early Development

It appears that the Sabbatarian Adventists (later to be Seventh-day Adventists) would arrive to a consensus on the nature of the sanctuary by 1847, and would agree on the meaning of the "cleansing" at some time in the mid-1850s (Knight 2000:61, 71). In this section of my research I intend to trace the development of this

teaching by the most significant contributions and contributors between 1844 and 1857.

The origins of this teaching have already been located in the insight of Hiram Edson, Owen RL Crosier and Dr. FB Hahn (see previous chapter, section 2.4). It was however *greatly underdeveloped*. They understood that Jesus' ministry as High Priest, typified by the Old Testament priestly ministry in the sanctuary, had entered into a new phase where He entered into the Most Holy Place in the heavenly sanctuary, to perform a particular task of removing the record of sins (*cleansing* of both the heavenly sanctuary and individual believers), based on His blood, prior to His return to earth (Crosier 1846:37-44; Edson 1921:4, 5; Knight 2000:62, 63; Maxwell 1989:132; Rodriguez 2000:405;). It took the work of others to mature Adventist theology on this topic.

Joseph Bates was made aware of Hiram Edson's and his friends' view of the heavenly sanctuary sometime in 1846. In that encounter with them, he also shared with them his then new understanding about the Seventh-day Sabbath. In his second edition of his book *The Seventh-day Sabbath, A Perpetual Sign* (January 1847), Bates appears to have been the first to see a connection between Christ's entry into the Most Holy Place and the then new Sabbath emphasis and interest among Adventists, after reading Revelation 11:19, which brings attention to the "ark" of the heavenly temple, containing the Ten Commandments (in the earthly sanctuary). His suggestion was confirmed in his mind when Ellen G White received visions a few months later, calling attention to the commandments of God and the Sabbath in particular, since it was the one commandment most commonly ignored (Andrews 1873:503; Knight 2000:65, 66, 68, 70; Maxwell 1989:137).

Joseph Bates, in his book which seems to be out of print, *Second Advent Way Marks and High Heaps* (May 1847), also made a direct connection between the *cleansing* of the heavenly sanctuary and the concept of *pre-advent judgment* of the saints, in that God decides the cases of the believers in the book of life; he saw pre-advent judgment as intrinsic to Christ's priestly ministry in the Most Holy Place. He made a link between the judgment scene of Daniel 7 and Revelation 14:6 with the ministry of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary (Damsteegt 1989:42; Maxwell 1989:138, 139). This

relationship of “cleansing” and “judgment” was further developed by others, especially James White, so that it was concluded that “the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary included the investigative judgment of God’s people, followed by the judgment of the wicked and the final disposition of Satan, represented by the figure of Azazel in Leviticus” (Rodriguez 2000:405).

Joseph Bates’ contributions to Adventist theology, in general, appear to have been crucial to the existence of the SDA church, and its self-identity as a remnant movement for truth (Knight 2000:71). Although he did not originate the key doctrines of the church (the heavenly sanctuary, the Second Advent, the Sabbath, and conditional immortality), he was the one who interlaced them and developed an eschatological theology which would form the heart of Adventism (Gordon 2000:18, 50; Knight 2000:68). Knight (2000:68) puts it in this way: “Bates’ [books between 1846 and 1849 were vital because they] developed a theology that integrated the key doctrines.... Beyond that, Bates set those integrated doctrines in the historical flow of events moving from Revelation 11:19 through the end of chapter 14. *His development of that integrated package in essence formed the platform for what would become the core of Seventh-day Adventist theology.*” George R Knight’s analysis of Bates’ contributions has led him to the publishing of a book entitled *Joseph Bates: The Real Founder of Seventh-day Adventism* (2004), in which he expresses similar notions.

Although James White believed in the two-phase priestly ministry of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary, he initially could not agree with Joseph Bates on the pre-advent judgment *of the saints* (when linked to the “cleansing” of the sanctuary). James White (1850:49) said in *The Advent Review* in September: “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.” James White had understood the judgment as *of the wicked*, located concurrently with the millennium and introduced by the Second Advent (White⁵⁰ 1847:23, 24). The only sense of pre-advent judgment *of the saints* that James White understood was in the form of the saints being examined or

⁵⁰ James White

tested by the then preached message of the gospel in the context of the Sabbath (Maxwell 1989:144, 146; White⁵¹ 1851:103;).

In *The Review and Herald*, January 29, James White (1857:100) appears to have had a change of mind sometime between 1850 and 1857, so much that he published a full-blown article and popularized the term “Investigative Judgment”: “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” (White⁵² 1857:323; Knight 2000:81; Maxwell 1989:147). The term “Investigative Judgment” was however first used a month earlier on January 1st, in an article for the same periodical by Elon Everts (1857): “It appears that...the righteous dead have been under investigative judgment since 1844.” This particular term has been used to refer to the pre-advent judgment ever since.

Ellen G White’s “confirmatory” contributions toward an Adventist theology of the PAIJ were of some significance although she rarely wrote of it emphatically or in detail until the 1880s when she wrote the fourth volume of *The Spirit of Prophecy* (1884) which was enlarged into *The Great Controversy* (1888). She did however allegedly receive early, prophetic, and confirmatory visions from the Lord with reference to this topic (Damsteegt 1989:43; Gordon 2000:29, 30; Maxwell 1989:153).

Just to name some, her first vision, *related to this topic*, was received in December 1844 and published in the *Day Star* in January 1846; she was allegedly shown the physical reality of a place in heaven containing the ark resembled by the one of the earthly sanctuary (Damsteegt 1989:25, 43; White⁵³ 1847:16).

Ellen G White had two more visions, one in February 1845, and the other in October 1845, both published in March 14, 1846, after Crosier’s article in the *Day Star*; they indicated that the Father had moved into the Most Holy Place, and portrayed the

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ Ellen G White

ending of the work of Christ in the Most Holy with heavenly and earthly events (Gordon 2000:29; White⁵⁴ 1846; 1882:54-57).

Following that one, she received “a more extensive one” in April 3, 1847, which also confirmed the integration and relationship of the sanctuary, the Ten Commandments, and the Sabbath (Damsteegt 1989:44, 45; White⁵⁵ 1847:18).

The next, given in January 1849, revealed that Jesus would not leave the Most Holy Place “until every case had been decided” and then probation on mankind will close (White⁵⁶1882:36-38).

It should be kept in mind though, with regard to her early visions, that the SDA church was not fully established until 1863, and even the four cardinal theological distinctives were not well developed until at least the 1850s. In other words, Ellen G White could not have had any established authority as a prophet prior to that time; she was relatively unknown (see previous chapter).

3.3 Developing Trends

Adventist church historian George R Knight in his book *“A Search for Identity”* (2000) discerns four general trends that he considers as obstacles to progress for the early church (particularly between the 1850s and the 1880s); these trends would also back-fire against the church during perilous times ahead (till today). He identifies them as the following: (1) “a temptation towards legalism”, (2) “the abrasive manner in which...ministers often did evangelism”, (3) “to preserve and protect their theological insights rather than to continue to progress in understanding”, and the (4) “[giving] a larger role to Ellen White’s writings in explaining issues” (Knight 2000:87-89).

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ Ibid.

The noted inclinations tended to stifle theological and constructive change for the church, but the resultant challenges would tend to inspire change and some development (Knight 2000:160, 161; see section 3.9).

3.4 Dissenters and Church Responses

The SDA church, in its history, has not had a theological challenge-free experience from within itself. There have been at various time-periods influential leaders who debated and rejected the Adventist view of the PAIJ. Examples are DM Canright, Albion Fox Ballenger, WW Fletcher, Louis Richard Conradi, EB Jones and Desmond Ford (Rodriguez 2000:405, 406).

This research does not have sufficient space to run a detailed account on all of these and their views. Therefore, I shall herein limit myself to a very brief outline of their experiences and views.

3.4.1 Dudley Marvin Canright (1840-1919)

DM Canright was an ordained minister of the SDA church from the age of 25. He rose up in recognition up to the level of membership into the General Conference Committee for a while. He left and rejoined the church more than once, but ultimately severed his connection with it in 1887 and joined the Baptist ministry (Neufeld 1976:231; Wallenkampf 1989:198).

Canright is most known for his book *Seventh-day Adventism Renounced* (1889), in which he, among other issues, argued against the Adventist theology of the PAIJ. He argued that there is absolutely no Biblical support for the theory of pre-advent judgment of the saints, and saw Adventist theology in general as a broken system centered on an idea with “absurdity” (Canright 1889:117, 127). DM Canright (1889:119) used the fact that ORL Crosier, the first publisher of Hiram Edson’s concept of sanctuary cleansing, had also renounced it during early Adventism: “It looks bad for a theory when its very authors renounce it”.

Norman F Douty (1964:108), a non-Adventist scholar who has been known for his anti-Adventism criticism and even against Walter R Martin’s evaluation of it, in his book *The Case of DM Canright*, suggested that the book of DM Canright was the

one that caused the most damage to Adventism, up to that time: “It has perhaps done greater injury to the Adventist cause than any other book ever published”.

3.4.2 Albion Fox Ballenger (1861-1921)

Ballenger first worked as a school teacher and then a minister for the SDA church, serving successfully in both the United States and in Britain (Neufeld 1976:121; Wallenkampf 1989:199, 200).

He did not reject the whole idea of pre-advent judgment, but rather formulated his own version of it, and was given a chance to present his views at the 1905 General Conference, in a committee of 25, after which his ministerial credentials were withdrawn, at least temporarily to give the committee time to study the issue. Four years later, after seeing no response about his views, he published the book *Cast Out for the Cross of Christ* (1909) (Neufeld 1976:121; Wallenkampf 1989:200).

In that book Ballenger argued that there was a two-apartment sanctuary in heaven. But the variance with the Adventist position was primarily the following: he argued that this heavenly sanctuary, the first apartment, was in use *prior* to the Cross-event; the angels ministered in the first apartment under an immortal Melchizedek as high priest; Jesus became man’s substitute immediately after the Fall of man, and was therefore barred from the Father’s presence then; Jesus gained access to the Father after the Cross-event to present his own shed blood; Ballenger saw the prayer of John 17:5 where Jesus requests the access to the glory of his presence as a fulfillment of Christ resuming the experience of God’s presence, a position “which He did not occupy after sin entered”; Christ therefore entered the Most Holy place after the cross where he then made atonement at the mercy seat and, 1800 years later, in 1844, began a work of judgment and cleansing (Ballenger 1909:35, 36, 44-46, 56, 67, 72-76; Wallenkampf 1989:200-202).

In response to this book, EE Andross (1868-1950), who was at that time an administrator in California, authored *A More Excellent Ministry* (1912), to which Ballenger again responded with another book *An Examination of Forty Fatal Errors Regarding the Atonement*. In this book he amplified some of the points argued in his first book (Wallenkampf 1989:200).

3.4.3 William Warde Fletcher (1879-1947)

He served the church as evangelist and administrator in Australia and Southern Asia. From his studies of the sanctuary, Fletcher received new convictions about the work of Christ as our High Priest. After presenting his views to leading Australian brethren in December 1929, he was asked to elaborate and expand himself more fully, which he did in February 1930 (Neufeld 1976:464; Wallenkampf 1989:203).

Fletcher was convinced that the SDA church has erred about the pre-advent judgment teaching. He found no Biblical foundation for the doctrine and that it is also incompatible with the gospel of the New Testament (Wallenkampf 1989:204). In his book *The Reason for My Faith* WW Fletcher (1932:106) argues against the PAIJ theology and combats the concept of *transferred sin*, by the sacrificial blood sprinkled on the veil in the sanctuary, and says, “there is no prophecy that can be shown to be in conflict with the teaching that sin is expiated by the blood of Christ, and that Christ entered the Holy of Holies in heaven at the time of His ascension. It is only our [the Seventh-day Adventist] interpretation of some of the prophecies and types that is in conflict with those truths”.

The Australian leaders met with him in April 1930 and discussed his views with him. After that he was invited to go to the United States with the purpose of further study into the matter with certain leaders. He was granted a hearing of some 13 General Conference Committee members, but his view was however found wrong after several discussions. He consequently severed his relationship with the SDA Church (Wallenkampf 1989:205).

3.4.4 Louis Richard Conradi

Conradi was German born and later migrated to the United States at the age of 17. He joined the SDA church in 1878 and pursued studies for the ministry at Battle Creek College, today known as Andrews University, an Adventist institution. After working enthusiastically for the German speakers in the Midwest, in 1886 the General Conference sent him to labour in Europe, where he travelled and worked in both Germany and Russia. He became the first chairperson of the General European Conference, and in 1903 became the vice president of the General

Conference. He was positioned as head, president, of the European Division until 1922 (Wallenkampf 1989:205).

It appears that Conradi's doubts about the Pre-Advent Judgment teaching rested largely on the Adventist interpretation of Daniel 8:13-14. He was the one who introduced the currently held Adventist view that the "daily" signifies Christ's *continuous ministry* in the heavenly sanctuary, although that was possibly suggested by ORL Crosier in his article of *Day-Star Extra*, February 7, 1846. However, he believed that the 2300 days of Daniel 8 have no relationship to the cleansing of the *heavenly* sanctuary, but rather referred to Islam, and that the Adventist teaching of PAIJ was mere fiction. Conradi argued that "The Lord avenged Himself on Islam because it suppressed God's people in the East, elevated Mohammed as the false prophet above Christ, and defiled the temple rite until today. He did this at the end of the 2300 year-days, in that He compelled the Turk, in 1844, to exercise tolerance toward all who would be Christians" (Wallenkampf 1989:206, 207).

He had nurtured his views for decades, but after publishing, as editor, an article of his views, he was eventually invited for a hearing on October 13-16, 1931. The committee consisted of 27 members (including all General Conference officers), at Omaha, Nebraska, Autumn Council. The interviewing committee found his views unacceptable, and as a result there was mutual agreement that he should resign from every church office he held. He was further informed not to air his views among church members, as a condition to the retention of his credentials. However, after presenting his views by voice and pen and unsettling members, a recommendation was sent to the General Conference (GC) for the withdrawal of his credentials. This recommendation was received at the GC on August 13, 1932. He was in this way separated from the Adventist church (Neufeld 1976:348; Wallenkampf 1989:207).

3.4.5 EB Jones

Unlike the preceding examples of ex-Adventist, EB Jones, a former Adventist missionary publishing house manager in India, did not separate himself with the church based on doctrinal convictions but rather with the church in general. He however raised his objections with the sanctuary doctrine after having left in

September 1943. He joined the First Baptist Church in Minneapolis, and was ordained to the Baptist ministry two years later (Wallenkampf 1989:208).

Jones (1943:9-10) argued against the division of the heavenly sanctuary into two apartments: “the veil of the sanctuary represented the flesh of Christ (see Heb 10:20). It follows inevitably that, since the veil represents the flesh of Christ, *the two apartments on earth did not represent two apartments in heaven*. The incarnate Christ stands between God and man today just as the veil intervened between God and man in the tabernacle of old”.

He also combated the idea that Daniel 8:13-14 had any connection with the beginning of the heavenly pre-advent judgment and cleansing of a heavenly sanctuary in 1844 (Jones 1943:10-11).

Jones (1943:12) also rejected the Adventist theology of a pre-advent judgment based on his understanding of the gospel: “One who believes the ‘investigative judgment’ doctrine of Adventism cannot have a true conception of the gospel.... The two are as opposite to each other as sin to righteousness.... Everyone who really knows and believes the gospel... *knows that he has been saved*. How can one enjoy the Good News of salvation if he must wait until God examines the books to see whether he is worthy?” It appears therefore that Jones saw the PAIJ as some kind of waiting period for the believer, with uncertainty of the judgment results.

3.4.6 Desmond Ford

Perhaps the most prominent and most controversial of opponents of the teaching of PAIJ is Dr Desmond Ford. Ford was born in Townsville, Queensland, Australia, 1929. He was introduced to Adventism at age nine, and baptized at age 16. Desmond Ford grew up to be a very eloquent theologian and Bible scholar within the Adventist church. He earned a Master’s Degree at Andrews University (Systematic Theology), two doctoral degrees, in 1961 at Michigan State University (Rhetoric), in 1977 at University of Manchester (New Testament Theology – *The Abomination of Desolation in Biblical Eschatology*) under Professor FF Bruce. His prominence appears to have begun around the 60s and 70s. Ford was also one of the members, in both Australia and the United States, of the Biblical Research Committee, the

official theological advisory of the world-wide Adventist church (Ford 2008:138, 141, 142; Wikipedia.org/wiki/Desmond_Ford accessed on the 21st of February 2010).

Desmond Ford first experienced doubt about the Adventist position of the PAIJ when he was 15 years old. This doubt was created by his reading of the book of Hebrews 9 from which he understood that the Day of Atonement applied to the crucifixion of Christ. The more widely he read, the more questions he had about this teaching (Ford 2008:20, 146). In his recent book, with his wife Gillian, *For The Sake of the Gospel: Throw out the Baby Water but Keep the Baby*, Ford (2008:99) notes the same thing: "Hebrews 9 is the one chapter in the New Testament that deals at length with the Day of Atonement. It is the one chapter that refers to the cleansing of the sanctuary over and over. Furthermore, it is the one chapter that explains the meaning of the two apartments." Ford (2008:20) explains: "the first apartment pointed to the Jewish age, and the second to the Christian age".

At around the age of 16, Ford also read various scholarly works like *An Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures*, by Thomas Hartwell Horne. In this work he encountered for the first time the "apotelesmatic" hermeneutic principle which he felt was valid for certain passages like Matthew 24 (Ford 2008:143). This principle Ford (2008:143) understood as meaning that many prophecies had multiple fulfillments, early and later: "I learned about what has often been called the apotelesmatic principle, whereby it is seen that many prophecies had both an early and a later focus and sometimes more than one later application where the same principles apply, but with fulfillment on a wider scale".

As a result of his hermeneutic, Desmond Ford interpretes Daniel 8 "the little horn" and 11 "wilful king" as referring to Antiochus IV Epiphanes, a Syrian king. This interpretation is contrary to the Adventist historicist one which applies the same prophecies directly to the papacy (Ford 2008:145).

Ford (2008:19, 21, 22) believes in a pre-advent judgment and in the last day significance of Daniel 8:14, but his understanding is different and he separates the cleansing of the sanctuary from an investigative judgment: "Never confuse the cleansing of the sanctuary with the Investigative Judgment.... I do believe in a pre-

advent judgment. If there are to be two resurrections, there has to be a decision as to who will be in the first. *But it's an instantaneous thing....* I firmly believe in a pre-advent judgment.... Two-thirds of my book on Daniel was trying to support a latter-day significance for Daniel 8:14, which I believe”.

In view of the amount of time that had passed from 1844 to his time, he also feels that is an evidence of the inaccuracy of the Adventist position which gave the impression of a short judgment (Ford 2008:144).

Due to the pressure on the leaders of the General Conference, by some Adventist brethren who opposed Ford's theology, and a sent recording of Ford's presentation which was accompanied with a request for his dismissal, Ford was called in November 1979 to the church Headquarters. He was then requested to write up his views (the document was entitled “*Daniel 8:14, the Day of Atonement, and the Investigative Judgment*”, also called the *Glacier View Manuscript*), and was given housing and 6-month leave for that purpose (Ford 2008:149).

On the 11 of August 1980, the six-day discussion session began in Glacier View, Colorado. Although it was stated by the presiding president of the church, Neal Wilson, that the meetings were not Ford's trial, Ford states that before the end of the week “it was”. The session had 111 participants, consisting of administrators and scholars. After the various small group discussions and session reports on various topics based on the Glacier View Manuscript, and Ford's answers to questions, Dr Desmond Ford's variant aspects of his theology were voted against, although some points of agreement were found. He eventually lost his church employment and credentials without the annulment of his ordination. He decided to retain his church membership, at least initially (Ford 2008:152; Wikipedia.org/wiki/Desmond_Ford accessed on the 22nd of February 2010). Ford (2008:152) states: “In 1980, Desmond Ford had his employment as an SDA minister terminated because he was at variance with the historicist views of traditional SDAism”.

Following his terminated employment by the church, Ford established his own interdenominational ministry, *Good News Unlimited*, which still exists. He still considers himself an SDA, keeping the Saturday-sabbath, with hope in the Second

Coming (Ford 2008:3; Wikipedia.org/wiki/Desmond_Ford accessed on the 22nd of February 2010).

A common thread running through all the “dissenters” of the PAIJ may be seen to be one or both of these: (1) a failure to find sufficient or any Biblical ground for the doctrine, and (2) a perception that the concept of an investigative judgment is not compatible with the pure gospel of *justification or righteousness by faith alone* (Wallenkampf 1989:213).

The list of ex-Adventists based on their rejection of the Adventist theology of the PAIJ, amongst other issues, is ongoing with the passing of time. Recent publications of these include *Exposing Seventh-day Adventism* (2005) by Russell Earl Kelly, and *It is Ok not to be a Seventh-day Adventist* (2008) by Teresa Beem. These books have more or less the same arguments as those already mentioned by their predecessors.

3.5 The publication of *Questions on Doctrine*

The book *Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine* (1957) – abbreviated *Questions on Doctrine* - has been a prominent and controversial book in Adventist history. The contents of this book have been credited with the responsibility of facilitating a schism of Adventism into at least two streams (later three streams), which I will discuss in the following sections: “mainstream”, “historic” and later “progressive”. Knight (2003: xiii) puts it this way: “*Questions on Doctrine* easily qualifies as the most divisive book in Seventh-day Adventist history.... Its release brought prolonged alienation and separation to the Adventist factions that grew up around it” (Douglass 2007; Knight 2000:166; Nam⁵⁷ 2007:1; Timm 2007:1).

The book was published by the church in response to numerous interactions with and questions from evangelicals in the 1950s. Walter R Martin, later joined by Donald Grey Barnhouse, was in investigation of SDA beliefs so as to ascertain whether Adventism could be legitimately considered evangelical. Meetings were

⁵⁷ Julius Nam

scheduled with representatives of the Adventist church: Le Roy Edwin Froom, Walter E Read and later Roy Allan Anderson. Donald G Barnhouse consequently endorsed Adventism as evangelical and Walter R Martin published his conclusions in his book which I have failed to locate, *The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism* (1960) in which he reportedly also endorsed Adventism as evangelical, at least those who believed according to *Questions on Doctrine*. He later published another book entitled *The Kingdom of the Cults* (1965) in which he reiterated the same position (Douglass 2007; Knight 2003: xiii-xvii, xxiv; Nam⁵⁸ 2007:1; Wikipedia.org/wiki/Walter_Martin accessed on the 7th of March 2010).

Before we look at the various factions resulting from those events, let us look at the issues. The first aspect that facilitated controversy was the “nature of Christ”. The book took the position that Christ took upon himself human nature fallen only in the sense of *carrying the effects* of sin, but *not infected* by sin. *Questions on Doctrine* (1957:54, 55) declared: “In...His [Christ’s] natures, the divine, and the human, He was perfect; He was sinless.... We emphasize again that His human nature Christ was perfect and sinless”. The authors also quoted a number of statements from Ellen G White, opposing the previously held traditional understanding of the nature of Christ.

This position indicated a change or shift in Adventist thinking; prior to the publication of *Questions on Doctrine*, the average Adventist had the position that the human nature of Christ was tainted with inherent tendencies to sin, although He never submitted to sin in thought, word or action. In view of this shift, it is understandable why some Adventists rose in opposition to this particular section of the book (Kirkpartick 2007:8-11; Knight 2003: xvii; 2000:168-170).

The second issue was the “atonement”. Prior to the publication of *Questions on Doctrine*, Adventist writers almost exclusively, if not entirely, never used the word “atonement” in reference to the accomplished work of the cross. This way of using the word “atonement” was inherited from William Miller and his movement. Early

⁵⁸ Ibid.

Adventism believed in the “finished” redemptive work of Christ on the cross and that it was the basis of His Priestly ministry in heaven, but the word “atonement” was rather used for his heavenly priestly ministry. The book *Questions on Doctrine* (1957:343) articulates this position in this way: “Those who view [the] work of Christ as a completed atonement, apply this term *only* to what Christ accomplished on the cross. They do not include in their definition the application of the benefits of the atonement made on the cross, to the individual believer. There are those however, who believe the atonement has a much wider connotation”. This position on the “atonement” did not indicate any *essential* change but rather a *terminological* or *semantic* change (Baldwin⁵⁹ 1989:159, 169, 170; *Questions on Doctrine* 1957: 348; Smith⁶⁰ 1898:237; Wallenkampf 1989:201).

The publishing of the book *Questions on Doctrine*, as a product of the Adventist/Evangelical conferences, and Barnhouse’s and Martin’s acceptance of Adventism as evangelical, *initially* resulted with the development of four groups: two *without* Adventism and two *within* Adventism. Julius Nam, in his paper developing from his doctoral dissertation at Andrews University, at the *Questions on Doctrine 50th anniversary conference* (2007), recognizes these groups and describes them as “Pro-Adventist Evangelicals”, “Anti-Adventist Evangelicals”, “Pro-*Questions on Doctrine* Adventists”, “Anti-*Questions on Doctrine* Adventists”.

Since this research is focused on Adventist thought I shall not analyze the *non*-Adventist reactionary factions, but I will briefly discuss the Adventist factions polarized by the publication of this book.

3.6 Historic Adventism

One of the resulting streams in Adventism is sometimes referred to as “historic”, “conservative”, “traditional”, “right-wing”, “independent right” or “fundamental”, depending on the person labeling or referring to it. It is a subgroup within the Adventist church that has as a goal the preservation of what it considers the

⁵⁹ Dalton D Baldwin

⁶⁰ Uriah Smith

traditional theological positions of the church, and generally regards the church leadership as in apostasy with respect to doctrinal “pillars” of the early Adventist church. This group constitutes *Anti-Questions on Doctrine* Adventists (Koranteng-Pipim 1996:16).

This stream is in the very minority and is currently less influential in Adventism’s scholarly world, and tends to operate more from outside the church structure. This is the case, such that Samuel Koranteng-Pipim (1996:16) almost ignores the “historic” stream and encourages a focus on the “liberal” stream: “The liberals, often educated and influential, operate within the church structure; the independents, appearing spiritual and orthodox, operate from without by establishing organizations and structures of their own.... The mainstream Seventh-day Adventist church, caught in the crossfire, should be more concerned about the liberals within than about the independents without.”

The key figures of the “historic” movement may be listed as ML Andreasen (late), Herbert Edgar Douglass, Larry Kirkpatrick, and Collin and Russell Standish. Dr ML Andreasen may be considered to have been the representative of this stream at its polarization in his protest and reaction to particular contents of the book *Questions on Doctrine*. Andreasen was later suspended from the ministry because of his methods of retaliation against the Adventist leadership. However, after reconciling with the leadership of the church during his last days at his deathbed, his suspension was reversed - March 1st - a month after his death - February 19, 1962 (Knight 2000:167-172, 174; 2003: xxv).

This book is regarded by historic Adventism as in compromise of the Adventist faith for the sake of compatibility of Adventism with Evangelical Christianity, particularly in the areas of Christology, Hamartiology, Soteriology, and Eschatology. The term historic Adventists frequently use is “New Theology” for what they consider as doctrinal changes (Standish⁶¹ 1999; 2000; 2006; 2007:2⁶²).

⁶¹ Collin D and Russell R Standish

⁶² Russell Roland Standish

Historic Adventism's general positions may be summarized as follows:

(1) *Christology*: It is believed that Jesus Christ possessed a fallen post-fall nature that was *in no way different* from all mankind (Standish⁶³ 2007:4, 13).

(2) *Hamartiology*: They define "sin" in a way limited to a behavior or an act that breaks God's commandments, rather than being inclusive of the inherent or intrinsic corruption of human nature, so that *keeping the commandments of God* is equated with *absolute perfection*; to them, God does not control and subdue the natural tendencies to sin, but God removes them altogether from human nature, prior to the saints' reception of the immortalized body of the resurrection (Andreasen⁶⁴ 1947:318, 321; Kirkpartick 2007).

(3) *Soteriology*: It is believed that "justification" and "sanctification" are both necessary for salvation. ML Andreasen (1947:177) argues that God's forgiveness is also based on one future life-course: "God forgives, but the forgiveness is not unconditional and independent of the sinner's future course." The ministry of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary is considered by historic Adventists a *continuation* of atonement which begun on the cross rather than an *application* of the benefits of an atonement completed on the cross.

(4) *Eschatology*: They typically believe that there will be a generation, "the last generation" prior to the Second Coming, which will live sinless lives in the same way that Christ did - *absolute perfectionism*. After stating that Jesus took upon himself human nature and that Christians are to follow his life-example, ML Andreasen (1947:299, 302) went on to say that the world is waiting for another "supreme exhibition" or "demonstration" of "the last generation" which will "live without sin" or in whom God will have "completed" and "finished His work [of sanctification]" so that they become "ready for translation". This "perfection" is regarded as a demonstration of God's love and power to all heavenly intelligences that God's law

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ ML Andreasen

can be kept perfectly by mankind and that Adam had no reason to sin (Andreasen⁶⁵ 1947:299-321).

Many historic Adventists also tend to *not* distinguish between Scripture and the writings of Ellen G White in the process of determining truth, rather than distinguishing the two in terms of purpose (Standish⁶⁶ 2007:13).

The official church, through a committee established by the General Conference in 1998, has evaluated the beliefs and activities of the organizations established by proponents of this movement: *Hope International*, *Hartland Institute* (both in the United States) and *Remnant Ministries* (in Australia) and produced a report in the year 2000. In that report, it was concluded that these ministries have wrongly placed themselves above the authority of the world church, since they reject the world church's interpretation of the Scriptures and the writings of Ellen G White. As such they could not continue, if persistent, to use the *Seventh-day Adventist* name as that would misrepresent the official church's teachings (*Adventist Review* 2000).

3.7 Progressive Adventism

Another stream within Adventism that competes with the official church-positions is the "progressive" movement. "Progressive Adventism" is sometimes labeled as "evangelical Adventism", "left-wing Adventism", or "liberal Adventism". These Adventists typically disagree with one or more of the fundamental beliefs of the church. They are often described as "liberal" but they prefer to describe themselves as "progressive" since they have a self-perception of being progressive in their quest for truth (Koranteng-Pipim 1996:16, 17; Wikipedia.org/wiki/Progressive_Adventism accessed on the 3rd of February, 2010).

This group also constitutes *Anti-Questions on Doctrine* Adventists, but it did not polarize immediately until being pioneered by Dr Desmond Ford who was defrocked from the ministry by the church.

⁶⁵ ML Andreasen

⁶⁶ Russell R Standish

On May 1982, Alan Candrall wrote in “progressive Adventist” magazine *Evangelica*: “The seeds of this movement were sown within the denomination via the book QOD in 1957, and the seed-plot was watered by the public ministries of such men as RA Anderson, HMS Richards Sr., Edward Heppenstall, Robert Brinsmead, Desmond Ford...and others”. But the first spokesmen for this movement are considered to be Desmond Ford and Robert Brinsmead (‘recruited’ by Desmond Ford, but Brinsmead eventually rejected the Sabbath and other Christian teachings) as they broke off from the “mainstream” of their predecessors by disagreeing with some fundamental doctrines of the Adventist church, particularly the PAIJ (Christofel 2007; Paulien 2007).

Ron Corson (2002) in *Adventist Today* (a “progressive Adventist” magazine) identified four general theological tendencies in “progressive” beliefs:

(1) *Investigative Judgment*: “Progressives” typically have a different version of this judgment or find no Biblical support for it at all.

(2) *Remnant*: They perceive an inclusion of other Christians in the concept of the “remnant”.

(3) *Ellen G White*: They may believe that her “inspiration” is fallible or that she was no prophet at all.

(4) *Sabbath*: There is a denial that the Ten Commandment-Sabbath will ever be involved in the mark of the beast of Revelation 13.

“Progressive Adventism” seems to have a strong presence in Adventist Universities and Colleges. Madelynn Jones-Haldeman (2001; cf. Wikipedia.org/wiki/Progressive_Adventism accessed on the 3rd of February, 2010) in the September issue of *Adventist Today* articulates this fact: “It is only within the last few decades that the Adventist Review has recognized editorially that there exists within the Seventh-day Adventist Church, at least in North America, 'liberals,' 'liberal churches,' 'liberal colleges/universities' and 'liberal conferences.’” According to the statistics of Malcolm Bull and Keith Lockhart in the October 1987 issue of *Spectrum* magazine, the majority of Adventist theologians described themselves as “liberal” (45%), then

“mainstream” (40%) and “conservative” (11%). Only 4% did not respond to the question.

3.8 Mainstream Adventism

By far the largest group, at least among the regular members, is “mainstream Adventism”. This stream represents the *official* SDA point of view on theological issues.

Prominent theologians regarded as “mainstream”, from the 1950s to the present, may include the contributors to the book *Questions on Doctrine*: Le Roy Edwin Froom, Walter E Read and Roy Allan Anderson. Other names may be Edward E Heppenstall, Hans Karl LaRondelle, Raoul Dederen, George W Reid, Angel Manuel Rodriguez, Norman R Gulley, and Samuel Koranteng-Pipim, just to name a few.

This stream has a challenge of facing criticism from both directions (“conservatives” and “progressives”). And, according to Koranteng-Pipim (1996:16), sometimes in the “crossfire” there is misidentification such that each group seems to bundle other streams into one: “When the liberals on the left speak about the Adventist church, they often seem to see only the independents on the right; and when the independents discuss the church, one could almost believe that all members of the church are liberals.”

The views of this stream in relation to my topic are going to be my study in the following chapters. Therefore I do not see any need to analyze them at this point of this research.

3.9 Basic Shifts in Mainstream Understanding and Expression

It has been noted that the Adventist theology of the PAIJ has experienced changes and shifts throughout history, in content and in both the use of terminologies and theological emphasis (Ford 2008:105-107; Knight 2000:11, 160, 161; *Questions on Doctrine* 1957:29-32).

These changes are not necessarily unwelcome to Adventist thinking; they *refine* the church’s theology without necessarily *revising* it in many cases (General Conference

of Seventh-day Adventists 2005:9). Ellen G White warned the Adventist church not to be stagnant but to search for greater understanding and knowledge of truth in an open minded way (White⁶⁷ 1938:25-28, 34).

Actually it has been recognized that were an early Adventist pioneer to wake up from their grave and see the present theological form and content of the church, they would not join it. An example of a specific theological change could be that of the Trinity; early Adventists neither believed in the deity of Christ nor the Trinity (Knight 2000:17, 18). Ellen G White also is seen to have initially used less definite terms in reference to the deity of Christ, but she did move on ahead of the church in her writings (Knight 2003:44-46).

The challenges that the church has faced throughout the history of this teaching have evidently provided it more motivation and opportunity for change in its understanding. Speaking of this principle in an early Adventist context, P Gerard Damsteegt (1989:57, 80) says: “The polemics served only to deepen and widen the study of [the sanctuary doctrine] advocates and clarify the doctrine on a sound biblical base.... Analyzing contrary views enabled them to clarify their own and to ground the sanctuary doctrine on a scriptural, soundly-reasoned basis.”

After the concept of “cleansing” the sanctuary was linked with that of “investigative judgment” by Joseph Bates, the first significant conceptual *refining* of Adventist theology in this area may have been that of Ellen G White. This is by her ‘scriptural’ attachment of a revelatory and cosmic element with regard to the heavenly intelligent beings (White⁶⁸ 1911:479-491).

Although Ellen G White frequently made it clear that it is only genuine faith in the blood of Christ that guarantees the acceptance of the believers in the pre-advent judgment, she clearly employed language that borders on legalism, language similarly to the book of *James* in the New Testament. This may have been due to the contextual intention of alerting her readers to the importance and extent of God’s

⁶⁷ Ellen G White

⁶⁸ Ibid.

law, in the context of the “Great Controversy” (see chapter 4 of this research) theme, and to deepen the readers’ sense of need for God’s grace (White⁶⁹ 1911:479-491).

Dr. Edward Heppenstall significantly contributed towards a shift in emphasis on grace and the vindication of God and the saints in the sight of the heavenly intelligences; at the same time the judgment becomes condemnatory to the unbelievers (Ford 2008:106; Knight 2000:171, 172, 196). Dr. Edward Heppenstall (1972:121, 207) in his book *Our High Priest*, asserts, “God’s people have nothing to fear from the judgment. The saints of the last days can also find confidence and security in facing the judgment when their names are confessed before the Father and the angelic host”.

Current discussions seem to continue in the same direction of emphasis on *assurance*. However, they also tend to be semantic. For example, an Adventist scholar, Arnold V Wallenkampf (1989:214, 215), in view of the ‘misinterpretations’ and challenges to this teaching, has recommended the name *Pre-Advent Heavenly Audit* for this judgment: “Probably it might more correctly be called an audit.... No decisions are made in an audit. The audit is just confirmatory. The investigative judgment might therefore more appropriately be called the pre-advent heavenly audit..., [which] is not for the benefit of God..., [but for] all angels.”

More recently, Jiri Moskola, in an article for the *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society*, suggests the term *Affirmative Judgment* since it is “investigative” only from the perspective of the heavenly intelligences as God *reveals* the evidences to them; but it is *confirmatory* and *affirmative* from both the believer’s and God’s view; furthermore, the believer is passive throughout the process and need not worry as Christ represents him/her in the heavenly court (Moskala 2004:154).

More will be discussed about the current trends of Adventist thought in the following chapters of this research.

3.10 Conclusion

⁶⁹ Ibid.

This chapter of my research has had a dedicated purpose of tracing and analyzing the development of Adventist theology of the PAIJ.

It has been established that Adventist theology has experienced changes throughout the years, in response to various challenges from within the church. The church became vulnerable to these challenges due to increasing unhealthy trends in the first decades. One can also trace a change of emphasis from one bordering on legalism to a more Christo-centric approach.

Although the mainstream church stands its ground in defending its theology of the investigative judgment, it experiences internal pressure from both directions of the “*historic*” streams – emphasizing on uniqueness and protection of truth – and the “*progressive*” streams – emphasizing on a need for theological revision of some fundamentals.

This chapter’s focus has been very limited due to the nature of this research thesis. However, sufficient historical-theological background has been covered for a readiness to analyze more closely the foundational theological concepts that lead Adventist theology in the direction of their teaching of the PAIJ.

Chapter 4

THEOLOGICAL PRESUPPOSITIONS TO PRE-ADVENT INVESTIGATIVE JUDGMENT

4.1 Introduction

It is often the case that one does not grasp a truth of Scripture because of wrong presuppositions that one brings into the study. Therefore, it is of great necessity that we ascertain the premises of the theology of the PAIJ.

4.2 Divine Authority

Adventists locate supreme authority in God. Norman R Gulley (2003:376) argues the idea that God is the location and source of all authority in the universe: “God is the ultimate authority; all other authority is derived from Him” (Canale 2000:105; Dederen 2000:559; Pfandl 2004; Reid 2000:762; Van Bemmelen 2000:41; 2006:77).

The proposal that supreme authority is in God alone is made on the ground of two factors: Creatorship and Character (Van Bemmelen 2000:41; 2006:77, 78).

Associated with the concept of God as Creator, are the sub-concepts of God’s “infinite power” and “knowledge” or “wisdom”. It is argued that God’s infinite power and wisdom are recognizable, for example, in David’s acknowledgment of God (1 Chronicles 29:10-13) as the “ruler above all” and to whom power and majesty belong. The ascribing to God of supreme wisdom and everlasting dominion can be seen from the words of Daniel, Nebuchadnezzar and Darius in Daniel 2:20-22; 4:34, 35 and 6:26, 27 (Van Bemmelen 2000:41). God’s “infinite power” and “wisdom” is

fundamentally revealed in his creative and sustenance acts. God's creation rests completely on his wisdom and power, and is not a revelation of the best He can do (Bradford 2000:654; Canale 2000:116; Shea 2000:418).

God did not *relinquish* his authority by appointing mankind as lord of creation. God *delegated* his authority and appointed human beings as his "representatives" and 'deputies'. Mankind is still accountable to God, even after the fall into sin, and God still reserves the supreme authority over human life (Bradford 2000:654, 655; Shea 2000:440, 441).

Adventists believe that God's authority over human life is also based on his character. In fact, this basis seems to outshine the first. This character is seen as one of love and peace, which finds its expression in an attitude of humility, service and self-sacrifice. These are demonstrated "supremely" in the incarnation, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ (Blazen 2000:285, 294; Brunt 2000:348; Dederen 2000:185; Gulley 2003:376; Van Bemmelen 2000:41).

4.3 The Authority of Scripture

Adventist theology recognizes the authority of Scripture. This authority is equated to the authority of God, and is the authority of God. As such, no other authorities can compete with it (Davidson⁷⁰ 2004:22, 23, 25; Dederen 2000:559; Gulley 2003:382). Van Bemmelen (2000:41) advocates this notion: "The authority of Scripture as the Written Word of God manifests all the characteristics of the authority of God.... The writings of prophets and apostles speak with divine authority to every generation, even though the human authors of those writings have long since passed away".

The Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments (with divine authority) are understood as purposed to be the only standard and test of all faith and practice for all humanity in all times (Caesar 2006:271-282; Du Preez 2006:285-303; General Conference of

⁷⁰ Jo Ann Davidson

Seventh-day Adventists 2005; Gordon 2000:174; Hasel⁷¹ 2006:36, 37; Klingbeil 2006:91-108; Pfandl 2006:309).

Logically, if the Scriptures have authority, this authority is received by the Scriptures through prophetic authority, which is of itself divine. Therefore, it stands to reason, that the process of “inspiration” does not dilute God’s authority received by the prophets through his call and revelation; somehow the “revelation *to* prophets” becomes “revelation *through* prophets” by the process of “inspiration”. Hence Van Bemmelen (2000:41; cf. Dederen 2000:559; cf. Pfandl 2004:1) concludes as already noted previously: “God endowed His chosen messengers with His own authority when they spoke or wrote under the impulse of the Holy Spirit”.

God’s “revelation *to* a prophet” (by vision, dream or auditory means) is equal to “revelation *through* a prophet” (Scripture). Therefore it is essential that one analyzes the intermediate process of “inspiration” which evidently guarantees the authority of Scripture.

4.4 The Inspiration of Scripture

4.4.1 Definition

“Inspiration” refers to the work of the Spirit on God’s messengers, as they spoke or wrote as indicated by 2 Peter 1:21 [emphasis mine], “For no prophecy was ever produced by the will of man, but men spoke from God as they were *carried along by* the holy Spirit” (ESV). Therefore, it is clear that “inspiration” is an act of God. Simultaneously, the human instrument (prophet) has a role of “speaking” or “writing” God’s words.

4.4.2 Theories

There are various theories of “inspiration” in general, the major are: (1) “intuition inspiration”, (2) “illumination inspiration”, (3) “mechanical inspiration”, (4) “verbal inspiration”, (5) “dynamic or limited verbal inspiration”. We shall use the terminologies as Gulley (2003) uses them.

⁷¹ Frank M Hasel

(1) *Intuition Inspiration* refers to the theory that inspiration is nothing supernatural or unusual; “it is like a talent or gift in matters religious as others have in various fields...such as mathematics, music, or painting”. Therefore, nothing special can be made of Scripture (Gulley 2003:302). I have not found any Adventist subscribing to this theory.

(2) *Illumination Inspiration* refers to the understanding that the Holy Spirit operates in all believers, and only “heightens” his influence with the Biblical writers; the writer only discovers truth and does not impart it, therefore Scripture gives no objective truth (Gulley 2003:303). Fernando Canale (2006:53, 54, 60) seems to be talking about (not advocating) this theory and calls it “encounter revelation”: “revelation is a divine-human encounter devoid of the impartation of knowledge.... Consequently, not a single word or thought that we find in Scripture comes from God”. Scripture therefore, “contains errors not only in historical details but also in all it expressly teaches” (Canale 2006:54).

An Adventist advocate of this notion is Herold Weiss. Weiss (1975:52), in an article *Revelation and the Bible: Beyond Verbal Inspiration*, published in *Spectrum*, said: “I do not understand revelation to be essentially the communication of divine information..... Revelation, rather, is first of all, a divine disclosure that creates a community in which life expresses this revelation in symbols of action, imagination and thought under the guidance of prophets”. This theory has had very few proponents (Rodriguez 2006:341).

(3) *Mechanical or Dictation Inspiration* theory, also advocated by some Adventist theologians, claims that the very letters and alphabets in Scripture were chosen by God directly; the Bible writers were mere copy or typing machines to God’s dictation of each word (Gulley 2003:304; Canale 2006:55). Fernando Canale (2006:52) calls this theory “verbal inspiration” and argues that this theory was built on an extra-Biblical philosophical understanding of hermeneutics: “The replacement of the biblical notion of God with the Greek idea of a timeless God made the idea of divine sovereign providence an overpowering, all-encompassing causal phenomenon”.

There are some noticeable tendencies that usually result from this theory. (1) The timelessness of God leads to the conviction that historical contexts and contents of texts may be “bypassed” in favour of timeless divine truths. (2) The concept of “absolute inerrancy” (defined below) according to which all the statements in Scripture are absolute truth (Canale 2006:53).

(4) *Verbal Inspiration* believes that the prophets were at complete freedom to express themselves naturally, with God aiding or assisting them however, in the choice of words so as not to permit error. The prophet and the words are inspired (Gulley 2003:304). This is the trendy view in Adventist discussion. I will discuss this one at length below.

(5) *Dynamic or Limited Verbal Inspiration* advances the theory that God gave the prophets revelations, but allowed an unsupervised choice of words in the communication of divine truth. Therefore, this theory gives room to the existence of error; “inerrancy” can be limited to matters of doctrine and ethics (Gulley 2003:304). In Adventist circles this view, also known as “thought inspiration”, is advocated also by Alden Thompson. This may be seen from his book *Inspiration: Hard Questions, Honest Answers*, 1991. Another book written by Thompson, recently published in 2009 and entitled *Beyond Common Ground: Why Liberals and Conservatives Need Each Other*, argues that both the “limited verbal inspiration” and the “verbal inspiration” proponents need each other, and should thrive concurrently in the Adventist church.

Therefore, within Adventist circles, four theories are currently advocated by theologians: “mechanical inspiration”, “verbal inspiration”, “dynamic or limited verbal inspiration” and “encounter revelation”. In the book *Understanding Scripture: An Adventist Approach* (edited by George Reid) Canale disqualifies three of the above theories as unbiblical, and argues for the “verbal inspiration” theory which he designates the “Biblical Model” (Canale 2006:61, 66, 67, 71).

4.4.3 Verbal Inspiration

Adventism seems to accept and recognize the paradoxical “incarnational model” of inspiration: just as Jesus is both God and man simultaneously (incarnation), so too is

Scripture's nature both divine and human (inscripturation) (Davidson⁷² 2004:26; Gulley 2003:278; Hasel⁷³ 2006:42; Kis 2000:68; Mueller 2006;).

With regard to the object of inspiration, it is understood that the prophet/apostle is the "locus" of inspiration. The Holy Spirit inspires the prophet/apostle, and also has a supervisory role in the selection of appropriate words to convey truth. The human instrument plays the role of selecting the words and style, but the Holy Spirit's presence reaches the words in supervision. For Van Bemmelen (2000:39; c.f. Canale 2006:67; cf. Hasel⁷⁴ 2006:29) argues that the Spirit moved on the individual messenger and produced through the messenger an inspired message: "Whether inspiration should be attributed to the inspired writers or to the Scriptures written by them is to a large extent a needless dilemma. It is clear that the primary locus of inspiration is in people [prophets]. The Holy Spirit moved upon people [prophets] to speak or write; yet what they spoke or wrote was the inspired word of God.... The primary locus of inspiration is the apostle [or prophet]; the result of that inspiration is Holy Scriptures".

This "verbal inspiration" is in opposition to the idea of partial inspiration within Scripture; dealing against the idea that some portions of scripture are inspired and others not inspired, Van Bemmelen (2000:38, 39; Canale 2006:70, 83, 84; Davidson⁷⁵ 2004:32; Hasel⁷⁶ 2006:38, 42; Klingbeil 2006:104, 105; Pfandl 2006:309; cf. White⁷⁷ 1889:747) uses Paul's text (1 Corinthians 7) to make it clear that all Scripture is inspired: "These texts do not, in fact, deal with the issue of inspiration. The contrast Paul draws in verses 10 and 12 is that in one case he can refer to an explicit command of the Lord (Matt. 5:32; 19:1-6), whereas in the other he cannot. Yet the advice in verse 12 and elsewhere is given under inspiration, for Paul

⁷² Jo Ann Davidson

⁷³ Frank M Hasel

⁷⁴ Frank M Hasel

⁷⁵ Jo Ann Davidson

⁷⁶ Frank M Hasel

⁷⁷ Ellen G White

concludes this discourse on questions regarding marriage with the emphatic assertion, 'I think that I have the Spirit of God' (1 Cor. 7:40)".

Ellen G White (1888:13) in her unpublished *Manuscript* (MS), also found in the published *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* (volume 7, page 920), argues that it is wrong to dissect and judge the Scriptures according to one's opinions: "Do not let any living man come to you and begin to dissect God's Word, telling what is revelation, what is inspiration and what is not, without a rebuke. . . . We call on you to take your Bible, but do not put a sacrilegious hand upon it, and say, 'That is not inspired,' simply because somebody else has said so. Not a jot or tittle is ever to be taken from that Word. Hands off, brethren! Do not touch the ark. . . . When men begin to meddle with God's Word, I want to tell them to take their hands off, for they do not know what they are doing."

Paul, in 1 Timothy 3:16, seems to advocate the same notion when he says "all" Scripture is inspired; not only part of it, or at different levels of inspiration. The same word "inspired" is used for "all".

4.4.4 Inerrancy

Another crucial aspect to be covered is that of *Inerrancy*. If factual errors are found in Scripture, that would damage the reliability, credibility or truthfulness of the Bible.

Adventists, according to the "verbal inspiration" theory, seem to admit that there are errors in the Bible, but assign such errors to transmission (copying and translation) causes (White⁷⁸ 1888:16; 1889:6; Klingbeil 2006:106).

Samuel Koranteng-Pipim (1996:93; Davidson⁷⁹ 2004:28-30; Donkor 2006; Holbrook 1998; Koranteng-Pipim 1996:105; cf. Van Bemmelen 2000:43, 44;), an African Adventist scholar, argues that inspiration kept the Bible writers from making culturally-conditioned errors: "The apostle Paul adamantly insists that his [God's] messages were not tainted by faulty logic of human wisdom or words distorted by

⁷⁸ Ellen G White

⁷⁹ Jo Ann Davidson

the culture of their times. Rather, the Spirit who revealed the message to the Bible writers also enabled them to communicate it accurately”.

Although the Adventist church believes that the Scriptures are fully trustworthy and reliable, I have failed to locate the word “inerrancy” being used as an Adventist official position. This is confirmed by Gulley (2003:354): “In my church tradition, we do not use the word ‘inerrant’ but believe Scripture is fully trustworthy and reliable; we believe that it is God’s Word to humans in human language”.

I suspect that the reason Adventists generally do not use the word “inerrancy” is because of the diverse meanings attached to the word. Norman R Gulley identifies at least four brands of “inerrancy”: (1) *absolute inerrancy* – this one represents the idea that Scripture is fully/absolutely true in its historical and scientific details; (2) *full inerrancy* – the idea being that the Scriptural references to history and scientific details are recorded as they appear (phenomenal), and “not as they may be”; (3) *limited inerrancy* – this carries the idea that the Scriptures reflect the limited understanding of historical and scientific details, in harmony with the Bible times; (4) *inerrancy of purpose* – carries the understanding that the Scriptures are not factually inerrant and not propositional but rather pragmatic to the end that one is brought by it into a saving relationship with Christ (Canale 2006:55, 56; Gulley 2003:344, 345).

According to my assessment, Adventist thinking on “verbal inspiration” is in line with the idea represented by *full inerrancy*.

4.4.5 Method of Interpretation

Adventist theology holds on to the “historical-grammatical method” of Biblical interpretation, in contrast to the “historical-critical method” or its “moderate” use (General Conference Committee 1986; Mueller 2006; Rodriguez 2006:339-350; Timm 2006:4-11).

The “historical-grammatical” method, sometimes called the “biblical-grammatical”, the “historical-biblical” or the “grammatical-historical” approach, assumes the

possibility of the supernatural element of Scripture, and that Scripture is inerrant (full inerrancy).

Ekkehardt Mueller outlines the assumptions of this method as follows: (1) only the bible is the final and the highest test of truth; (2) all Scripture, totally, is inspired by God and is the “propositional Word of God” – the divine and human “sides of Scripture are linked inseparably”; (3) Scripture is its own interpreter, is self-consistent and is sufficiently clear in conveying truth; (4) it is essential that the interpreter of Scripture have a the abiding leadership and illumination of the Spirit, which never contradicts its own testimony in Scripture (cf. Baldwin 2006:20-24; cf. General Conference Committee 1986; Mueller 2006:111, 112; cf. Rodriguez 2006:339, 340;).

Attempts by some have been made to blend the “historical-grammatical” and the “historical-critical” methodologies, resulting in a “moderate” use of the “historical-critical” methodologies (assuming the “dynamic or limited verbal inspiration theory”). While this blend has its supporters within Adventist circles, it has not become acceptable by the official church (General Conference Committee 1986; cf. Hasel⁸⁰ 2006:27; Koranteng-Pipim 1996; Rodriguez 2006:341-343; Timm 2006:8-11).

4.5 Biblical Apocalyptic

One needs to comprehend the Adventist approach to Biblical apocalyptic because of the location and context of some of the key texts (e.g. Daniel 7:9-14; 8:13, 14) used in support of their theology of PAIJ.

Adventists perceive both a necessity and a possibility of studying Biblical apocalyptic. The recognized necessity is based on the importance of the apocalyptic element in Scripture, and the possibility being dependant on the accuracy of the presuppositions brought to the study (Hasel⁸¹ 2006:27; Johnsson 2000:784; Paulien 2003:15, 26, 27; Strand 1992:3;).

4.5.1 Apocalyptic Genre

⁸⁰ Frank M Hasel

⁸¹ Ibid.

When Adventists speak of Biblical apocalyptic, they refer especially to the books of Daniel and Revelation, and to other parts of Scripture – like Isaiah 24-27; Ezekiel 38; 39; Joel 2; 3; Zechariah 9-14; Matthew 24; Mark 13; Luke 17; 21; 1 Thessalonians 4; and 2 Thessalonians 1; 2 – that generally share marked similarities like “common symbolism, common time periods, and a common concentration on last-day events”. It is recognized however that *not all parts* of the books of Daniel and Revelation are apocalyptic (Johnsson 2000:785; Paulien 2003:33-35; Strand 1992:3).

In recognition that there is extra-Biblical literature that has some resemblance to Biblical apocalyptic, Adventists believe that the *Biblical* apocalyptic “stands apart” and that it alone bears the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. As such, Adventists believe that “biblical apocalyptic must disclose itself to us on its own terms” and should be the one “shaping” its own definition (Johnsson 2000:786; Paulien 2003:29; Strand 1992:8).

Adventists see *at least* seven features or characteristics in apocalyptic sections of the Scriptures. The *first* one is that apocalyptic is “revelatory literature”. Apocalyptic tends to seemingly unveil the hidden heavenly world, and its interaction with this world; it tends to unveil not just present realities but future ones as well (Davidson⁸² 2006:184; Johnsson 2000:786; Paulien 2003:23). Strand (1992:12) concurs: “Apocalyptic has..., as its warp and woof, the element of cosmic sweep or universal scope.... Apocalyptic prophecy approaches the great controversy between good and evil...from the vantage point that draws aside the curtain, as it were, on the *entire world* for the *whole span* of human history”.

Secondly, Biblical apocalyptic is *not* produced in a hidden way, time and place. Johnsson (2000:786) puts it this way: “Although the *content* of Biblical apocalyptic may appear mysterious, there is nothing mysterious as to how the messages were *conveyed* to humanity. Biblical apocalyptic is not secret literature generated in time and place unknown to us”. This transparency about the circumstances and manner of revelation is essential to correct interpretation of apocalyptic.

⁸² Richard M Davidson

Thirdly, Biblical apocalyptic tends to have angelic beings featuring prominently. Examples are Gabriel and Michael in Daniel, and the angels that stand at the four corners of the earth and those that surround the throne in Revelation (Johnsson 2000:787; Paulien 2003:23). Strand (1992:13) entitles this element of apocalyptic “Basis in visions and dreams” and argues: “Apocalyptic is characterized by more frequent reference to visions and dreams than is true of any other kind of literature found in the Bible. Also, the appearance of angels to interpret such visions and dreams is not uncommon”.

Fourthly, apocalyptic is *usually* produced in times of crisis or national tragedy, except places like Matthew 24, Mark 13 and Luke 21. Referring to the books of Daniel and Revelation, Johnsson (2000:787) says: “Despair, crisis, and persecution are the backdrop to both books.... The purpose of the messages given...were to assure them [believers] that, contrary to all appearances, God was still in control of history.... [And that] ultimately the divine purpose would triumph”. Strand (1992:13) argues the same notion: “It appears that Apocalyptic prophecy emerges when dire circumstances for God’s people might well lead them to question whether God is still the master of history, that He is with His people, and that He will fully vindicate them at a grand and eschatological climax”.

Fifthly, Biblical apocalyptic is frequently marked by “striking contrasts” between good and evil, present and future, the above and the below. An example is that of Revelation 12-14 where the cross of Christ is given a cosmic perspective (Davidson⁸³ 2006:184; Johnsson 2000:788). Strand (1992:12) concurs: “Apocalyptic prophecy makes a clear and invariable line of demarcation between good and evil”.

Sixthly, apocalyptic tends to be heavy with vivid imagery and symbolism (Davidson⁸⁴ 2006:184; Paulien 2003:24; Strand 1992:14). These are frequently composite in nature. Johnsson (2000:788) puts it this way: “In biblical apocalyptic apart from Daniel and Revelation we do not find such heavy use of symbolism. However, the language is vivid, with graphic word pictures and strong contrasts”. Strand (1992:14)

⁸³ Ibid.

⁸⁴ Ibid.

adds in agreement: “Whatever symbolism the classical prophets use, it tends to follow true-to-life patterns, whereas apocalyptic often departs from conventional forms”.

Lastly, Biblical apocalyptic reveals the divine long-range plans for history, with a focus on its end, when “God brings about closure to the present world order and ushers in His reign” (Davidson⁸⁵ 2006:184; Johnsson 2000:788, 789; Paulien 2003:28). Strand (1992:13) suggests the same understanding: “Apocalyptic prophecy...treats history down through the stream of time, [and] has a particular focus on the end-time events”.

Current discussion about apocalyptic includes the suggestion that there is a difference between “mystical” apocalyptic and “historical” apocalyptic. The former represents those sections where the visionary (author) is taken to a real place (like heaven) and “usually gives a sustained and straightforward narrative involving” himself; “there is more sense of reality in the description”. The latter refers to those sections that give “an overview of a large sweep of history, often divided into periods, and climaxing with a prediction about the end of history and the final judgment”. However, there appears to be no sharp distinction between the two types (Paulien 2003:24, 25).

4.5.2 Apocalyptic Interpretation

Adventists have principles of interpretation when it comes to Biblical apocalyptic, particularly Daniel and Revelation. This section of this chapter seeks to briefly analyze these sufficiently to the end that one may fairly evaluate whether Adventist theology is self-coherent or not, and further more to correctly judge it according to the Scripture standard.

The *first* presupposition with which Adventists approach apocalyptic is that *God knows the future, and that he reveals it in Scripture*. This includes both classical prophecy and apocalyptic prophecy. Therefore, the “predictions cited in biblical apocalyptic are not, as some scholars assert, historical accounts given in the guise

⁸⁵ Ibid.

of prophecy” (Canale 2000:113, 114; Johnsson 2000:791; Paulien 2003:23, 24, 33, 34).

The *second* precondition is that *almost all apocalyptic predictions do not hinge on the principle of conditionality*, but have God’s sovereignty and foreknowledge as predominant. The exceptions are those passages where God’s covenant with Israel is the leading concern. Classical predictions are generally conditional upon human response, whether they be short-term - involving surrounding nations and sometimes specific individuals - or long-term predictions - those that have to do with the end of time (Johnsson 2000:792-796; Paulien 2003:28). Strand (1992:21) is of like mind: “Apocalyptic prophecy sets forth a historical progression that allows no room for variability.... In neither Daniel nor Revelation is the prophetic forecast itself subject to conditionality. The events are fixed and the prescribed time periods are definite and invariable”.

Thirdly, Adventists presuppose the *historicist view* also called the *continuous-historical view*. Johnsson (2000:797) articulates this point where he says: “In contrast with other modes of exposition, historicism – though sometimes marred by diverse, sensational, speculative, and contradictory approaches – appears as the most valid hermeneutical approach to the biblical apocalypse”. Historicism as understood by Adventists is the understanding that apocalyptic prophecies have a “cosmic range that begins in the writer’s own day and takes the reader down to the end” to the “establishment of God’s eternal kingdom” (cf. Bennett 1986:346; Daniel and Revelation Committee 1992:xiii; Johnsson 2000:797; Paulien 2003:15-20; 2006:249, 250, 268; Strand 1992:5;).

This approach is based on various texts where there is a sequential development of predicted events such as in Daniel 2 and 7-12 (with signpost words like “after”, “first”, “second”, etc, leading to the establishing of God’s kingdom). Another example cited by Adventists in which there is seen a sequential development is that of Revelation 12-14 (Johnsson 2000:796, 797; Paulien 2006:253, 254; Shea 1986:165-182; Strand 1992:13;). However, as already noted, it is not every text or section in apocalyptic books that qualifies as a portrayal of a sequence of events.

The *fourth* presupposition is that of the *day-for-a-year principle* based on “Hebrew-thought” patterns. With this it is understood that whenever an apocalyptic text speaks of a “day” in a symbolic context, it refers to an actual “year” in reality (cf. Gordon 2000:73-80; Johnsson 2000:798; LaRondelle 2000:875; Schwantes 1986:463; Shea 1992:67-110, 139; 2001:89). Jon Paulien, at the *2008 Bible Symposium* of the *Adventist Theological Society*, presented the topic *A New Look at the Year-Day Principle*. In this presentation he argues in favour of this interpretation, and points out that this principle cannot be supported, prescriptively, by Scripture through the exegesis of a particular text, rather through understanding *the thinking of the Hebrew mind* which frequently understood the word “day” for a “year” in Scripture - he calls this “year-day thinking” and “year-day equivalency” – as demonstrated by various cultural practices and Jewish laws, one example being the sabbatical years (http://atsjats.org/site/1/podcast/spirit_prophecy_jon_paulien.mp3 accessed on the 5th of March 2010).

The *fifth* presupposition is that *Scripture should be used to interpret its own symbols*. Adventists reject the frequent sensationalism which has at times discredited the historicist method by reading unmentioned meanings into the details of symbols. Johnsson (2000:799; cf. Paulien 2006:256; cf. Strand 1992:22, 26) argues: “It would be presumptuous and probably unproductive...for modern interpreters to advance meanings that have not been revealed. In fact, fanciful interpretations often have attracted – occasionally justifiably – the opprobrium of scholars who reject the historicist approach”.

Two ways are recognized for use in interpreting apocalyptic symbols: the first one is when the writer explains the meaning in the same passage or book (as in Daniel 8 where Daniel is told the meaning of the ram); another way beyond that is when that writer draws upon the imagery of an earlier writer - an example is Revelation’s Danielic echoes, and even its use of symbols and allusions of classical prophecies. The historical background of the author is also considered very useful. However, the Scriptures are to be the beginning place and final authority (Johnsson 2000:798, 799; Paulien 2006:256, 257).

The *last* precondition is the understanding that *Daniel and John juxtapose their visions*. Also, *the writers sometimes repeat themselves or rush on ahead of their topic*. This characteristic is called “recapitulation” or “progressive parallelism”. Johnsson (2000:799) argues: “the structure of the book of Revelation suggests that sequences like the seven seals and seven trumpets are parallel and take the reader from apostolic times to the second advent of Christ”. This principle of repetition rules out the idea of “a continuous or straight-line reading” through the chapters as though they represent chronological events in fulfilment (Johnsson 2000:799; Strand 1992:4, 5; Webster 2000:928).

4.6 Christology

Jesus Christ, as one at the centre of the Adventist PAIJ, needs to be also pre-conditionally understood prior to associating him to the pre-advent judgment. If the atonement is central to the pre-advent judgment, then Christ and his work is more central. I will herein analyze *some* key concepts.

4.6.1 Christ’s Death

Adventists understand the death of Christ as *sacrificial*, and that his blood signified both his life and his death as the ground for divine forgiveness (Dederen 1989:202; 2000:175, 176; Heppenstall 1989:252; Treiyer 1989:193).

The death and sacrifice of Christ in Adventist theology is *substitutionary*. By that it is understood that Jesus did not only die because of mankind but that he died in their place, such that mankind need not die eternally any more (Dederen 1989:204; 2000:177, 178; Fowler 2000:258; Heppenstall 1989:243, 244;).

Christ’s death-sacrifice is also understood as *expiatory* and *propitiatory*. It is *expiatory* because his death cancels or removes the guilt incurred. It is also *propitiatory*, in the Biblical loving sense, because God’s wrath is turned aside (Romans 3:21-26). This *wrath* of God is not like that of humans – an uncontrollable and often irrational outburst of passion – but simply God’s reaction to evil. Dederen

(2000:179; cf. 1989:202-204; cf. White⁸⁶ 1893:13, 14) argues: “It is actually the combination of God’s holiness, of His reaction against sin and His unshakable love for sinners, that sets forth the context in which the Scriptures refer to expiation-propitiation”. And further, Edward Heppenstall (1989:241) argues that the wrath of God is not uncontrollable anger, but his enmity toward sin and the implementation of judgment: “The wrath of God refers to His intense displeasure and condemnation of sin.... The wrath of God is not to be defined in terms of passion and anger manifest by sinful men. The term denotes the necessary opposition to sin of a holy God and the execution of an adequate judgment before the universe.... I prefer to use the word ‘judgment’ to avoid controversy and misunderstanding”.

4.6.2 Christ as High Priest

With Jesus having lived, died and resurrected into heaven, he does the work typified by the earthly priests in the Old Testament sanctuary. Christ intercedes in heaven as our High Priest, so that any repentant sinner “has constant and confident access to the Father” (Dederen 2000:187; Kiesler 1989:77; Johnsson 1989:32; Rodriguez 1986:549).

Adventists understand Christ’s High Priestly ministry as having two phases, pictorially represented by the earthly priests. While the intercessory function continues during the second phase, this phase is understood to include a work of judgment – this will be explored more in the next chapter (Dederen 2000:187; Kiesler 1989:53, 76; cf. Salom 1989:215; Veloso 1989:197; White⁸⁷ 1890:357).

4.6.3 Christ as King

Adventist theology sees Jesus as not currently a King-in-the-making, but as a King victorious and possessing all authority over all things, including his headship of the church. Therefore, Jesus is seen as a Priest-King. His current “kingdom of grace” or “mediatorial kingdom” is however expected to move to a second phase at the second

⁸⁶ Ellen G White

⁸⁷ Ibid.

coming when he shall be crowned as the King with the “kingdom of glory” spanning the whole globe (Dederen 2000:187; Nam⁸⁸ 2000:947-968; Specht 1989:174, 175).

4.7 Anthropology

Another question of importance which needs to be clear in one’s mind prior to any understanding of a pre-advent judgment is that of human nature and his state at death. For what purpose could be a discussion, investigation or revelation of names *after* the saints have already received their reward of heaven and the presence of God?

Adventist theology conceives human nature as monistic and that which originally had “conditional immortality” in contrast to “natural [or inherent] immortality”. Aecio E. Cairus (2000:212; cf. Andreasen⁸⁹ 2000:316; cf. Brunt 2000:340; cf. White⁹⁰ 1890:60; 1911:545), an Adventist scholar, articulates: “The components of a human being function as a unit. There is no separable soul or spirit capable of conscious existence apart from the body. Thus the words ‘soul’ or ‘spirit’ describe intellectual, affective, or volitive manifestations of the personality”.

Jonathan Oey Kuntaraf and Kathleen Liwidjaja-Kuntaraf, in an article entitled “Emphasizing the Wholeness of Man” for the *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* (2008:135, 136) argue that based on the conviction of the wholeness and indivisibility of man, all attempts to meet mankind’s needs should be wholistic and balanced: “Because the Bible [teaches] the wholeness of man, the indivisible man, and the interdependence of man, we need to regard man as a whole in our ministry.... Furthermore, every effort in introducing the gospel to human beings should be centered on the whole man as a physical, mental, and spiritual being”. Therefore, the “aspects” of mankind are the physical, mental, and the spiritual faculties – interdependent.

⁸⁸ Daegeuk Nam

⁸⁹ Niels-Erik Andreasen

⁹⁰ Ellen G White

Adventists understand death as simply a reversal process in which a human being returns to the ground out of which he was made, and also returns the *breath* to God. This *breath* is understood as representative of the “life force leased to him, as well as to other living creatures”. Niels-Erik A. Andreasen (2000:317; cf. Cairus 2000:213) argues this: “Since the Bible maintains a wholistic understanding of human nature, death does not divide body from soul so as to permit the soul to continue existing (soul immortality). Rather, death brings the whole life to a complete end. No function of human life survives death”.

Furthermore, Adventists believe that there is no consciousness at death and that only at the bodily resurrection will consciousness be regained (General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists 2005:19). Cairus (2000:213; cf. Brunt 2000:347) argues: “No personal or conscious entity survives the reversal process of death... The reversal can be turned around only at the resurrection. Thus all hope of life beyond the grave centers on the resurrection”.

Whether this Adventist theology is Biblical or not, it seems reasonably consistent that no believers, generally, should be present in heaven and enjoying the rewards *prior* to the PAIJ which has allegedly begun in the year 1844. I say “generally” because Adventists recognize that there are Biblical exceptions like Enoch, Moses and Elijah of whom Scripture specifically mention as having evaded death or been resurrected (Moses) into eternal life for divine reasons (Andreasen⁹¹ 2000:318; Gulley 2003:449; Holbrook 2000:977).

4.8 Soteriology

There are some soteriological concepts that play a crucial role in Adventist theology of the PAIJ. A lack of knowledge as to how Adventists view these, may lead to unnecessary misunderstanding and an unjust evaluation of their view. This section is an overview of these.

4.8.1 Predestination

⁹¹ Niels-Erik Andreasen

Adventist theology differentiates between “foreknowledge” and “predestination” according to Romans 8:29. Canale (2000:115) argues: “The two notions should not be confused”.

Adventist thinking comprehends “predestination” as referring to the plan of salvation, which includes “the incarnation and death of Jesus Christ, the free human response to the call to accept all the provisions of God’s plan, and God’s judgment of our response”, and other aspects of the salvation plan (Blazen 2000:275; Canale 2000:114, 115).

Therefore, “predestination” is not understood as a divine act of deciding human destinies without the consideration of their free response to the gospel. Angel M. Rodriguez (2002:14) in the *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* argues: “God knows in advance the names of those who will respond positively to the work of the Spirit in their lives and has written their names in the book – but not predestination in the sense of an arbitrary decision fixing the eternal destiny of every human being”.

“Predestination” is therefore *based on* “foreknowledge” of free human response. “Predestination” appears to be understood as God’s premeditated and intended salvation plan (with its components) for the future, whereas “foreknowledge” is understood as God’s prior knowledge of the future (including both human and divine experience and activity); so, *what God foreknows is not merely what he will or can do, but inclusive of how created beings will respond*. The teaching of pre-advent judgment implies free human choice (Canale 2000:115; Gulley 2003:448-452).

4.8.2 Justification

This is a key concept, one of at least three that are considered as descriptive of the believer’s new relationship with God, the other two being “reconciliation” and “adoption” (Blazen 2000:278, 287; Dederen 1989:209, 210; 2000:180-182; Heppenstall 1989:246, 247).

“Justification” is understood as having a forensic background, and as such is to be understood as a pronouncement that God gives as a judge; God as judge gives a verdict of justification for the believer or condemnation for the unbeliever. However,

there is a blend of forensic and covenantal contexts in the word's use in the New Testament, such that it also signifies a relationship between God and his people (Blazen 2000:278, 279; Dederen 2000:180).

Adventist theology recognizes at least 8 facets to "justification": (1) Justification means that a person who previously had a wrong and broken relationship with God now *comes into a right relationship with Him*; (2) Justification means *an acquittal*, when God "saves sinners from condemnation for their sins...by acquitting them of all charges"; (3) Justification is when God *reckons a sinner as righteous*; (4) Justification means divine *forgiveness* – the covering of sin, or "not reckoning sin to the believer"; (5) Justification means eschatological life "of the age to come" and new creation as contrasted to spiritual death; (6) Justification also means an *exchange of lordships* from sin to Christ; (7) Justification also implies *community*, or God's *bringing of believers into right relationship with each other* and becoming *one body*; (8) Justification is *the reality of righteousness* in that the believer actually is righteous, in a relational sense, and not merely treated as though he were righteous (Blazen 1986:343-349; 2000:280-284; Dederen 2000:180; White⁹² 1896:114; 1900:420).

The *ground* of justification is located in the cross of Christ, and the *means* of receiving justification is faith and faith alone (Blazen 1986:343; 2000:284-286; Dederen 2000:180).

4.8.3 Sanctification

Among the life-changing processes of a believer, sanctification is one of them, and regeneration, and repentance and conversion are the other. All these fall under God's one of three solutions to sin by means of *him giving new life* (Blazen 2000:292-294; Cairus 2000:216).

The word "sanctification" is understood by Adventists as having two meanings: the first one being relational and similar with "justification". Blazen (2000:295) argues: "Sanctification in its primal sense is also a relational word. The basic meaning is to

⁹² Ellen G White

be set apart or separated.... [As such it] is like justification, the work of a moment". In a context of God's call to holiness, Miroslav M. Kis (2000:683) concurs with Blazen and gives one of two senses of holiness - "holiness as separateness": "Christ's disciple is set apart, sanctified by the Word".

However, there is also a second meaning for the word "sanctification": it means "moral growth in goodness". This growth begins at the moment of being set apart by God to the moment of translation at the second coming – as long as life shall last and the believer is in Christ. It is a progressive work of moral change by the power of the Holy Spirit in cooperation with the human will. Actually, even in the next life, there will ever be a process of growth and ceaseless approaching to God (Blazen 2000:296-298; Cairus 2000:216; Kis 2000:684; White⁹³ 1911:560, 561; 1898:671).

As already noted "sanctification" begins as the moment of being set apart (justification). Therefore, there cannot be a separation of "justification" from "sanctification"; the two are not identical, yet they are inseparable. Kis (2000:684) argues this: "Justification and sanctification cannot be separated. Sanctification incarnates and perpetuates justification".

Adventist theology has no place for *absolute perfection* being realized prior to the resurrection and the reception of glorified and immortal bodies. *Relative perfection* is believed, the key of which is supreme love for God. "Absolute perfection" refers to a state of sinlessness in both behavior and inner propensities; "relative perfection" refers to living fully according to the light one has, and *not deliberately cherishing* any *known* sin (outward or inward) according to the power Christ gives by His Spirit (Blazen 2000:291, 296, 297; Cairus 2000:217; Dederen 2000:190; Kis 2000:684; Veloso 2000:481, 483; White⁹⁴ 1903:105, 106).

4.9 Cosmic Controversy

Another crucial aspect of Adventist theology is its thinking with regard to the effect of sin, not just on earth but also on the cosmic level. Adventist theology believes and

⁹³ Ibid.

⁹⁴ Ibid.

promotes the Biblical *emphasis* on human salvation. However, it also tends to take glimpses beyond the terrestrial to the cosmic concerns about sin (Fowler 2000:240, 241; Gulley 2003:433; Holbrook 2000:969, 1003).

Adventist theology locates the origin of sin in Lucifer, or Satan, prior to the Fall of Mankind. His pride and ambition to dethrone God as ruler of the universe eventually led to his expulsion from heaven together with those angels, or demons, who sympathized with his mission and ideas (Fowler 2000:240, 241; Gulley 2003:433-438; Holbrook 2000:977, 978).

Satan's issue against God is understood to have been centred on God's character (justice and law to be particular). Satan judged that God was not worthy of all respect and worship, hence Satan deceived angels and mankind into his rebellion against God's kingdom and rule. "Law" being seen as central to any type of government, Adventists identify divine law as Satan's point of controversy. Hence the temptations of Jesus so that he might sin - break God's law (Fowler 2000:240, 241; Gulley 2003:439; Holbrook 2000:972-976; White⁹⁵ 1890:33-43;).

The ultimate demonstration that vindicated God's love and justice is located at Calvary. The cross is regarded as not just a saving event to mankind, but also a vindication of God's rule to all heavenly intelligences (cf. Ephesians 3:10-11; 1 Corinthians 4:9) – that God is just and loving. At the same time the cross revealed beyond shadow of doubt the true nature of the devil, hence his second expulsion, this time from all access to heaven in Revelation 12 (Holbrook 2000:969, 971). Gulley (2003:449) argues: "Calvary is the unparalleled revelation of the justice of God and the injustice of Satan".

It is believed that although the "battle" continues after the cross, the "war" is over based on the cross event (Gulley 2003:445). This battle will continue until the final confrontation between God and Satan at the final judgment, during which there will be a final vindication of God's justice resulting in the confession and bowing of all creatures to Christ, that God in Jesus is truly just and fair – Jesus is Lord. In the final judgment, it is believed that God will not be merely interested in rewards for the

⁹⁵ Ibid.

faithful and the faith-less, but God will bring closure to sin as he will be “more interested in the question of his justice”. The answer to this question is the guarantee that prevents the rise of sin, ever again, in the new heaven and earth (Gulley 2003:448-452; Holbrook 2000:980).

Gulley (2003:441) argues that all theology should be done in the *context* of the *cosmic controversy* between God and Satan: “The cosmic controversy is the biblical metanarrative within which [every biblical past-and-future event or story took or will take place].... So the cosmic controversy is the biblical context for all self-revelation of God in Scripture”. As such, Gulley further argues that it is impossible to do justice to theology without this *context* (Fowler 2000:240, 241; Gulley 2003:442; Holbrook 2000:969, 1003).

4.10 Judgment

The term of “judgment” generally tends to awaken feelings of fear and insecurity to most people. The source of that reaction is the understanding of judgment as a negative act or event - one that is not compatible with love and acceptance. This general trend also contributes to an almost automatic negative response to the Adventist theology of the PAIJ of believers. Therefore, it is necessary that one comprehends the *essential* meaning that Adventists have of this term.

Based on their study of the Scriptures, Adventists believe that the themes of “salvation” and “judgment” are inseparable. These are both understood to be a revelation of God. Gerhard F Hasel (2000:815) argues this point: “Judgment and salvation are the twin topics that weave themselves like threads from Genesis to Revelation... reflecting divine mercy and justice [and as such] cannot be separated; otherwise both lose their fullness and mutual complementarity.” “Judgment is thus portrayed in Scripture as an essential part of the ‘eternal gospel’”. Raoul Dederen (1989:224; cf. Heppenstall 1989:252) argues this in the context of the cross, that it did not only proclaim forgiveness, but also judgment/condemnation against sin: “At the cross the very act that mediated forgiveness also proclaimed judgment. Mercy did not replace justice.... Pardon was there, full and free; but the very mode of God’s forgiving grace was sin’s downright condemnation forever”.

“Judgment” has dual aspects or dynamics. On the positive it can mean *vindication*, resulting in *deliverance*. On the negative it can mean *condemnation*, resulting in *punishment*. Therefore judgment is *not* essentially negative (Hasel⁹⁶ 1989:120; 2000:816, 817; cf. 2000:844; cf. Shea 1992:144, 149).

With respect to the Universal Last Judgment in Adventist eschatology, there are three sequential *major* phases: the first is termed “Pre-Advent Investigative Judgment”, the second being the “Post-Advent Millennial Judgment”, and lastly the “Post-Millennial Executive Judgment” (Hasel⁹⁷ 2000:830, 833; cf. Paulsen 1992:294; cf. Shea 1986:326; cf. Webster 2000:932).

Since this research is in discussion of the first one, I will just briefly describe the other two. The “Post-Advent Millennial Judgment”, occurring after the second coming of Christ and the resurrection of the saints, will be located in heaven and happens during the millennium. The judgment begins with the “household of God” (PAIJ; cf. 1 Peter 4:7) and then the second phase (Post-Advent Millennial Judgment) moves to the “unbelievers” (cf. 1 Corinthians 6:2; Romans 2:2-16; Jude 14, 15) ; the angels are the judges next to God in the first pre-advent phase (to see who are saved and why, based on the records), and the saints are the judges (cf. 1 Corinthians 6:2; Revelation 20:4, 6) next to God in the second post-advent phase (to see why the lost are lost, based on the records). The second phase judgment actually goes beyond judging the lost – it includes judging the fallen angels (cf. Jude 6; 1 Corinthians 6:3). Through this transparent process God is also able to further reveal his love and justice, vindicating himself against the charges of the enemy (Hasel⁹⁸ 2000:846, 847; Holbrook 2000:994; Webster 2000:931, 932).

Adventist eschatology believes in a third and final phase (Post-Millennial Executive Judgment; cf. Revelation 20) which is to occur after the millennium, when the saints return to earth with the holy city Jerusalem from heaven. The wicked will then be resurrected back to life, but without immortal bodies; God’s purpose of final

⁹⁶ Gerhard F Hasel

⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁹⁸ Ibid.

destruction and eradication of sin and sinners will be fulfilled at this time; Christ's opening of the records in view of all and the revelation of his justice leads to voluntary confession and a bowing of all knees to Christ as Lord; however, the confession of the wicked, though voluntary, is not motivated by love but rather fear of impending punishment; the eventual attempt to attack God's people is halted by divine punishment of fire which ultimately destroys and annihilates them (so as not to perpetuate the presence of rebellion should sinners *live forever* in torture). After "this destruction of the wicked God will create 'new heavens and a new earth in which righteousness dwells'.... This will be the eternal abode of all the redeemed" (Hasel⁹⁹ 2000:847, 848; Holbrook 2000:994, 995, 1003; Webster 2000:932-934).

4.11 Heavenly Books of Record

One of the foundation stones to Adventist PAIJ is the existence and purpose of a heavenly recording system referred to as the "book of life" and the "book(s) of deeds". Based on texts like Daniel 7:9-14 and Revelation 20:11, 12 Adventists believe that these records have a central role in the Judgment (Rodriguez 2002:1, 21; Shea 1992:144; Veloso 1989:192; White¹⁰⁰ 1911:479-491).

These "heavenly books" are not understood as *actual* books. The Biblical references to them are understood as metaphoric of the "reality" of records in heaven. The symbolic language is believed to be rooted in Israelite cultural and social practices of record keeping – names of citizens according to cities and genealogies, the recording of which implied certain rights and privileges; included are the practices of record keeping of the experiences and deeds of kings of Israel (for example, these records were also used as sources for the books of Chronicles). Rodriguez (2002:26; cf. Paulsen 1992:288) argues: "The biblical writers are clearly using human language and images to allude to a heavenly reality that cannot be fully contained in the language or in the social practices they employed to communicate their message".

⁹⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid.

After clarifying that the heavenly process and practice of record keeping is not perfectly identical to the earthly, but that the symbols are limited, Rodriguez (2002:26) further argues against using that as evidence against the heavenly 'reality': "Therefore, one should not press the discontinuity between the earthly and the heavenly or the heavenly and the earthly to the point of denying the reality of the heavenly. The specific nature of the heavenly is not accessible to us, but inaccessibility should not be equated with nonexistence".

4.11.1 The Book of Life

Just briefly, the "book of life" represents the recording system in which only the names of the righteous are recorded for "eternal life". Names are included based on the event of the cross, but they are entered when an individual surrenders himself or herself to the Lord. Names can also be removed based on rebellious sin or unconfessed known sin. The removal of a name is an act of judgment (Maxwell 1989:123, 124; Rodriguez 2002:13-15; White¹⁰¹ 1911:479-491).

Rodriguez (2002:18, 19; cf. Maxwell 1989:124; cf. Paulsen 1992:288, 289) suggests four points of significance about the "book of life": (1) "Something happens at the administrative center of the universal government of God when a person becomes a citizen of His kingdom.... [It is] not only celebrated in heaven but recorded in the book of life"; (2) "The certainty of their [believers] heavenly citizenship is so unquestionable that Jesus encourages them to rejoice because their names are already in the book of life"; (3) "the decision to record the names of believers in the book of life is not arbitrary or accidental"; (4) "it is possible for the name of a person to be removed.... What makes possible the inclusion of their name in that book is at the same time what makes it possible to retain it there, namely, the forgiving grace of God"; therefore, the application of God's grace for a sinner includes and retains his/her name in the book of life; however, the person's name is removed if God's forgiving grace is later rejected by the sinner.

4.11.2 The Book(s) of Deeds

¹⁰¹ Ibid.

The “book(s) of deeds”, in Malachi 3:16 referred to as “book of remembrance”, is/are representative of the recording system in which all experiences and deeds (inward and outward) are recorded. These books are predominantly judiciary, and include all those who have ever lived on earth, not just the righteous. Rodriguez (2002:21; cf. Gulley 2003:448; cf. Paulsen 1992:288; cf. Shea 1986:324, 326, 327; 1992:144, 148) argues: “they preserve evidence that will be used in the divine tribunal to determine the nature of the commitment of the individual to the Lord.... This is judgment by works.... It is explicitly stated that the final and immutable verdict is based on what has been written in the books. All are judged according to their deeds, as recorded in the heavenly books”.

The deeds, good or bad, can be “blotted out” or “not remembered” depending on the nature of the individual relationship with Christ - forgiven or not forgiven (cf. Gulley 2003:448; Hasel¹⁰² 2000:845; Maxwell 1989:124; Rodriguez 1986:547, 548; 2002:23, 24; cf. Shea 1992:147; White¹⁰³ 1911:479-491).

Rodriguez (2002:24, 25; cf. Shea 1992:147) suggests three points of significance about the “book(s) of deeds”: (1) “those records indicate that God is interested in every one of us as individuals.... We are all equally important before the Lord”, (2) “the record is not only about our actions, but about God’s involvement in the lives of humans”, (3) “the fact that human deeds are recorded in heaven in some form implies that they are accessible to others for objective analysis”. Paulsen (1992:288; cf. Shea 1986:327) adds another point of significance showing God’s objectivity in basing his decision upon recorded fact: “John [the Revelator] seeks to make [a point] here...that...the verdict in the heavenly court is not arrived at arbitrarily, but is based on data”. Paulsen’s point seems to be implying the fairness of God, which Gulley (2003:449) stresses as an objective of this judgment: “God is more interested in the question of His justice”.

4.12 Conclusion

¹⁰² Ibid.

¹⁰³ Ellen G White

This chapter of the research has set out to analyse the theological presuppositions that have led Adventist theology to include a PAIJ.

It has been observed that Adventist presuppositions include the location of authority in God and Scripture. Scripture is in that way understood as with absolute authority as it faithfully reveals to mankind the revelation given to prophets and apostles. This “revelation *through* prophets” (Scripture) is also infallible and “fully inerrant”.

It has been noted that Adventist theology of the PAIJ relies heavily on apocalyptic literature in Scripture. Therefore, the foundational stones of this teaching necessitate mature principles of apocalyptic interpretation, amongst which Adventists use the historicist approach and the “year-day thinking” principle.

Christological and Soteriological analysis proves Adventist theology to believe in the sacrificial, substitutionary and expiatory-propitiatory death of Christ. It also reveals that Adventist theology may not be described as “predestinarian” in a sense that God determines the destiny of individuals regardless of them and their response to the gospel. In addition to that, Adventist theology subscribes to “righteousness by faith alone”, but believes that “sanctification” is inseparable from “justification” in the sense that it is not an optional experience in Christ; there is no room for “absolute perfection” but rather “relative perfection”.

Adventist understanding emphasizes the salvation of mankind, and yet links this theme to the cosmic level; God uses the plan of salvation to also remove evil from the whole universe in the destruction and annihilation of sin and sinners (who do not have “natural immortality”).

The concept of “judgment” has both negative and positive connotations. And Adventism locates the Second Coming prior to the millennium throughout and after which there are eschatological phases of judgment.

The “heavenly books of record” are central to the process of eschatological judgment. These metaphoric books are kept for objective analysis by “heavenly intelligences” and human beings for the purpose that God can safely save others and destroy sin and sinners; they are God’s way of running a transparent

government so that all accusations against him by the devil can be eternally answered and removed.

Much else could have been stated in relation to theological presuppositions to my topic. However, the scope and space limitations of this research forbid that venture. Sufficient theological presuppositions have been analysed to provide background for the next step which is to analyse the actual theology of the PAIJ.

Chapter 5

THE PRE-ADVENT INVESTIGATIVE JUDGMENT

5.1 Introduction

This chapter is designed to analyze the Adventist theology, with emphasis on current thinking, of the PAIJ.

I am going to discuss Adventist sanctuary typology and the understanding of this judgment as a day of atonement; its time, location, judge, objects and objectives. Another section will be devoted to analyzing the relationship between faith and works in the judgment context.

5.2 Sanctuary Typology

Adventist theology understands the sanctuary services and the bipartite sanctuary as a type of the plan of salvation, which began its fulfillment at the cross of Christ, as the all-sufficient and ultimate substitutionary and expiatory-propitiatory sacrifice for human sin. It is as “a lesson book in salvation”; as such it helps in the clarification of the heavenly ministry of Christ, and his sanctuary (Andreasen¹⁰⁴ 1989:63-79; Gane 2007:2; Rodriguez 2000:375).

Sanctuary typology is understood as being correspondential in both “vertical” and “horizontal” dimensions. In the “vertical” dimension the typology that is assumed

¹⁰⁴ Niels-Erik Andreasen

between the earthly and the heavenly sanctuaries is not “antithetical” (contrasting to show incongruence) but correspondential - having comparative agreement and contrastive quality (see section on “The Nature of the Heavenly Sanctuary” below). In the “horizontal” dimension it is “predictive”, “prefigurative” and “historical” of the salvation-plan (Davidson¹⁰⁵ 1984; 1989:121-186; Gane 2007:2, 3; Holbrook 1989:8, 9; Treiyer 1989:187-198).

5.2.1 The Atonement Sacrifice of the Heavenly Sanctuary

The death of Christ on the cross is regarded by Adventists as central and foundational to all of theology and salvation. Nothing can be added to it to increase its effectiveness. Rodriguez (2000:375; cf. Blanco 2000:246; cf. Dederen 2000:174-179; cf. Moskala 2004:142, 143) argues: “Christ’s death and resurrection from the grave lie at the very heart of the plan of salvation..... Nothing can be added to the cross in order to supplement its atoning and expiatory power”.

The death of Christ was a work of atonement, typified by all the various kinds of sacrifices, *including those of the Day of Atonement*, offered at the Old Testament sanctuary. Each of the various types of Old Testament sacrifices presented their special significance. However, “atonement” was the common denominator. It is in this sense that *the Day of Atonement was fulfilled at the cross*; the sacrifice of atonement was made; this presents a New Testament tension between the “already” and the “not yet” (Dederen 1989:199-227; Gane 2007:1; Hasel¹⁰⁶ 1989:86; Heppenstall 1989:235-253; Johnsson 1989:115; Rodriguez 2000:379, 381, 385).

This atonement included the judgment of God (vindication) and Satan (condemnation) at the cross. All judgments in Scripture, pre-Cross and post-Cross, derive from this one; the eschatological judgments of God are a mere “outworking” of this one; this is the *central-cosmic judgment*. (Moskala 2004:146, 147; Webster 2000:931).

¹⁰⁵ Richard M Davidson

¹⁰⁶ Gerhard F Hasel

Moreover, the definitive power of the cross of Christ has not led Adventists, with some other Christians, to believe that all of Christ's work for our salvation ceased at the cross. Rodriguez (2000:375; cf. Duffie 1989:346; cf. Gane 2007:2) proposes: "The NT's emphasis on the finality of Christ's atoning death has led some to conclude that His work for our salvation came to an end at the cross.... [But], as our high priest, Christ is ministering the benefits of His sacrifice to those who draw near to Him, a ministry as essential to our salvation as His atoning death". Therefore, Adventist thinking attaches essential value in the priestly ministry of Christ as our high priest in heaven. His work there is a work of *applying the benefits of His death* in favor of believers.

5.2.2 The Inauguration of the Heavenly Sanctuary

Adventist theology reasons that just as the Old Testament sanctuary was initiated and inaugurated prior to its use, so too does the heavenly sanctuary have an inauguratory process (Gane 2007:4; Rodriguez 2000:391). This understanding is primarily based on texts in the books of Daniel, Hebrews and Revelation.

Daniel 9:24-27 is seen as a Messianic prophecy. The anointing (Spirit-baptism) of the Messiah is understood as the point of commencement of the 70th week. Messiah being "cut off" refers to his death at the middle (3 ½ years of ministry) of the 70th week in the prophecy. "Sin is brought to an end because divine forgiveness is now available" (Rodriguez 2000:391; Winandy 1986:119-127).

The anointing of a "most holy" of verse 24 is interpreted to refer to the dedication of the heavenly sanctuary. This is based, amongst other things, on the observation that the phrase "most holy" is never applied to a person in the Old Testament, and when it is used to refer to the Most Holy Place it takes the article, which it does not have here. Rodriguez (2000:391) concludes: "In the absence of the article 'most holy' refers to the sanctuary and/or to things connected to it.... Daniel refers to the anointing or dedication of the heavenly sanctuary when Christ would begin His priestly work".

The book of Hebrews clearly makes references to the Day of Atonement (Hebrews 9:25, 26 and 10:1-10), the purpose of which is “to show the superiority of the sacrifice of our Lord” (Kiesler 1989:69, 70; Rodriguez 2000:394; Salom 1989:214, 215). There are also references, amongst others like “the ‘red heifer’ sacrifice” (Hebrews 9:13), to the inauguration of both the earthly and heavenly sanctuaries (Hebrews 9:11, 12, 18-21). Rodriguez (2000:391; cf. Davidson¹⁰⁷ 2002; cf. Gane 2007:4; Salom 1989:214) notes the use of the word ἐγκεκαίνισται “was inaugurated” in verse 18: “The verb [ἐγκαίνιζω] means ‘to dedicate, to inaugurate, to renew’, and is used in verse 18 to refer to the inauguration of the first covenant”. τὰ ἅγια (in verses 11 and 12) is interpreted to mean the entire “sanctuary” and not just the Most Holy Place (see Hebrews 8:2).

Hebrews 9 is understood to picture Christ as arriving for the first time at the heavenly sanctuary, after obtaining eternal redemption. This inauguration signaled the commencement of Christ’s “application of the merits” of his death, the dedication not being so much about the sanctuary as of Christ’s ministry since the heavenly sanctuary pre-existed the earthly one (Gane 2007:4; Rodriguez 2000:391, 392).

Revelation 5 is also used to support the idea of Christ’s inauguration or enthronement as King-Priest, being worthy based on his death-payment as ransom for the world. Rodriguez (2000:392) argues: “One of the purposes of this vision is to throw light on the enthronement of Christ as king and high priest in the heavenly sanctuary...because He died to pay the ransom for the world (verses 9, 12)... The Son is enthroned as king and high priest. From this point on in Revelation, the Lamb is associated with God on His throne”.

5.2.3 The Nature of the Heavenly Sanctuary

As already noted about Adventist theology, there is a parallel between the earthly and the heavenly sanctuary. One is a type and the other an antitype. There are about three ways that this parallel is interpreted among Adventists: (1) *Metaphoric*

¹⁰⁷ Richard M Davidson

parallelism rejects the concept of any objective reality in heaven; “concrete terms are given spiritualized meanings”; (2) *Literalistic parallelism* advocates the notion that each descriptive term used in Scripture about the sanctuary points to literal-detail existence; “the heavenly reality is construed in all aspects to be exactly like the earthly structure”; (3) *Conceptual-structural parallelism* argues that the parallel between the earthly and the heavenly is to be understood in both *functional* and *limited-structural* correspondence. The third view is the one *most* supported in Adventism (Davidson¹⁰⁸ 1989:121; Johnsson 1989:35; Salom 1989:206-208, 210).

Although the typological parallel is very limited, it is believed that there is some extent or type of structural relationship between the earthly and the heavenly sanctuaries. Rodriguez (2000:382; cf. Davidson¹⁰⁹ 1989:186; Treiyer 1989:190, 191, 196, 197) proposes that this structural relationship should not be comprehended in terms of physical dimensions or material but rather in concept: “This correspondence should not be defined in terms of size or the materials used in the construction of the earthly sanctuary, but rather in the architectural concept of the structure.... Of course, the heavenly sanctuary is infinitely superior to the earthly”.

The key difference between the two sanctuaries lies in the difference of the makers: one was erected by man (limited), and the other by God (unlimited). Alwyn P Salom (1989:206) argues this point: “The expression, ‘set up not by man but by the Lord’ (vs. 2), suggests immediately that there is a difference between the earthly and heavenly sanctuaries. That difference lies in the nature of the builder.... The heavenly sanctuary is not to be viewed with the restrictions and limitations which an earthly facility might be expected to possess”.

Furthermore, the Biblical texts describing the heavenly sanctuary do so using the colourful language and imagery of the earthly types; the “earthly sanctuary was but a pale copy of the vastly superior and glorious heavenly one”. Therefore, the heavenly one is understood as more glorious and majestic, although Scripture provides us

¹⁰⁸ Richard M Davidson

¹⁰⁹ Ibid.

with only “limited information about the nature of that reality” (Rodriguez 2000:389; Salom 1989:206, 207, 209).

Adventist theology uses this parallel of the sanctuaries and the priestly ministries. It suggests that the distinction between the *daily* (Holy Place) and the *yearly* (Most Holy Place) ministries of the earthly sanctuary has its fulfillment in Christ’s two-phased priestly ministry. The first phase is only intercessory, and the second phase includes an *additional* element of “judgment” (Veloso 1989:197; see next section). Rodriguez (2000:383; cf. Salom 1989:208) argues: “The two-apartment structure of the earthly sanctuary points not only to a two-apartment heavenly sanctuary, but also to the two-phased ministry of Christ in that place”.

As an apologetic response, JN Andrews (1853:146, 147), in the *Review and Herald*, argued that the phrase, “sitting down at the right hand of God”, does not signify a geographical or postural position: “So far as the idea of *sitting* down is concerned, it would be equally proper to represent him as *standing* on the Father’s right hand. Acts 7:56”. He continues: “If the Saviour is at ‘the right hand of the power of God’ when descending from heaven, as He testifies respecting Himself [Matt.26:64; Mark 14:62; Luke 22:69], then he certainly can be at the Father’s right hand, in both the holy places”. In this way, according to early Adventist theological reasoning, was the argument made in favour of the existence of “holy places” (plural, as in the Greek) in heaven in which Christ ministers.

Alwyn P Salom sees the phrase “right hand of God”, as used in the book of Hebrews, as signifying the claim that he has been ministering in the presence of God since the ascension (Salom 1989:210). Walter F Specht (1989:156) adds that the exaltation of Christ to God’s “right hand” signifies that Christ has a position of power, honor, dignity and authority: “The exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of God indicates not only honor but also authority. It means that He shares the throne of the universe (Rev 3:21). His exaltation was enthronement as a partner in the government of the universe.... He was enthroned with power and glory, not only as a Jewish Messiah but also as a cosmic ruler and judge”.

In summary, the bipartite earthly sanctuary and its two-phased ministry was a type of both the *conceptual-structural* parallel with the heavenly sanctuary and its two-phased ministry of Christ as our High Priest.

5.3 The Typical Day of Atonement

As shall be seen below, the Day of Atonement (yearly ministry in the Most Holy Place) is understood to have included a work of judgment. The Day of Atonement had at least three purposes in the Old Testament. These functions/purposes are claimed to be fulfilled anti-typically in Biblical eschatology.

5.3.1 The Final Cleansing/Vindication of the Sanctuary/People

Based on Leviticus 16:16, 18, 21 30, 34 Adventist theology teaches that the rituals of the Day of Atonement were intended to purify the sanctuary and the altars, and yet *those rituals were for the benefit of the people* because their cleansing was final. The cleansing/vindication of the sanctuary *indirectly* cleanses/vindicates the people (Hasel¹¹⁰ 1989:105, 107, 108; Rodriguez 1986:546, 547; 2000:386).

The “cleansing of the sanctuary” is understood to be possible and necessary because “through the daily services the sin[s] and [impurities] of the Israelites were transferred to the sanctuary” (Gane 1997:183; 2007:3; Hasel¹¹¹ 1989:120, 121; Rodriguez 1986:169-197; 1989:130, 138; 2000:386; Shea 1986:151). Rodriguez (2000:385) suggests: “Sin was transferred to the sacrifice, to the priest, and to the sanctuary; but they all remained holy”. It was on the Day of Atonement that their (Israelites) cleansing was made final.

The view that the final cleansing of the people was only done at a later time from the actual time of repentance, confession and transference of the sin into the sanctuary did *not* imply *uncertainty of forgiveness*. Rodriguez (2000:387 [emphasis mine]; cf. cf. Gane 2007:9; Hasel¹¹² 1989:120, 121; cf. Shea 1986:165, 166) argues: “In the

¹¹⁰ Gerhard F Hasel

¹¹¹ Ibid.

¹¹² Ibid.

daily services the sin/impurity of the penitent was transferred, through a sacrificial substitute, to the sanctuary, and *the person was left at peace with God*.... [On the Day of Atonement] *those who kept their daily faith relationship* with the Lord were preserved". Therefore it is argued that the *justification* received through the daily services and the individual's *continued faith-commitment* to God was the basis of preservation on the Day of Atonement.

5.3.2 The Judgment of Israel by God

This was a day when everyone was to humble themselves, in that way expressing "their dependence on God and their desire to preserve the covenant relationship with the Lord" (Rodriguez 1986:546-548; 2000:386).

God as Judge, "evaluated whether or not they had humbled themselves..., depending on His cleansing power and forgiving grace (Lev. 23:29)". Those who did not humble themselves, through pride and self-reliance, were found guilty and no more recognized as one of God's people, since they "rejected God's atoning grace" and nullified the benefit of the daily services (Gane 2007:4; Rodriguez 1986:546-548; 2000:387).

Therefore, the Day of Atonement is understood in Adventist theology as a period of God's judgment of his people – *vindication* for the righteous, and *condemnation* for the ungodly.

5.3.3 The Vindication of God and His Sanctuary

As already noted, the confessed sins were recorded in (transferred into) the sanctuary, and kept there, although the individual was immediately at peace with God. It was on the Day of Atonement when those sins would be removed (symbolically) from the presence of God.

Adventist theology claims that the storage of sin was only a *temporary* arrangement, for the loving purpose of atonement, because sin and holiness have no fellowship. Rodriguez (2000:387; cf. 1986:546, 547) argues: "The Day of Atonement proclaimed that holiness and sin, purity and impurity, had nothing in common.... Sin [was] permitted by God to remain temporarily in His presence in order to preserve those

whom He loved". This act of storage is also seen as an act of love. This act of love (temporary storage of sin) required that God vindicates himself since he did not condemn but rather forgive sinners (Gane 2007:3, 4).

Based on some observations, Adventist theology applies the goat "for Azazel" to Satan, as the source and originator of sin. The first observation is a parallelism in Leviticus 16 between "for the Lord" and "for Azazel", indicating that "Azazel was a personal being, probably a demonic figure". Secondly, Azazel only features in after the blood-cleansing of the sanctuary. Also, the phrase "to carry iniquity away" to the wilderness does not have expiatory overtones, and it is only here where the phrase is followed by a destination (a solitary land). Therefore amongst other 'evidences', it is concluded, the goat was not part of the expiatory rituals of the Day of Atonement; the goat did not "bear" the sins of the Israelites vicariously; "the rite of the scapegoat was a rite of elimination of sin/impurity, not a sacrificial act" – it supplied no blood-atonement (Hasel¹¹³ 1989:115, 118, 119; Rodriguez 1986:546, 547; 2000:387).

Therefore, the Day of Atonement revealed God's power over evil and Satan, by placing sin onto its originator (owner). Rodriguez (2000:387; cf. Gane 2007:4; cf. 1986:546, 547) concludes: "While Israel rests, the Lord reveals his power over evil and all demonic forces. The Day of Atonement is, therefore, a proclamation of God's sovereignty and of the supremacy of holiness over sin/impurity". In that way, God is vindicated by the removal and distancing of sin away from himself.

Furthermore, the moments of the high priest's leaving of the sanctuary and the placing of sin onto the original culprit, is viewed as indicative of the climactic fulfillment of the salvation plan for humanity – the Second Coming and beyond (Rodriguez 2000:387).

It is in this way that the Old Testament sacrificial system outlined the plan of salvation in types and shadows, with the "Messianic Redeemer" being at the center of the whole plan (Rodriguez 2000:387).

¹¹³ Gerhard F Hasel

This Old Testament Typical Day of Atonement has its far superior and antitypical counterpart: the *Eschatological Antitypical Day of Atonement (PAIJ)*.

5.4 The Eschatological Antitypical Day of Atonement: *The Time of this Judgment*

Adventists determine the *beginning time* of the pre-advent judgment based on the books of Revelation, Daniel and the typology of the Day of Atonement.

5.4.1 The Time According to the Book of Revelation

Although no exact date can be derived from Revelation, the text that is most used to locate the time or period of the pre-advent judgment is Revelation 14:7. In keeping with the historicist understanding of apocalyptic, this text is understood to be part of the “sequential flow of recapitulated events”, particularly between chapters 12 through 14 (Blanco 2000:254; Hasel¹¹⁴ 2000:833; Paulsen 1992:283, 284, 293).

The three angels (representing the church with the evangelistic commission) of Revelation 14:6-12 fly in the midst of heaven preaching to all nations of the world the “eternal gospel”. Therefore Adventists reason that the cross of Christ (righteousness by faith) is the centre of these messages. However, these provide a situational context in time when the gospel is to be *especially* applied against the specified (second and third messages) evils in society and the church – “the present truth”, and in that way preparing the world for the Second Advent (Blanco 2000:254, 255).

In keeping with the sequential flow of events, and the fact that Revelation 14:14 refers to the “hour of reaping” (the Second Coming), Adventists interpret “the hour of his judgment” (verse 7) as a time period after Calvary but prior to the resurrection of the righteous. Gerhard F Hasel (2000:834) argues: “The judgment, which according to Revelation 14:7 has arrived, can be located neither at Christ’s return nor after Christ’s return during the millennium. Neither can it be located at Christ’s death on the cross.... The arrival of the judgment time is part of the arrival of the time of the end”. Roy Gane (2007:6) confirms this observation: “We know that this time of

¹¹⁴ Ibid.

judgment is before Christ's Second Coming.... So in Revelation 14 the appeal during the time of the judgment is God's answer to the threat posed by the beast".

5.4.2 The Time According to the Book of Daniel

From the book of Daniel, the text that presents the timing of the pre-advent judgment is found in chapters 7 through 9.

Chapter 7 is understood to present the sequential flow of events from the time of Daniel right up to the time of the established eschatological kingdom of God (in keeping with the historicist approach); the four beasts (applied to the empires of Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece and Rome), including the *little horn*, are chronological-sequential (Hasel¹¹⁵ 2000:834; Nichol 1976 1957:830; Shea 1986:165-219).

The judgment scene (verses 9-10) is presented parallel to the little horn of the fourth beast, after the little horn persecutes God's people, but prior to its ultimate destruction. There are two important "time markers" noted in the text that distinguish three different phases during the time of the fourth beast. These "time markers" are the words "until" and "and the time came" (verses 21 and 22). Gerhard F Hasel (2000:834; cf. Shea 1986:175-177) writes: "These two time markers separate the three phases of activity indicated in Daniel 7:21, 22".

The first phase consists of the horns war against the saints; the second phase (separated by the word "until" and indicating change) constitutes the heavenly judgment "in behalf of" the saints of the Most High; the third phase (separated by the words "and the time came") is the reception of the kingdom by the saints, in consequence to the preceding judgment. Gerhard F Hasel (2000:834, 835; cf. Gane 2007:6) advances the conclusion: "These three chronological sequences with their specific time markers, demonstrate that the divine heavenly judgment of the Ancient of days takes place *after* the war of the little horn against the saints of the Most High and *before* the saints of the Most high receive the eternal kingdom".

¹¹⁵ Ibid.

The period of time allocated to the persecution of God's people by the little horn is given in verse 25: "for a time, two times, and half a time". A similar time period is found in the parallel prophecy of Revelation 12:14 "a time, and times, and half a time"; this is interpreted earlier in verse 6 as "one thousand two hundred and sixty days"; even earlier in Revelation 11:2 it is given as "forty-two months" (30-day months). The three and a half symbolic times are interpreted through the word "time" taken to mean a year (360 days) as seen in the LXX version on Daniel 4:16, 23, 25 and 32. In that way it adds up to 1260 days as paralleled by Revelation 12:6. Using the "year-day thinking" principle, this comes to a period of 1260 *specified* years of persecution of God's people by the "little horn" (Hasel¹¹⁶ 2000:835; Nichol 1976:833; Shea 1992:359).

Using the historicist approach and the "year-day equivalency", Adventist theology applies the little horn to the papacy of Rome. The beginning period of papal *supremacy* was in 538 AD when the Ostrogoths abandoned their siege of Rome, and the Bishop of Rome was then capable of increasing his power in the Roman Empire. It was exactly 1260 years later (1798) that the papal supremacy declined in power when general LA Berthier, under Napoleon of France, arrested and exiled the pope. Therefore, Adventists see the fulfillment of prophecy since the pre-advent judgment also begins after 1798, in 1844, as shall be seen later (Gane 2007:11; Nichol 1976:833-838). Gerhard F Hasel (2000:835) says: "According to this evidence the heavenly pre-Advent investigative judgment of the saints takes place between 1798 and the Second Advent. It is located in the time of the end".

However, it is in Daniel 8 and 9 where Adventists have more precision with their calculations of predicted time (2300 evening[s]-morning[s], and the 70 weeks), as these visions are seen as an enlargement of Daniel 7 (Gane 1997:182; 2007:11; Hasel¹¹⁷ 2000:835; Shea 1986:183-219).

¹¹⁶ Gerhard F Hasel

¹¹⁷ Ibid.

In line with the principle of “recapitulation” that was mentioned in the preceding chapter of this research, Daniel 8 is understood as the third “historical apocalyptic” prophecy in the book of Daniel. Gerhard F Hasel (2000:836; cf. Gane 2007:9; cf. Shea 1986:183-219) states: “Here we find the third sequential prophetic outline vision in the book of Daniel, enlarging and complementing the visions of Daniel 2 and 7”.

Daniel 8 presents three powers (since Babylon was at the brink of dethronement – see Daniel 5) represented by the ram (Medo-Persia – “silver” in Daniel 2 and “bear” in Daniel 7), the he-goat with its four horns (Greece/Macedonia and its four Hellenistic kingdoms – “bronze” or “brass” in Daniel 2 and “leopard” with four heads in Daniel 7), and the “little horn” (Pagan and Papal Rome - the fourth “beast” and “little horn” in Daniel 7). Daniel 8:13, 14, ends the vision with an auditory revelation of the angels conversing with each other with regard to the time element of the activities of the “little horn”. Therefore, verses 3-12 provide the background to verses 13 and 14 (Gane 2007:10; Hasel¹¹⁸ 2000:836; Nichol 1976:840-843; Shea 1986:183).

An angel in verse 13 raises the question, “how long” or “until when” will be the “vision”? The favoured translation is “until when”, and this focuses the question to the end point or termination of the time period. However, the more important issue to be understood is whether the angel includes the whole vision and begins where it starts or whether it starts at a later point during this historical period (Gane 1997:182; Hasel¹¹⁹ 1986:387, 426; 2000:836).

Gerhard F Hasel (2000:836; cf. 1986:426) sees the importance of the Hebrew word for “vision” which first appears in verses 1 and 2, and argues that as the basis for concluding that the whole vision is included in the mind of the angel: “The word ‘vision’ is of essential importance for the question; this term is employed for the first time in Daniel 8:1, 2. The word thus includes the entire ‘vision’ from the ram period

¹¹⁸ Ibid.

¹¹⁹ Ibid.

forward...to the ‘time of the end’ (verses 17, 19).” He (ibid.) further argues: “The ‘vision’...began in the ram period, of ‘the kings of Media and Persia’ (verse 20). This would be at some point after Babylon had come to an end in 539 B.C.”.

The period covered by the angel begins during the time of the “ram” (Medo-Persia) and continues throughout history, including the period of the “he-goat” (Greece) which finished around 168 BC, and right through the period of Pagan Rome (ending in 476 AD, “when the last emperor of the Western Roman Empire, Romulus Augustulus, was deposed by Odoacer and his barbarian Germanic mercenaries) and the “little horn” (Papal Rome); it continues until “the time of the end” (verses 17, 19) (Gane 2007:10, 11; Hasel¹²⁰ 2000:837).

Daniel 8 is seen to give us “internally and contextually that an evening-morning, or a day of prophetic time, equals a year of historical time”. The answer to the question “until when...?” is that till 2300 days (evening[s]-morning[s]) and after that the sanctuary will be cleansed. This cleansing of the sanctuary is predicted to occur at the “time of the end” (verses 17, 19), having begun counting during the time of the empire of Medo-Persia, and therefore “this means that the symbolic evening[s]-morning[s] cannot refer to anything but years in historical time” – teaching the “year-day thinking” principle (Hasel¹²¹ 2000:837; 1986:426, 429).

The *precise year* for the beginning of the cleansing of the sanctuary is not derived from Daniel 7, but from chapters 8 and 9. Therefore, there needs to be a link made between chapters 8 and 9.

Daniel 8 and 9 are recognized as a “prophetic unit” in Adventist interpretation. This conclusion is based on *at least* 5 factors or “major linkages”: (1) “common terminology”, (2) “cultic perspective”, (3) “same angel-interpreter”, (4) “auditory-revelation” and (5) “conceptual link” (Gane 2007:11; Hasel¹²² 2000:837).

¹²⁰ Ibid.

¹²¹ Ibid.

¹²² Ibid.

(1) Common terminology: The use and key positioning of the word “understand” (in Daniel 8:15-17, 23, 27 again in Daniel 9:2, 22, 23) in the interpretation of the vision is seen as very significant. The “time” element of the vision in Daniel 8 is not explained in that chapter, but it is in chapter 9. Gerhard F Hasel (2000:837) argues this: “Understanding is not complete until all elements, including the time element, is understood. The vision of Daniel 8 is not understood until further explanations are provided in Daniel 9:24-27”.

(2) Cultic Perspective: Daniel 8 and 9 seem to complement each other from a cultic perspective. This can be derived from the use of cultic words like “sanctuary”, “cleansed”, and “transgression” (Daniel 8:11-14); “transgression”, “atone”, “anoint”, and “sacrifice and offering” (Daniel 9:24-27) (Hasel¹²³ 2000:837).

(3) Same Angel-Interpreter: Gabriel is seen for the first time in Daniel 8:16, and reappears in Daniel 9:21-23 where the writer says in the King James Version “Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning” (Hasel¹²⁴ 2000:837; Shea 1986:220).

(4) Auditory-Revelation: Chapters Daniel 8:13, 14 and 9:24-27 are both auditory revelations with timetables, the former being part of a larger vision. Considering the fact that the timetable auditory revelation of Daniel 8 is not explained in that chapter, and that Gabriel arrives with a mission of explaining a timetable, it appears logical and conclusive to Adventists that the only “vision” referred to in Daniel 9 is that of Daniel 8 (Hasel¹²⁵ 2000:837). Further William H Shea (1986:220) argues that in Daniel the “time” is usually stated last, whereas it is stated first in Daniel 9: “The time elements in Daniel’s visions are usually stated near their close. However, the vision in chapter 9 is so presented that its time element (70 weeks) is placed first”.

(5) Conceptual Link: Daniel 9:24 is interpreted to include the prediction of Christ’s “anointing” or “inauguration” of the heavenly sanctuary at his ascension into heaven,

¹²³ Ibid.

¹²⁴ Ibid.

¹²⁵ Ibid.

whereas Daniel 8:14 is understood to predict the “cleansing” of the heavenly sanctuary. These are both seen as climactic events in the heavenly “cultus” (Hasel¹²⁶ 2000:838; Shea 1986:221, 222).

To the 5 points above, William H Shea adds 3 more: (6) both the time-periods (70 weeks and 2300 “days”) begin in the Persian period of dominion; (7) both time elements are connected by the angel’s use of the term מְרֵאָה “vision”; the term originally used for the whole vision in Daniel 8 is חֲזוֹן “vision”, but the angel used מְרֵאָה “vision” for the time element, and used the same word in Daniel 9; (8) the root meaning of the word נִקְחָה (translated “decreed” or “determined”) is “cut off” and should thus be thought of here – 70 weeks being “cut off” from 2300 “days” (Shea 1986:220, 221).

Now that it is seen how Adventists recognize Daniel 8 and 9 as a “prophetic unit” or a “unitary vision”, I need to analyze Adventist interpretation of Daniel 9:24-27 with which it is calculated (together with Daniel 8) that 1844 begins the PAIJ.

Daniel 9:24-27 is viewed as a revelation of Israel’s probationary time period which was to extend for 70 weeks, or 490 years. This prophecy is seen to consist of “an uninterrupted, sequential, three-part chronology based on sequences of weeks”: 7-weeks/49-years, 62-weeks/434-years, and 1-week/7-years (Gane 2007:13; Shea 1992:376).

Presupposing, as already mentioned above, that the vision of chapter 8 is further explained in chapter 9, the time-periods of both chapters are understood to begin at the same time (2300 “days” and 70 “weeks”). Furthermore, it is argued that the Hebrew word נִקְחָה “decreed” (in Daniel 9:24) may just as well be translated “cut off”. As such, it means the 70-weeks/490-years are “cut off” or subtracted from 2300 days/years, leaving 1810 years (Gane 2007:12, 15; Hasel¹²⁷ 2000:838).

¹²⁶ Ibid.

¹²⁷ Ibid.

Little can be done with the above time-periods unless the beginning point is established. In the process of establishing the exact year for the beginning of these time-periods, it is noted by Adventists that Daniel 9:25 (King James Version) says the 490 “years” begin “from the going forth of the word [decree] to restore and build Jerusalem”. The “restoration” and the “rebuilding” of Jerusalem are understood as two separate but related aspects; “restoration” refers to its religio-political autonomy and self-governance, whereas “rebuilding” refers to the physical rebuilding of Jerusalem. Therefore, it is expected that the decree referred to in Daniel 9:25 should have both these aspects (Gane 2007:12; Ferch 1986:64; Hasel¹²⁸ 2000:838).

There are four major decrees that Adventists derive from Scripture, the first two and the fourth are seen to disqualify. The first decree in 538/537 BC (by Cyrus in Ezra 1:2-4) and the second in about 520 BC (by Darius I in Ezra 6:1-12) both refer to the rebuilding of the Temple in Jerusalem; they do not meet the requirements set by Daniel 9:25. The fourth one by Artaxerxes I in 445/444 BC (Nehemiah 1, 2, 3, 6) is that which gave Nehemiah permission to repair Jerusalem’s walls and gates damaged by the Samaritan outrages. However, the third decree by Artaxerxes I in 457 BC (Ezra 7:12-26) “qualifies as the fulfillment of the one mentioned in Daniel 9:25, because it speaks of both the rebuilding and the restoration of Jerusalem” (Gane 2007:12; Ferch 1986:64-74; Hasel¹²⁹ 2000:838; Shea 1992:375-394). Gerhard F Hasel (2000:839; Ferch 1986:64-74; cf. Shea 1986:225, 226) argues that this is the only one that qualifies, and therefore dating 457 BC/BCE as the commencement date for the time-periods of Daniel 8 and 9: “The ‘decree’ given by Artaxerxes is the only one which meets the two qualifications of Daniel 9:25.... Based on classical historical sources, an Egyptian astronomical source, a Babylonian astronomical source, Egypto-Jewish historical sources, and Babylonian historical sources, the decree and the return are dated to 457 BC... The year 457 BC is the beginning of the 490 years of Daniel 9 and likewise the beginning of the 2300 years of Daniel 8, from which the 490 years are ‘cut off’”.

¹²⁸ Ibid.

¹²⁹ Ibid.

Understanding the phrase 2300 “evening[s]-[morning[s]” (from Daniel 8:14) as meant to mean literal “years” in historical time, and 457 BC as the commencement date for both the 2300-years and the 70-weeks prophecies, the ending date arrived at is 1844 AD/CE – “the year in which the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary begins” (Gane 2007:15; Hasel¹³⁰ 2000:839).

In conclusion, it has been observed (by Adventist interpretation) that Daniel 7 places the cosmic and heavenly judgment sometime during the “time of the end”, after 1798 and prior to Christ’s return to earth. Based on Daniel 8 and 9, a precise year can be determined as 1844, referred to as the time for the restoration/cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary. This is understood as the heavenly pre-Advent judgment in harmony with the “hour of his judgment” in Revelation 14:7 (Davidson¹³¹ 2000:115; Hasel¹³² 2000:839).

5.4.3 The Time According to the Typology of the Earthly Sanctuary Services

In addition to the foregoing reasoning in support of the year 1844 as the beginning date of a pre-Advent judgment in heaven, the “ancient Israelite sanctuary service” is viewed as a typological contributor.

The link between Daniel 8 and Leviticus 16 (and the sanctuary) is based on at least 4 observations: (1) Daniel 8 uses two sacrificial animals (a ram and he-goat) that are “found as a pair in only one ancient Israelite ritual context – the Day of Atonement – as the two sacrifices of the Israelite non-priestly community”; (2) in Daniel 8:11, the “little horn” removes the *הַתְּמִיד* “regular”/“daily”, noting that this word elsewhere in Scripture qualifies a “cluster of regular worship activities” done for God by his people at the sanctuary; (3) the “sanctuary” is thrown down in verse 11; (4) in Daniel 8:12 rebellion/transgression against “the regular worship of God” is referred to, with the Hebrew word *פְּשָׁע* “transgression”, which “appears in pentateuchal ritual law only in

¹³⁰ Ibid.

¹³¹ Richard M Davidson

¹³² Gerhard F Hasel

the context of the Day of Atonement (Lev 16:16, 21)” (Gane 2007:8; 1986:427, 441-458; Rodriguez 1986:527-549).

The linkage between Daniel 8:14 and Leviticus 16 is made based on Daniel’s concept of “cleansing” of the sanctuary and the term “sanctuary” itself (Andreasen¹³³ 1986:475-496; Rodriguez 1986:531, 537-545).

No exact date can be determined from the sanctuary typology, except to indicate the *order of the phases* leading to this pre-Advent judgment. As already noted in the preceding chapter of this research and earlier in this chapter, Adventist theology views a “correspondential” parallel between the earthly sanctuary (with its priestly ministry) and the heavenly sanctuary (with its priestly ministry – Christ being the sole priest). Based on this conviction, and understanding a distinction between the “daily” and the “yearly” (Day of Atonement) ministries of the earthly priest, Adventists interpret this to mean that Christ as the true High Priest ministers in *two phases* in the heavenly sanctuary, after offering himself as the sacrifice at the cross. Gerhard F Hasel (2000:840; cf. Shea 1986:325, 326, 329, 330) reasons about the second phase of the priestly ministry of Christ: “The timing of this grand ritual day at the end of the ritual year is analogous to the timing of the heavenly antitypical day of atonement in ‘the time of the end.’ Thus the pre-Advent judgment corresponds antitypically to the Day of Atonement of the earthly sanctuary services”.

5.5 The Eschatological Antitypical Day of Atonement: *The Location of this Judgment*

It has already been established in this research that Adventism locates the New Testament sanctuary in heaven, as a correspondential parallel (see section on “Sanctuary Typology”) to the Israelite one. This sanctuary is in heaven, and as such, the Most Holy Place in which Christ ministers as priest in the Antitypical Day of Atonement is in heaven.

¹³³ Niels-Erik Andreasen

The key texts used in support of this conviction are: (1) Daniel 7 and its interplay of scenes between heaven and earth, describing cosmic judgment at the “thrones” related to the “Ancient of Days” (God); (2) Daniel 8 and its depiction of a “little horn” which ventures on a horizontal (political) war and eventually a vertical (spiritual/religious) war against the “Prince of the host” (Christ) and symbolically “takes away” his ministry from him; the expected fulfillment occurs at a time after the ascension of Christ when he is in heaven; (3) Hebrews 8 & 9 and its reference to a ἄληθινός “true” (the Greek term used in John 17:3 to describe the reality of God) sanctuary in heaven, such that the existence of the sanctuary “is real as God himself is real”; (4) Revelation 11:19 (cf. 14:15, 17; 16:17: 15:5; 7:15) and its distinction between heaven and the temple: “Then God’s Temple in heaven was opened...” (ESV); and Revelation’s depiction of the angels coming out of the temple, showing the heavenly sanctuary as “God’s command center of the universe, for the throne of God is there” (Hasel 2000:843; Moskala 2004:152).

5.6 The Eschatological Antitypical Day of Atonement: *The Judge of this Judgment*

Adventist theology recognizes God the Father as the one presiding as Judge in this first phase (PAIJ) of the last judgment, as derived from Daniel 7:9, 13 and 22. Gerhard F Hasel (2000:840; cf. Shea 1986:325) argues: “The first phase of the last judgment has God the Father as its judge.... God the Father is the judge in the Pre-Advent Investigative Judgment. Christ does not judge at that time”.

This involvement of the Father is seen to imply that the Father has an active role in the plan of salvation, and that he has interest in the welfare of the objects of judgment who will either be vindicated to life or condemned to death (Hasel 2000:840; Moskala 2004:139, 140).

Although the Father presides as judge in this judgment, Christ is also judge (John 5:22) in the sense that he is the one who pronounces judgment. Daniel 7 does not say that it is the “Ancient of Days” who pronounces, but rather that judgment is

pronounced in favor of the saints (Moskala 2004:151; Paulsen 1992:275, 291; Specht 1989:156).

Furthermore, the role that Christ plays at this time is that of *advocate* and *support* for those who are judged. He later receives a kingdom that he gives to the saints, as understood from Daniel 7:13, 14 and 18 (Hasel 2000:840; Moskala 2004:142; Wade 2000:280, 281).

5.7 The Eschatological Antitypical Day of Atonement: *The Objects of this Judgment*

The objects of God's judgment on this Antitypical Day of Atonement are those who *claim* to be Christians, those who *claim* faith in God through Christ's sacrifice. This is derived from the typology of the Typical Day of Atonement (as discussed in that section above) (Gane 2007:5; Veloso 1989:192). Biblical support is claimed from 1 Peter 4:17 where the apostle Peter declares that God's judgment must begin with the "house of God", meaning "believers".

It is further argued from Daniel 8:9-14 that "the cleansing, vindication, and restoration of the sanctuary in verse 14 are not a response required by the activity of the 'little horn'". Gerhard F Hasel (2000:841) proposes: "It [the little horn] attacks the 'Prince of the host,' but it does not contaminate the sanctuary". Therefore, the "little horn" is not the *direct* object of judgment. The judgment of the saints is the *indirect* solution to the "little horn" (Gane 1997:183; Hasel¹³⁴ 2000:842).

That Christians are the object of God's judgment at this time is also understood from the vision of Daniel 7 where the "books are opened". The contents of these books are said to include the names of the righteous, from Daniel 12. See section on "Heavenly Books of Record" in the preceding chapter within this research.

5.8 The Eschatological Antitypical Day of Atonement: *The Objectives of this Judgment*

¹³⁴ Gerhard F Hasel

There are 4 objectives of this judgment: (1) the determination of the inheritors of the kingdom; (2) the vindication of the saints; (3) the vindication of God's character; (4) the cleansing of the sanctuary (Hasel¹³⁵ 2000:844, 845). It can be seen that these derive and concur with the understanding of the objectives of the Typical Day of Atonement (see section above).

(1) *The determination of who will inherit the kingdom of God* is not taken to mean that God does not know. God has full knowledge as to who will make it to the kingdom, but God reveals to the heavenly intelligences what he knows (which is also recorded for all to see). Based on record, and in all transparency, God removes all already forgiven and pardoned sins of the righteous. The records ultimately reveal the destiny of all (Gane 2007:7; Hasel 2000:844).

(2) *The vindication of the saints* is also seen in Daniel 7 as God vindicates before the universe those who are "falsely accused, persecuted, and misjudged" by the "little horn". The emphasis of this judgment is not condemnation, since all humanity is already condemned, but it is vindication (Hasel 2000:844; Moskala 2004:152; Wade 2000:280, 281).

(3) *The vindication of God's character* is also accomplished in this judgment. In light of the view that God has been misrepresented by the devil as capricious, vindictive, distant and not caring, this judgment reveals him as one who fights for justice, righteousness and grace as he defends those covered by his own blood (Gane 2007:8; Hasel 2000:844).

(4) *The cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary* is seen as necessary from the view that sins have "accumulated" in the heavenly sanctuary. Holiness and sin do not have fellowship, therefore sin needs to be removed the holy sanctuary supposed to be in heaven (Hasel 2000:844, 845; cf. Treiyer 1986:228-255).

According to my observation of the interrelationship of the above objectives, the "cleansing" of the sanctuary is not only an objective, but also a means for the

¹³⁵ Ibid.

“vindication” of both God and saints. The “determination” or “revelation” of who ultimately inherits eternal life also depends on the “cleansing” of the sanctuary. Therefore, the correct understanding of the nature of “cleansing” (in Daniel 8:14, and its possible relationship with Leviticus 16) is crucial to the validity/invalidity of the Adventist theology of PAIJ.

5.9 “Righteousness by Faith” and “Judgment According to Works”

It is noted that there are some people who perceive a tension between the concept of “righteousness by faith” and that of “judgment according to works”. This “tension” does not exist according to Adventists (Blazen 2000:291; Hasel 2000:828, 829).

First of all, it is understood to be a bible-based teaching that God judges “according to works”. This is based on texts of the Old Testament and those of the New Testament (Matthew 7:17, 18; 25:31-46; John 15:1-11; Romans 2:13; 1 Corinthians 3:8, 13-15; Revelation 20:12; 22:12, etc.) (Blazen 2000:290; Hasel 2000:828).

Secondly, as noted in the preceding chapter under “Soteriology”, justification (righteousness by faith) is understood as not only a momentary act of God, but as one that continues to cover an individual against the wrath of God as long as the individual maintains the faith-relationship with Christ. As Ivan T Blazen (2000:290; cf. 1986:339-388) puts it: “Salvation is always a gift, but the gift does not remain when the Giver is rejected as the Lord of one’s life”.

Therefore, it is believed in Adventism that the works of faith of the justified believer are “the fruit of justification and the expression of a life guided by the Holy Spirit in sanctification”. These works do not “contribute in any way to the salvation of the believer” (Blazen 1986:339-388; 2000:291; Gane 1997:189, 190; 2007:5).

With “works” (“*relative* perfection” – see preceding chapter of this research) being understood as the “fruit” of justification by faith, no tension is recognized between the two, and no separation (although they are considered distinct) between them is warranted (Blazen 1986:339-388; 2000:291; Gane 2007:7; Paulsen 1992:275).

In a sense it can be said that this pre-Advent judgment is a *judgment of justification*. Jiri Moskala (2004:153; cf. Paulsen 1992:293, 294) argues this in this way: “What

was done heretofore more or less privately in the life of the individuals in relationship between God and themselves is now publicly made known to the whole universe. God affirms his judgment of justification in front of the universe to show that the saved stayed in close relationship with Him”.

Therefore, as I observe and understand the Adventist position, in the PAIJ God judges based on works (recorded evidence in full view of the universe) as a reliable reflection of the nature of his relationship with the individual undergoing judgment.

5.10 Conclusion

This chapter has had the objectives of analyzing the Adventist concept of sanctuary typology, the understanding of the Day of Atonement (type and antitype), and the relationship between “righteousness by faith” and “judgment according to works”.

It has been observed that Adventist sanctuary typology is both “vertical” and “horizontal” in its thrust. It is “vertical” in the sense that the earthly sanctuary is regarded as a limited but corresponding representation of the heavenly sanctuary; an earth-heaven parallel that did not begin in the New Testament but from the inception of the earthly sanctuary. It is “horizontal” in the sense that the earthly sanctuary and its ministrations is regarded as “pre-figurative”, “predictive” and “illustrative” of Christ’s ministrations as Sacrifice, Priest and Judge-King.

Christ’s priestly ministry has been shown to be understood as two-phased, corresponding to the two-phased ministries of the earthly priests in the “daily” and the “yearly” services. In the antitypical fulfillments, the “daily” corresponds with Christ’s intercessory ministry, and the “yearly” corresponds with Christ’s intercessory and judicial ministry from the year 1844 to the close of probation just prior to Christ’s return.

The objectives of this “affirmative” or “investigative” judgment have been shown to be the “vindication” of both God and believers in the sight of heavenly beings, through the removal of recorded but forgiven sins of the saints.

It has also been seen that Adventists see no inconsistency and tension between the concept of “righteousness by faith” and that of “judgment according to works”.

Adventists 'reconcile' these two notions by arguing that justification (righteousness by faith) produces fruits of obedience to the Lordship of Christ in the believer's life. Therefore, this view is claimed to exclude the notion of "faith *and* works" (salvation by works) but rather include or reflect the notion of "faith *that* works" (salvation by faith alone).

It is argued that there is no "degree" of holiness that one has to arrive at in order to be saved, but rather a continuance of faith and commitment to Christ (with its cycle of falling and repentance, and thus renewed forgiveness) guarantees salvation.

Much more could have been discussed about the Adventist theology of PAIJ. But sufficient has been covered to the end that the objectives of this research be met. Now, there needs to be an examination of Scripture, as the standard and test of all faith, to the end that the Adventist theology of PAIJ is evaluated (weaknesses and strengths revealed).

Chapter 6

THE EXEGETICAL AND THEOLOGICAL STUDY OF KEY TEXTS

6.1 Introduction

The overall objective of this chapter is to uncover the teaching of Scripture, through exegesis, in the texts which the writer of this research has found critical. These texts, specified below, are all located in the books of Daniel and Hebrews.

This research will also specify the theological implications of exegesis for the Adventist theology of the PAIJ.

6.2 Biblical Evidence (Daniel)

6.2.1 Introduction

The passages:

The passages of Scripture that the writer has found critical in the book of Daniel are chapters 7, 8 and 9. More specifically Daniel 7:9, 10, 13, 14; Daniel 8:9-14; Daniel 9:24-27. The reason for investigating their meaning under one section of this chapter is simply because of their location in the same book. Although the book of Daniel is largely written in the Hebrew (Daniel 1, 8-12) language, some parts of the book are in Aramaic (Daniel 2-7).

I chose the specified verses of Daniel 7 since they are the ones which refer to the event of judgment in heaven that evaluates “books”, and are therefore used by Adventists to support the claimed reality of a heavenly *investigative* judgment during the “time of the end”.

I chose the specified verses of Daniel 8 based on the fact that the most direct reference to a “cleansing” or “vindication” of the sanctuary is found here. Furthermore, it has been observed in this research that there is no other text as popular as verse 14 – both for the most direct reference to “cleansing” of the supposed “heavenly” sanctuary and also for the numerical quantity of 2300 “evening[s]-morning[s]” understood to be days.

I have chosen the mentioned verses of Daniel 9 simply because it is claimed that they are part, or an explanation, of the vision of Daniel 8.

The objectives

The general objective of this exegesis being to uncover the meaning of the texts in question, there will be greater focus, but not exclusively, on specific parts of the texts.

In Daniel 7, there will be shown a special interest in the words and phrases “thrones”, “Ancient of Days”, “fire”, “court”, “books”, “opened”, and “son of man”.

In Daniel 8, there will be special interest in the references to the “out of one of them”, “a little horn”, “host of the heavens”, “prince of the host”, “the continual”, “the place of his sanctuary”, “transgression”, “until when”, “make desolate”, “evenings and mornings” and “justified”.

In Daniel 9, there will be special attention paid to the references to “weeks”, “decreed”, “atone”, “seal”, “anoint a most holy”, “restore and build”, “an anointed one”, “shall be cut off”, “the prince”, “desolations are decreed”, “make a covenant with many”, “abominations” and “desolator”.

The perspectives

The major scholarly perspectives on Daniel 7:9, 10, 13, 14 are at least three, specifically with regard to the identity of the “Son of man”: (1) the “son of man” represents the archangel Michael and the “holy ones” of Daniel 7 are his angelic followers; the archangel is understood to receive the kingdom on the angelic followers’ behalf; (2) the “son of man” is understood as a personification of the nation or people of Israel; (3) the “son of man” is Christ; this is the “messianic view”; the most powerful evidence in favour of this view is Christ’s own words in Mark 14:61-62, where he could not have been referring to any other text in the Old Testament but this one; this is the view that survives the Scriptural test (cf. Baldwin 1978:142, 152, 154; Miller 1994:207-210).

The major scholarly perspectives on Daniel 8:9-14 are at least four: (1) the most commonly held view is that the “little horn” is Antiochus IV Epiphanes, who desecrated the Jewish Temple and persecuted many Jews; Julius Maccabees rededicated the Temple in December 14 164 BC/BCE; (2) the “little horn” refers to the “papacy” for his persecution of the saints and war against Christ’s priestly ministry; the sanctuary is “justified/cleansed” as an eschatological fulfillment of the Hebrew Day of Atonement; (3) the “little horn” refers to both Antiochus IV Epiphanes and the “papacy”; the prophecy is recurring (the later fulfillments being secondary and not being in the author’s mind); (4) Antiochus IV Epiphanes is just a type of the “little horn”, a future Antichrist is still to come (Ford 2008:143, 144; cf. Ford 2009:3-7; Hasel¹³⁶ 1986:378-461; Miller 1994:225-230; Schwantes 1986:462-474; Shea 1992:31-66;).

The major scholarly perspectives on Daniel 9:24-27 are: (1) the “weeks” of this text represent literal years (for some it is symbolic), commencing 587/586 BC (the date of Jerusalem’s fall) and terminating at the end of Antiochus’s persecution, at which time the kingdom of God is expected to come upon the earth; week 1 extends from 586 BC to the fall of Babylon in 539/538 BC and the release of Jewish exiles by Cyrus, the “anointed one” being largely considered Joshua the high priest associated with

¹³⁶ Gerhard F Hasel

Zerubbabel; the other 62 weeks extend from Joshua to the death of another “anointed one” (the high priest Onias III in 171/170 BC); Aniochus’s persecutions become the subject of the last 1 week, ending in 163 BC (cf. Goldingay 1989:257, 258; Hill 2008:174; Miller 1994:253).

(2) The “70 weeks” are mere symbolic periods of time that terminate at the first century AD; the 7 weeks begin at Cyrus’s decree to release the Jews in 538 BC to the time of Ezra (about 440-400 BC), and then the next 62 weeks continue until the first advent of Christ, and the last week begins from the first advent to an unspecified time after Christ’s earthly ministry prior to the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 AD (cf. Baldwin 1978:176-78; Hill 2008:173, 174; Miller 1994:254; cf. Young 1949:201).

(3) The “70 weeks” are symbolic periods of time of church history that begin with Cyrus’s decree in 538 BC and stretch to Christ’s second coming; the first 7 weeks span from the decree to the first Advent, the 62 weeks then cover the time from Christ to the persecutions of the Antichrist at the end of the age; the “city” is interpreted as the “church”; the events in verses 26 and 27 occur in the last 1 week; the “ruler” of verses 26-27 is the Antichrist who destroys the church and stops all organized worship until judgment is poured out upon the Antichrist at Christ’s coming (Miller 1994:255, 256).

(4) The “70 weeks” are literal years ending with Christ’s second coming; the first 7 weeks start at the command to rebuild Jerusalem (Ezra - 458 BC or Nehemiah – 445 BC) and end with the completion of the work (409/396 BC). The following 62 weeks extend to either the baptism of Christ in 26 AD or his presentation of himself to the people as Messiah on Palm Sunday in 32/33 AD. After the rejection of the Messiah by the Jews, the time for Gentiles began (not included in the “70 weeks”). At the end of the this present age, God is expected to begin his special recognition of the Jews – the last week – during which time there will be great tribulation for the world and the Jews. This period will terminate with the arrival of God’s eschatological kingdom

(earthly) that will last a thousand years and beyond (Hasel¹³⁷ 1986:5, 22; Hill 2008:173; Miller 1994:257).

(5) The Adventist interprets the “70 weeks” as 490 literal years, beginning at the decree of Artaxerxes in 457 BC. The first 49 years extend to 408 BC at which time Jerusalem is expected to have been rebuilt and restored. The next 62 weeks extend to the baptism of Christ in 27 AD, and the last 1 week is held to extend to the shifting of the gospel from the Jews to the Gentiles (traditionally signified by the stoning of Stephen presumably in 34 AD). In this way, the Messiah is Christ and is “cut off” at his death in the middle of the week (3 and ½ years after baptism), giving the Jews about 3½ years of the gospel’s attention. The “70 weeks” prophecy is understood to be part of the larger 2300 literal years of Daniel 8, and “cut off” from it. Thus leaving 1800 literal years from 34 AD, leading to 1844 AD, at which point a cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary is expected to have begun, extending to the close of human probation and the second coming of Christ (see *chapter 5* of this research).

The plan

This study will analyze the context (general, historical, literary structure, theological) of the book of Daniel as a whole. This study will also conduct exegesis (make a translation and show the meaning to both the original and today’s readers) of the relevant texts.

6.2.2 Context of the book

General background: author, date and audience

Regarding the authorship and date of the book of Daniel, there are two competing major views of approach: (1) the “Exilic Thesis” or “Traditional” view which largely consists of conservative/evangelical (those assuming the “historical-grammatical” method of Biblical interpretation) scholars, and (2) the “Maccabean Thesis”, “Critical” or “Mainline” view which is largely advocated by liberal (those assuming the

¹³⁷ Gerhard F Hasel

“historical-critical” method of Biblical interpretation) scholars. There are some who profess to be evangelical and yet adopt a modified version of historical-critical assumptions, and thus support the Maccabean Thesis (Ferch 1986:3; Hill 2008:22; Steinmann 2008:1).

The “Exilic Thesis” or “Traditional” view accepts the book’s self-testimony with regard to the authorship, date and origin. It assigns all the historical events (and prophetic visions) and characters in the book to the 6th century BC/BCE Jewish captivity in Babylon. The entire book is said to be the product of one author, Daniel. As Andrew E Steinmann (2008:1; cf. Ferch 1986:3; cf. Hill 2008:22) says, "This view accepts the book as coming from the pen of Daniel and understands the events related in the book as historically accurate”.

The “Maccabean Thesis” or “Mainline” view stands in contrast to the preceding view, and is apparently the dominant one, at least since the early 20th century. This approach considers the book as historically unreliable, and with “pretended” predictions (written after the fact). Also, it is argued that the book was largely (if not entirely) written by multiple authors/editors in the 2nd century BC/BCE, during the persecution of the Jews in Palestine by Antiochus IV Epiphanes. The first author might have lived in the 6th century, but the book was developed by others (Ford 2007:95-99; Miller 1994:23; Steinmann 2008:1, 3-5).

Since the author of this research does not share the presuppositions of the Maccabean Thesis or Mainline view, he subscribes to the Exilic Thesis or Traditional view - accepting the book’s self-testimony. He believes that the book of Daniel is fully reliable (without historical or prophetic error) and is the genuine work of Daniel as one author under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, writing in the 6th century BC/BCE.

Historical context: occasion, purpose and milieu

Daniel chapter 1 makes us to know that many Jews were in exile in the land of Babylon, after Nebuchadnezzar and his forces invaded Judah in 605 BC. Daniel and his friends were taken into captivity but soon received various promotions within their service for the Babylonian king.

While other prophets were ministering (Jeremiah in Judah, Ezekiel amongst the exiles) elsewhere, Daniel ministered more directly within the context of the king's palace. He provided heavenly advice and direction to monarchs – with Nebuchadnezzar (chapters 1-4), Belshazzar (chapters 5, 7, 8), Darius (chapters 6, 9), Cyrus (chapter 10).

From the themes of this book (see below) it appears that Daniel's mission was to reveal to monarchs and the Jews God's control of history and all powers within, and the role that each entity was to play within God's larger plan.

Literary structure: structure and argument

Part A: Daniel's ministry and experiences in Babylon (chapters 1-6)

- I. Introduction and diet test (chapter 1)
 - i. Exile into Babylon (verses 1-4)
 - ii. Diet test (verse 5-16)
 - iii. Divine reward of superiority (verses 17-21)
- II. Nebuchadnezzar's dream and Daniel's interpretation (chapter 2)
 - i. Nebuchadnezzar's dream and demand for interpretation (verses 1-13)
 - ii. Daniel request for time and God's revelation to him (verses 14-23)
 - iii. Daniel's relation and interpretation of the dream (verses 24-45)
 - iv. Nebuchadnezzar's respect, recognition and promotion of Daniel and his friends (verses 46-49)
- III. Daniel's friends are tested at the fiery furnace (chapter 3)
 - i. Nebuchadnezzar's image and the proclamation of its homage (verses 1-6)
 - ii. The people's worship of the image and the defiance of the three Hebrews (7-18)
 - iii. Nebuchadnezzar's fury and attempted punishment of the three Hebrews (verses 19-23)

- iv. Nebuchadnezzar's astonishment, the release of the Hebrews and the proclamation of forced worship to God (verses 24-30)
- IV. Nebuchadnezzar's dream and Daniel's interpretation (chapter 4)
 - i. Nebuchadnezzar's introduction (verses 1-3)
 - ii. Nebuchadnezzar's dream and the wise men's failure of interpretation (verses 4-7)
 - iii. Nebuchadnezzar's relation of the dream to Daniel (verses 8-18)
 - iv. Daniel's interpretation and call for repentance (verses 19-27)
 - v. The fulfillment of the dream (verses 28-33)
 - vi. The acknowledgment of God by Nebuchadnezzar and his restoration to power (34-37)
- V. Daniel interprets the writing on the wall (chapter 5)
 - i. Belshazzar's feast (verses 1-4)
 - ii. The writing on the wall and the wise men's failure (verses 5-9)
 - iii. Daniel is called in for interpretation (verses 10-16)
 - iv. Daniel's declaration of God's justice and interpretation (17-28)
 - v. Belshazzar's command for Daniel's reward (verse 29)
 - vi. The death of Belshazzar and fall of Neo-Babylonia (verses 30-31)
- VI. Daniel is tested in the Lion's Den (chapter 6)
 - i. The distinction of Daniel (verses 1-3)
 - ii. The envious plan for Daniel's demise (4-9)
 - iii. Daniel's courage and consistency takes him to the den of lions (verses 10-18)
 - iv. Daniel's deliverance and the enemies' destruction (verses 19-24)
 - v. Darius' recognition and decree for the reverence of Jehovah (25-27)
 - vi. Conclusion (verse 28)

Part B: Daniel's visions in Babylon (chapters 7-12)

- VII. Daniel's vision of four beasts and the Little Horn (chapter 7)
 - i. Introduction (verse 1)

- ii. The vision of four beasts and the Little Horn (verses 2-8)
 - iii. The heavenly judgment scene (verses 9-10)
 - iv. The destruction of the beast – and the Little Horn (verses 11-12)
 - v. The coronation of the Son of Man for the eschatological kingdom (verses 13-14)
 - vi. Daniel’s request for an interpretation (verses 15-16)
 - vii. The interpretation of the vision (verses 17- 27)
 - viii. Conclusion (verse 28)
- VIII. Daniel’s vision of two sacrificial animals and a Little Horn (chapter 8)
- i. Introduction (verse 1)
 - ii. The vision of the ram, goat and the Little Horn (verses 2-14)
 - iii. Daniel’s need for interpretation (verse 15)
 - iv. The Interpretation (verses 16-26)
 - v. Conclusion (verse 27)
- IX. Daniel’s vision of the 70 weeks (chapter 9)
- i. Introduction (verses 1-2)
 - ii. Daniel’s prayer for the Jews, Jerusalem and the Temple (verses 3-19)
 - iii. Gabriel arrives to give Daniel understanding (20-23)
 - iv. Gabriel gives Daniel understanding about the 70 weeks (24-27)
- X. Daniel’s last vision (chapters 10-12)
- i. Introduction (verses 1-3)
 - ii. The vision of the man clothed in linen (4-10)
 - iii. The man in linen explains the vision to Daniel (10:11-12:13)

Theological: themes and motifs

The themes of the book of Daniel cluster around the concept of divine judgment; every chapter of the book lives up to the meaning of Daniel’s name, “God is my Judge”. In each chapter, we find Judgment: (1) God’s vindication of Daniel and his friends by giving them wisdom, (2) God’s judgment on the world empires in succession and the eschatological kingdom’s destruction of those preceding, (3) the

vindication and deliverance of the three Hebrews from the furnace, (4) the judgment on Nebuchadnezzar, (5) the judgment on Belshazzar and Neo-Babylonia, (6) the vindication-deliverance of Daniel and the condemnation-destruction of his enemies, (7) the vindication-deliverance of the saints and the condemnation-destruction of the Little Horn, (8) the vindication of the sanctuary (and the saints) and the condemnation-destruction of the Little Horn, (9) the judgment on the sanctuary, Israel, and the “desolator”, (10-12) the judgment on the nations, closing with the eschatological resurrection of the saints.

Other themes related to Judgment are Eschatology, the Work of Christ as the Son of Man, Michael and the Messiah. The Sovereignty of God is attached to these themes as well.

6.2.3 Exegesis of the passages

The Hebrew text used for this translation of my own is the Leningrad Codex (L).

The text and its translation (Daniel 7)

Daniel 7:9-10, 13-14 *“[9] I kept looking until thrones were placed and the Ancient of Days sat, whose garment was as white as snow and the hair of his head like pure wool. His throne was like flames of fire and its wheels like burning fire. [10] A river of fire came out and did flow from before him; a thousand thousands served him and myriad myriads stood before him. The court sat and books were opened.... [13] I kept looking in visions of the night, and behold, one like the son of man was coming with the clouds of the heavens, and he came to the Ancient of Days. And they brought him near before him. [14] And to him was given dominion, and honour, and a kingdom that all peoples, nations, and languages should serve him. His dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed”.*

The immediate historical setting

Daniel, still working in the king's palace during King Belshazzar's first year of reign, receives a vision/dream at night which he writes down afterwards (Daniel 7:1, 2).

The meaning for the original readers

כְּרִסְוֹן “thrones” - There is a plurality, whereas only God as the “Ancient of Days” is stated to sit down on a throne, leaving one with two options: (1) there is only one more throne reserved for the “son of man” who later receives the universal kingdom (verse 14), or (2) there are many thrones for the angelic group (“myriad myriads”) to sit on when “the court sat”. In the absence of textual evidence in Scripture of angels on thrones in heaven, receiving service, it is the “son of man” who later sits on *one* other throne at his reception of the kingdom (verse 14) (BDB 1996; Strong 1890; cf. Henry 1706).

The identity of the אֲנִיִּים יוֹמֵי “Ancient of Days” is God, simply based on the parallels of description between Daniel 7:9, 10 and Ezekiel 1, 10; and also on the fact that this Being gives universal authority to the “son of man” (verse 14) (BDB 1996; Strong 1890; Holladay 1988; cf. Jamieson, Fausset and Brown 1871; cf. Henry 1706).

The references to אֵשׁ “fire” (“flames of fire”, “burning fire” and “river of fire”) signify the *presence of God*, which implies judgment (condemnation) for the wicked and the eradication/purification of sin (Exodus 19:18; 24:17; Leviticus 10:2; Deuteronomy 5:25; Isaiah 30:30) (BDB 1996; Strong 1890).

The word דִּינָא “court” also means “judgment”, implying that the sitting down here is the commencement of a judiciary process, with God presiding. Hence the statement that the סְפָרִין “books” were פְּתִיחוּ “opened”. The “books” are “records” that God keeps of the lives of humanity (Exodus 32:32; Malachi 3:16). To “open” the books means to reveal what is in them (BDB 1996; Strong 1890; cf. Jamieson et al. 1871).

It is clear that this whole scene is one of judgment. Considering the context of the “little horn”, the judgment is against the “little horn”. Hence, the “little horn” and the beast are eventually destroyed (verse 11, 26); in the judgment, the “little horn” is condemned and, based on that, eventually destroyed.

The basis for the little horn’s destruction is that which is written in the books; a process of investigative/revelatory judgment is herein found. This judgment process

is clearly not for the benefit of God since he is omniscient. It is therefore for the benefit of the angelic beings constituting the “court” or “judgment”.

Although the “little horn” is clearly the primary focus of this judgment, the judgment does not involve it alone as its subject. This is clear from verse 22 that *וְדִינָא יְהִי לְקַדְיִשֵׁי עֲלִיּוֹנִין* “judgment was given for the saints of the Most High” (cf. verse 27). Logically, it does not make sense as to how the judgment could be pronounced in their favour without any objective analysis of their role in this crisis; as much as God is omniscient, that does not make him biased in judgment. Furthermore, the “books” that are the basis of judgment do not only have the life-records of the wicked, but also of the saints (BDB 1996; Holladay 1988; Strong 1890; cf. Henry 1706).

This judgment of the “little horn” is clearly not the only concern of this vision, for there are cosmic concerns that climax in an eschatological kingdom (verse 14). The bigger theme in the book of Daniel overshadows the “little horn”; the theme of God’s justice and sovereignty. This may well be the “day of judgment” foreseen by Christ in Matthew 12:37 where he says, “...by your words you will be justified [δικαιωθήσῃ], and by your words you will be condemned [καταδικασθήσῃ]” (ESV).

The structure of this passage (Daniel 7) places the judgment-event concurrently with the blasphemous and persecutory activities of the “little horn”, prior to its destruction and the arrival of the eschatological kingdom of the “son of man”. Furthermore, verses 21 and 22 give markers of the sequence of events; the word *עַד* “until” (between the *persecution-activities* and the *judgment-event*) and the words *וְזָמַן מְטָא* “and the time came” (between the *judgment-pronouncement* and the *eschatological kingdom*). It is clear that this is a pre-advent judgment. However, the *exact* time, *duration* and *details* of this judgment are *not* given in this text.

בְּרִאֲשׁוֹן “son of man” (Daniel 7:13) is the Aramaic equivalent of the Hebrew *בֶּן־אָדָם* (Daniel 8:17) – this phrase is consistently used in the Old Testament to denote a human being, thus humanity (Numbers 23:19; Job 25:6; 35:8; Psalm 8:4; 80:7; 144:3; 146:3; Isaiah 51:12; 56:2; Jeremiah 49:18, 33; 50:40; 51:43; and many more

in Ezekiel). However, the being referred to in Daniel (7:13, 14) is more than a human based on the following evidence: (1) he receives the universal eschatological kingdom, and (2) receives worship. This being can be no other being than Christ himself – he is both human and divine (BDB 1996; Holladay 1988; Strong 1890; cf. Henry 1706).

Exegetical synthesis

This is a scene of heavenly judgment on the “little horn”. However, the condemnation of the “little horn” would not make any sense without the vindication of its victims – namely the persecuted saints and the name of Jehovah God. The work of condemning the “little horn” necessarily involves and includes the vindication of the saints.

This work is accomplished by the investigation of the books of record which are obviously not needed by God (he is omniscient) but are needed for the witnesses in court, namely the angelic beings. This act balances the concept of God’s Sovereignty so prevalent throughout the book of Daniel; God is here revealed as one who cannot be questioned and yet one who shows Himself transparent, objective and just in all of His ways.

Contrary to the views that the “Son of Man” is a personification of Israel or that he is an archangel Michael, who receives the kingdom on behalf of elevated saint followers (elevated to angelic rank), it has been shown that the “Son of Man” is none other than Christ himself, at the coronation and inauguration of his eschatological kingdom.

Contemporary significance (theological and ethical)

The exegesis of Daniel 7:9, 10 shows some congruence with the Adventist understanding of this scene to an extent: (1) one of judgment (references to the “court” or “judgment” and “fire”) with elements of investigation/revelation (references to “books” that were “opened”) from the perspective of the heavenly beings, and confirmation/affirmation from the divine perspective; (2) this judgment is *against* the “little horn” and *for* the saints; (3) also, the event-order testifies to the Adventist

understanding that this judgment takes place in heaven prior to the Second Coming of Christ – a pre-advent judgment.

The exegesis of Daniel 7:13, 14 also shows compatibility with the Adventist understanding that the “Son of Man” is Christ, receiving His eschatological kingdom which he shares with the saints of the Most High.

In an age of hopelessness and calamity, this text shows that God is still in control. The church might seem as if about to fall and not succeed in its mission, but Christ will receive the kingdom, implying that the church will rise triumphant over the forces of evil.

Our world is plagued by corruption and injustice, but God shows us a better model of holiness – a model of justice for the weak and the oppressed and a model of restoration for the victims of evil.

The text and its translation (Daniel 8)

Daniel 8:9-14 “[9] ...And from one of them came a little horn, and became very great, toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the beautiful land. [10] And it became great even to the host of the heavens. And it made fall to the ground some of the host and of the stars, and trampled them. [11] He made himself great even to the ruler of the host, and by him the continual was removed, and the place of his sanctuary was thrown down. [12] And a host was given with the continual through transgression; and it threw truth to the ground; and it worked and prospered. [13] Then I heard a certain holy one speaking, and another holy one said to the one who spoke, ‘Until when is the vision, the continual and the desolating transgression, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trampled?’ [14] And he said to me, ‘Until 2300 evenings and mornings, then will the sanctuary be justified’”.

The immediate historical setting

Daniel continues to serve in the king of Babylon’s palace. At this point Belshazzar is king in his third year of reign. Daniel receives a vision (Daniel 8:1, 2).

The meaning for the original readers

The clause *וּמִן־הָאֶחָת מֵהֶם יָצָא קֶרְנוֹ־אֶחָת מִצְעִירָה* “and out of one of them came a little horn” (verse 9) presents some grammatical problems, at least in the English translation. The numerical *אֶחָת* “one” and the pronoun *מֵהֶם* “them” (verse 9) refer back to verse 8 “...And there came up four conspicuous [horns] in its place, toward the four winds of the heavens”. There are two possibilities: (1) the pronoun “them” in verse 9 refers to the four *קֶרְנוֹת* “horns” (not found in verse 8, but implied), or (2) the pronoun “them” in verse 9 refers to *הַשָּׁמַיִם* “the heavens” (verse 8). To know the correct option, one needs to do a verbal analysis. The pronoun *מֵהֶם* “them” is *plural-masculine*. The implied word *קֶרְנוֹת* “horns” is *plural-feminine*, whereas the word *הַשָּׁמַיִם* “the heavens” is *plural-masculine*. Therefore, the pronoun “them” in verse 9 refers to the “heavens”. Furthermore, the numerical *אֶחָת* “one” (*feminine*, verse 9) refers to the *רוּחוֹת* “winds” (*feminine*). Verse 9 could therefore read, “And from one [the winds] of them [the heavens] came a little horn”. The fact that this horn (verse 9) comes out of the four winds, without the mention of any beast to which it is attached (and thus unnatural), is not a strong enough counter-argument since neither the animals nor the events in the vision fit natural law. Furthermore, considering the sanctuary context of this vision, this “little horn” might be a deliberate echo of the horns of the four-cornered bronze altar of the sanctuary (Exodus 27:2) (BDB 1996; Holladay 1988; cf. Jamieson et al. 1871; Strong 1890).

The identity of *מִצְעִירָה* *קֶרְנוֹ־אֶחָת* “a little horn” (verse 9) is crucial as this is the subject of almost all activities in this passage. Based on the preceding understanding that this horn came from the four winds of the heavens, the “little horn” does not come from the kingdom symbolized by the goat. Since the goat-symbol is interpreted to mean the Macedonian Empire through its king (verse 21), the “little horn” must represent a king (and his kingdom) arriving after the four kingdoms of Greece, and is unattached to them. The text says about this “horn”, *וַתְּגַדֵּל־יָתֶר* “and became very great”, by its exploits *אֶל* “against” the “south”, “east” and *הַצְּבִי* “the glorious [land]”, and also against the “host of the heavens” (see below) and the “ruler of the host” (see below); during the multi-directional exploits of the “little horn”, there are many *עֲצֻמִּים* “mighty” (in number) and “holy people” (see below) who are killed and persecuted (verse 24) (BDB 1996; cf. Henry 1706; Holladay 1988; Strong 1890).

The phrase, עַד־הַשָּׁמַיִם הַשָּׁמַיִם “even to the host of the heavens” (verse 10), calls for special attention. The phrase “host of the heavens” is *always* used in the Old Testament (about 20 verses altogether) to refer to the celestial stars, usually (almost exclusively) in the context of apostate worship (Deuteronomy 4:19; 17:3; 2 Kings 17:16; 21:3, 5; 23:4, etc.), and at least once used to refer to heavenly beings standing around the throne of God (1 Kings 22:19). שָׁמַיִם may mean “heaven” or “heavens” as seen in various Bible translations. Therefore, the reference of the phrase “host of the heavens” is to heavenly beings. The phrase “and of the stars” may simply be a rephrase of the initial phrase “host of the heavens”. These heavenly beings *cannot* be *literally* thrown or “cast down” to the *earth* and “trampled upon”. The activities of the “little horn” somehow figuratively וַתִּפֹּל “and overthrew” (another meaning for “cast down” in the Hebrew) and trampled upon them, possibly, in drawing closer to “the ruler of the host” (verse 11) who is the real enemy (BDB 1996; Holladay 1988; Strong 1890).

The phrase, וְעַם־קֹדְשִׁים “and the holy people” (of verse 24), clearly refers to the Jews, but not necessarily in an exclusive way. It was God who declared them as such, or at least intended them to be holy (Leviticus 20:26; Deuteronomy 7:6; 14:2; 14:21). In the book of Daniel, the Jews are also referred to by Gabriel as עַמְךָ “thy people” (9:24; 10:14; 11:14; 12:1), לְקֹדְשֵׁי עֶלְיוֹנִין “for the saints of the Most High” (7:18, 22, 25, 27), and possibly עַם “[the] people” (11:32, 33). However, just as one does not expect only Jews to inherit the eschatological kingdom (Daniel 7:27), so too should one not be dogmatic in understanding “the holy people” to be Jews exclusively. God was even then open to non-Jews’ worship of himself (cf. Isaiah 62) (BDB 1996; Holladay 1988; Strong 1890).

The phrase שֹׁרֵה־הַצִּבָּא “ruler of the host” (verse 11) also needs special attention. The term שֹׁר “ruler” is used in Daniel and in the Old Testament for various earthly positions of leadership (Daniel 1:8; Genesis 12:15; Numbers 22:8; 2 Chronicles 22:8; etc.). Furthermore, the phrase “ruler of the host” is found numerous in reference to army captains and their armies (1 Samuel 12:9; 17:55; 2 Samuel 10:16; 1 Kings 2:32; 11:15; etc.). It is used at least once in Joshua 5:14, 15, where a being that

receives “worship” and makes that meeting place “holy ground” (similarly to Moses at the burning bush), thus divine, calls himself the “ruler of the host”. Therefore, if the “host of the heavens” refers to heavenly beings, it is logical to understand the “ruler of the host” as referring to Christ (BDB 1996; cf. Henry 1706; Holladay 1988; Strong 1890; cf. Jamieson et al. 1871).

When comparing Daniel 8:11 with 8:25, there appears to be a parallel between, “ruler of the host” and שַׂר־שָׂרִים “ruler of rulers”; and in verse 25, the “little horn” is interpreted as the “strong-faced king”, seen also by the use of the word אֶל “against” for its activities in relation to the “ruler of rulers”. Gabriel, talking to Daniel (10:13), mentions a “Michael” who is הַרְאֲשָׁנִים הַשָּׂרִים אֶחָד “a chief of the rulers”. Without going into a discussion about the identity of “Michael”, suffice it to note that heavenly beings may also be referred to as הַשָּׂרִים “the rulers”, hence parallel to “the host” of the heavens (verse 10) (BDB 1996; cf. Henry 1706; Holladay 1988; Strong 1890).

This is another crucial phrase, הָרִים הַתָּמִיד “the regular/continual was removed” by the “little horn” (verse 11). The word תָּמִיד “continual” is found about 103 times in the Old Testament (about 5 times in Daniel). In Daniel, it is never used with the word זָבַח or מִנְחָת “sacrifice”, even when the word “sacrifice” is used in Daniel 9:21, 27. In the Old Testament, the word תָּמִיד “continual” is used (the *sanctuary* linguistic-context of Daniel 8 helping to narrow down the list) with at least 6 sanctuary related things: (1) the *burnt offering*, (Exodus 29:42; Numbers 28:3, 6, 10), (2) the *bread* (Numbers 4:7; 2 Chronicles 2:4); (3) the *meal offering* (Leviticus 6:20; Numbers 4:16; Nehemiah 10:33); (4) the *fire* (Leviticus 6:13); (5) the *lamp* (Leviticus 24:2); and (6) the *incense* (Exodus 30:8). The common thing between all of these is their daily and continuous use or service at the sanctuary. In the absence of textual evidence in Daniel 8 (or the whole book), qualifying the “continual”, the author of this research finds no better (and broader) word than “service”. Thus, the text could mean, “the continual *service* [of the ruler] was removed”. The Ruler’s “service” is bound to be priestly, as the sanctuary context dictates (BDB 1996; Holladay 1988; Strong 1890).

Related to the preceding phrase, is the one that says מְכוֹן מִקְדָּשׁוֹ “the place of his sanctuary” (verse 11). The מִקְדָּשׁוֹ “sanctuary” or “temple” is consistently understood

as a מְכוּן “place” of God’s dwelling, referring to the earthly sanctuary (Exodus 15:17; 25:8; etc.) or to the heavenly sanctuary (Psalm 33:14; 68:35). If Christ is really the “ruler of the host”, then this can be no other sanctuary than the one in heaven (BDB 1996; Holladay 1988; Strong 1890).

Going back to the “little horn” and its activities (described above), an apparent parallel is worth mentioning between the number and sequence of kingdoms of chapters 2, 7 and 8. Chapters 2 and 7 list four empires in succession, and chapter 8 lists only three (possibly because of the timing of the vision – the Babylonian Empire about to be overthrown). With that in mind, the “little horn” (chapter 8) appears to be a repetition or echo of the one in chapter 7. Both arrive after the four divisions of Greece (if the leopard of chapter 7 is symbolic of that); both exploit against political kingdoms, and both make exploits against God and his saints. However, that is an area parallel but not within the scope of this research as it implies more extensive exegesis of chapter 7.

The phrase עַד־מָתַי הַחֲזוֹן “until when is the vision” (8:13) is very significant. In chapter 8 of the book of Daniel, the word הַחֲזוֹן “the vision” is used about six times. Before its use in verse 13, it is used three times in verses 1 and 2, referring to the appearances he sees from verse 3 through 13. It is clear therefore, that the “holy one” has the whole vision in mind (from the “ram” through the appearances of “holy ones” in dialogue), not just the activities of the “little horn”, although these get special attention. Furthermore, Daniel, when he had seen the “vision” (הַחֲזוֹן) and “requested” or “desired” בְּקִשָּׁה for its meaning in verse 15, the “holy ones” explained to him *from the beginning*, from the “ram” through (see verses 15-27). It is clear, however, that the activities of the “little horn” are especially, but not exclusively, focused upon (in harmony with the uniqueness of the horn’s activities). The further references within the question to “the desolating transgression” and the trampling of both the sanctuary and the host testify to this (BDB 1996; Holladay 1988; Strong 1890).

וְהַפְּשַׁע שׁוֹמֵם “and the desolating transgression” – While the activities of the “little horn” include its political exploits (warring against the “south”, “east” and the “glorious land”

–verse 9), the special concern of its activities in verse 13 seems to be narrowed down to a sanctuary context (warring against the “host” – eventually taking away the “continual” from the “ruler of the host” – and “trampling” on the sanctuary). Therefore, the terms “desolating” and “transgression” should be interpreted best in a sanctuary context. The concept of עוֹמֵם “desolating” in relation to the sanctuary is used for its destruction - punishment because of apostasy, and consequently the ceasing of its services (Leviticus 26:32, 33). This fact fits well with the Danielic prophecy of the “little horn” in that it takes away the sanctuary “continual service” of the “ruler of host” and casts down the “host of the heavens”, and in this way ceasing its services and causing desolation. Interestingly, the only time, at least in the Pentateuch, the term פֶּשַׁע “transgression” or “rebellion” is used in a sanctuary context is in Leviticus 16:16, 21 (the chapter describing and prescribing the Day of Atonement). However *that alone* is not sufficient ground to impose the backdrop of Leviticus 16 into Daniel 8 (BDB 1996; Holladay 1988; Strong 1890).

עד עֶרֶב בִּקְרֵי אֲלֵפִים וְשֵׁלֶשׁ מֵאוֹת “until 2300 evenings-mornings” (verse 14) – the key into understanding this clause lies at grasping the phrase עֶרֶב בִּקְרֵי “evenings-mornings”. The main challenge here is the fact that this phrase is nowhere found as *is* in the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, except here (Daniel 8:14). Considering the use of the words “evening” and “morning” for the offerings, sacrifices and services of the sanctuary, and the sanctuary context of Daniel 8, it becomes clear that the angel uses *at least* the language of the sanctuary. As already noted, the angel does not qualify the “continual” so as one may know the specific reference he has in mind, if he is not speaking broadly about the “service”. There are two options presented by the use of these words (“evenings-mornings”) in the sanctuary context: (1) the angel has the “burnt offering” or the “grain offering” in mind; however, the question would be, why not use the “morning-evening” word order *consistently* used in the Old Testament (Leviticus 6:20; 1 Chronicles 16:40; 23:30; 2 Chronicles 2:4; 13:11; 31:3); (2) another option would be that the angel has the priest’s tending of the “lamp” - “evening till morning” - in mind (Exodus 27:20, 21; Leviticus 24:3). Although number 2 is the better option according to verbal analysis, it falls short of

being conclusive on the theological level, especially since the angel of Daniel 8 does not elaborate (BDB 1996; Holladay 1988; cf. Jamieson et al. 1871; Strong 1890).

Another option would be to view the angel as speaking about “days” as used in the Genesis 1 account of creation. There, the word order of “evening-morning” exists, paralleling “day”. Furthermore, the numerical association of the “evening-morning” formula is found by references to “first”, “second” etc. (as found in Daniel 8 – “2300 evenings-mornings”). In this case, the quantity or length of the 2300 period will depend on one’s view of the “days” of creation; if the “days” of creation are 24 hours long, then logically Daniel 8 would be referring to 2300 24-hour days. Also, if one understands the angel’s question (Daniel 8:13) as including the whole “vision” (see above), it would become objectionable to interpret the 2300 24-hour days (just over 6 years) as covering the period of the rise and fall of at least two world empires (Medo-Persian and Macedonian). Therefore, if this view is taken, the interpreter would be forced to interpret the 2300 24-hour days as symbolic of mathematically calculable time, extending over many years. Lastly, this view need not be mutually exclusive with a preceding sanctuary (lamp-tending) alternative. For example, two full 24-hour days both have an evening and a morning. Therefore, 2300 “evenings *till* mornings” (taken as a unit) would still add up to 2300 24-hour days. If these two views (creation “days” and lamp-tending “evening till morning”) are amalgamated and blended, the result appears to be plausible: *the angel of Daniel (8:14) clothes the concept of the “days” of creation with the language of the sanctuary “service”.*

וְנִצְדָּק קִדְשׁ “then the sanctuary will be justified” – the key word in this clause is נִצְדָּק “will be *justified*” or “will be *vindicated*”. The first challenge about this word is that it is never found anywhere else in its Niphal form. Secondly, this word is never used, in any form, in the sanctuary context of the Old Testament or in the book of Daniel itself (except once in Daniel 12:3 referring to the “righteousness” of the saints). What is clear, however, is that the use of this word in the context of the attacks of the “little horn” is befitting because it is a forensic term as demonstrated by its use in Exodus 23:7 and Deuteronomy 25:1. The “justification” or “vindication” of the sanctuary under attack by implication is a condemnation of the “little horn”, and as a result, it is

ultimately broken without hand (cf. Daniel 8:25). By the condemnation and judgment of the “little horn”, the “ruler of the host” (verse 11) and the persecuted “saints” (verse 24) are also “justified” and “vindicated” (BDB 1996; Holladay 1988; Strong 1890).

The fact that the key terms in the vision of Daniel 8 almost exclusively give a sanctuary linguistic-context, particularly the climactic verses 13 and 14 (in which קִדְּשׁוּ “will be *justified*” is found) which are thoroughly cultic (“holy”, “continual”, “desolating”, “transgression”, “sanctuary”, “evenings”, “mornings”), is a question of serious concern; that this one all-important term of קִדְּשׁוּ “will be *justified*” could have *absolutely no ties* to the sanctuary linguistic-context. Perhaps the same reasoning led the LXX translation to use the Greek word καταρισθήσεται “will be *cleansed*” (Daniel 8:14) – a word with clear ties to the sanctuary context in the book of Leviticus, and a word that is a figurative meaning for “justified” in the Old Testament (Job 4:17; 17:9) and even in the New Testament (1 John 1:9). While the word (קִדְּשׁוּ “will be *justified*”) is best translated thus, it is better understood when the indirect (through its figurative meaning of “cleansed”) connection to the sanctuary is kept in mind. If the preceding analysis is true, then the “justification”, “vindication” (or figuratively “cleansing”) of the sanctuary *against* the “little horn” may include the sanctuary service typified in Leviticus 16 (which would also explain the reason that the only place where the word “transgression” is used in a sanctuary backdrop outside of Daniel, as noted above, is in Leviticus 16), when the sanctuary was cleansed [vindicated, justified]. And as already noted above, the “justification” or “vindication” of the sanctuary, implying the condemnation of the “little horn”, also “justifies” and “vindicates” the saints; this notion finds its expression in the “cleansing” services of the Day of Atonement of Leviticus 16 (BDB 1996; Holladay 1988; Strong 1890; Thayer 1996).

Possibly, therefore, the angel of Daniel (8:14) deliberately used a word (קִדְּשׁוּ “will be *justified*”) that could both be relevant to the condemnation-context of the “little horn”, and at the same time maintain (through its figurative meaning) compatibility with the sanctuary linguistic-context.

Exegetical synthesis

Based on the foregoing analysis of the Biblical text, the original readers could have understood that after the Macedonian Empire there would be another kingdom. It would have superior political (international) power, and would also impose itself against the worship of the true God.

This power would attempt to nullify the effectiveness of Christ's redemptive ministry in the minds of God's people, and would persecute the faithful ones.

This situation would continue until the Sovereign God intervenes and stops the success of this "little horn" power, and restores the effectiveness of Christ's redemptive ministry.

There is no doubt that the original readers, in exile, would have their minds turn to their immediate situation of a destroyed city and temple in Judah. God's control of the larger picture of human history would not doubt inspire hope in God's control of Jewish destiny, and the hope of their restoration into Judah as a nation.

Contemporary significance (theological and ethical)

Since this study has not covered the historical studies (application of these prophecies), whatever is observed below is only limited to the Biblical texts in question.

The exegesis of Daniel 8:9-12 supports the Adventist understanding to an extent: (1) the "little horn" does not come from the four-horned goat (as shown by the verbal analysis of the words "one" and "them" in verse 9); (2) this "little horn" is a power that is both political and religious in that it subdues nations and figuratively usurps Christ's priestly authority and ministry (as shown by the analysis on the identity of the "host of the heavens", the "Prince of the host" and the horn's removal of the "continual" from the "Prince").

The exegesis of Daniel 8:13, 14 also indicates harmony with the Adventist understanding to an extent: (1) the "vision" refers to the whole revelation, and not just the activities of the "little horn"; (2) the meaning of "evenings-mornings" as 24-hour days shown as the best interpretation (creation "days" in sanctuary language);

(3) the sanctuary being “justified” is best understood as including a sanctuary context of being “cleansed” as typified in Leviticus 16.

Once again the sovereignty of God is revealed in his knowledge and control of history and the future. We have no need to fear the future, for God is in control.

Once again God is one who does not keep silence forever, but a God who responds to crises with a permanent solution (the ministry of Christ).

The text and its translation (Daniel 9)

Daniel 9:24-27 *“[24] 70 weeks are cut off and decreed as to your people and as to your holy city, to finish the transgression and to make an end of sins and to atone for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up vision and prophecy, and to anoint a most holy. [25] Know, then, and understand, that from the going out of the word to restore and rebuild Jerusalem, until Messiah the Prince shall be 7 weeks and 62 weeks. It shall be built again with open square and ditch, even in the times of affliction. [26] And after the 62 weeks, Messiah shall be cut off with no one. And the people of a coming prince shall destroy the city and the sanctuary. And its end shall be with the flood, and until the end shall be war; desolations are determined. [27] And he shall confirm a covenant with many for 1 week. And in the middle of the week shall he make sacrifice and offering to cease. And because of the extremity of abominations, a desolator will come, even until the end. And that which was decreed shall pour out on the desolator”.*

The immediate historical setting

Daniel, now still serving in the king’s palace under the Medo-Persian king Darius in his first year, prays for the restoration and rebuilding of Jerusalem, the temple, and the Jewish nation as promised by God through the prophetic books of Jeremiah – 70 years of exile. Daniel confesses his sins and the sins of his people when the angel Gabriel visits him with an explanation, without giving him any symbolic vision as in preceding chapters 7 and 8 (Daniel 9:1-23).

The meaning for the original readers

שבועים “70 weeks” – the numerical שבועים “70” finds its best contextual link with the “70 years” prophesied by Jeremiah (25:11, 12; 29:10) about the exile and return of the Jews. Daniel had just been praying about the matter when Gabriel suddenly greeted him and announced his mission to give Daniel prophetic understanding (verse 23). The “70 years” are associated with punishment (exile) and hope/forgiveness (a promise of return into their land) for the Jews. Possibly, Jesus was using the number “70” in the same way in Matthew (18:22), referring to complete forgiveness for one’s neighbor. Hence Gabriel (Daniel 9) specifies that the “70 weeks” (not synonymous with “70 years”) are על-עמך “for your people” (verse 24). Based on the fact that this number is mathematically divided (“62”, “7” and “1”) in this passage, it is more than just a symbol, but is to be understood literally. The term שבועים “weeks” or “sevens” simply denotes any period equally divided into seven parts/sections. As used in the Old Testament, this word is associated with (1) the *Feast of Weeks* (Exodus 34:22; Leviticus 12:5; Numbers 28:26; Deuteronomy 16:10, 16; 2 Chronicles 8:13), (2) literal *days* (Deuteronomy 16:9; Daniel 10:2, 3), and (3) literal *years* (Genesis 29:27, 28). Clearly, the first option is out simply because Gabriel is talking about calculable time and not about a ceremonial event. And considering the number and extensiveness (such as the return of the Jews to their land and the rebuilding-restoration of Jerusalem) of things predicted to occur in this passage (Daniel 9:24-27), it is naturally impossible for them to be all fulfilled in 490 literal days (just over one year). Therefore, the only viable option is to understand the “70 weeks” as 70 weeks of years or 490 literal years (BDB 1996; cf. Henry 1706; Holladay 1988; cf. Jamieson et al. 1871; Strong 1890).

נִקְטָעוּ “are *cut off*”, “are *decreed*” or “are *ordained*” – the greatest difficulty with the intended meaning of this word is that it is never used anywhere else in the Old Testament, in any form. The safest course in such a situation is to take the word’s *literal* meaning, which is “are *cut off*”. The other meaning, “are *decreed*”, is figurative but is not necessarily irrelevant since the 490 years are *decided* and *announced* by God *for them*, and thus also “decreed” in a sense. Based on the former (“cut off”) translation, there are at least two possible things that the 70 weeks are “cut off” from, for the Jews: (1) “cut off” from history in general, or (2) “cut off” from a specific time

prophecy in the Old Testament (probably within the book of Daniel). Since Gabriel has revealed preceding time-prophecies to Daniel, it appears probable that one of them is referred to – one that Daniel would quickly recollect without any elaboration. Due to space limitations, this research will not venture into that area of study (BDB 1996; Holladay 1988; cf. Jamieson et al. 1871; Strong 1890).

לְכַלֵּא הַפְּשָׁע “to finish the transgression” (verse 24) – this clause simply means that God expects the Jews to “finish” or “refrain” from disobedience (cf. Psalm 119:101) (BDB 1996; Holladay 1988; Strong 1890).

וְלַחְתֵּם הַטְּאוֹת “and to make an end of sins” (verse 24) – this clause is a negative parallel with the preceding one (BDB 1996; Holladay 1988; Strong 1890).

וְלִכְפֹּר עֲוֹן “and to atone for iniquity” (verse 24) – this clause is a negative parallel with the preceding one (BDB 1996; Holladay 1988; Strong 1890).

וְלַהֲבִיא צְדָק עֲלָמִים “and to bring in everlasting righteousness” (verse 24) - since צְדָק “righteousness” is the opposite of “sins”, “iniquity” and “transgressions” (Proverbs 14:34; Psalm 69:27; Ezekiel 33:12), this is a positive parallel to the preceding clause (BDB 1996; Holladay 1988; Strong 1890).

וְלַחְתֵּם חֶזוֹן וְנְבִיא “and to seal up vision and prophecy” (verse 24) – the word used for “seal up” has the same root with “make an end of” in a preceding clause. If one understands these “70 weeks” as probationary time for the Jewish nation, and also takes this phrase as a complementary parallel to the preceding one, the meaning would be to “seal up” and “end” the vision by making part of its purpose fulfilled (BDB 1996; Holladay 1988; Strong 1890).

וְלִמְשַׁח קֹדֶשׁ קְדוֹשִׁים “and to anoint a most holy” (verse 24) – it is worth noting that the phrase, קֹדֶשׁ קְדוֹשִׁים “most holy”, is never used in the whole Old Testament without a definite article when referring to the Most Holy Place of the sanctuary (Exodus 26:33, 34; Numbers 18:10). Only one exception is found in Ezekiel 45:3, however, it is there qualified with the word הַמִּקְדָּשׁ “the sanctuary” which is not found here in Daniel 9:24. Without the definite article, as found here, it consistently (throughout the whole

Old Testament) refers to some article or thing associated with the sanctuary: (1) the *altar* (Exodus 29:37), (2) the *perfume* (Exodus 30:36), (3) the *grain offering* (Leviticus 2:3), (4) the *sin offering* (Leviticus 6:25, 29), (5) the *trespass offering* (Leviticus 7:16), (6) the *bread* (Leviticus 24:9), (7) *anything devoted* to God (Leviticus 27:28), or (8) sanctuary *things in general* (Numbers 4:4, 19; 18:9; 1 Chronicles 23:13; 2 Chronicles 31:14; cf. Exodus 30:28, 29). Furthermore, in association with “anointing”, “a most holy” refers to the day of the inauguration of the sanctuary (Exodus 29:36, 37; 40:10). Based on the foregoing evidence, the author of this research is compelled to view this phrase, וְלִמְשַׁח קֹדֶשׁ קְדוֹשִׁים “and to anoint a most holy”, as *referring to an inauguration of the sanctuary*. Whether this sanctuary is earthly or heavenly is not within the space limitations of this research (BDB 1996; Holladay 1988; Strong 1890).

לְהָשִׁיב וּלְבַנּוֹת יְרוּשָׁלַם “to restore and to rebuild Jerusalem” (verse 25) – as used in the Old Testament, particularly in Jeremiah, who provides the backdrop to this prophecy, the word לְהָשִׁיב “to restore” (and its cognates), is associated with a number of key ideas in relation to Jerusalem: (1) the reappointment of judges and counselors (Isaiah 1:26), (2) the return of the Jews to the lands and cities of their heritage (Jeremiah 12:15; 15:19; 16:15; 23:3; 24:6; 29:10, 14; 30:3, 18; 31:8, 16, 17, 21), (3) freedom from captivity (Jeremiah 29:14; 30:18), (4) the reconstruction of destroyed cities (Jeremiah 30:18), and (5) the revival of commerce (Jeremiah 32:44). Since all of these are dependent on each other, it is reasonable to *consider them collectively*. The term לְבַנּוֹת “to rebuild” (and its cognates) is largely used for the physical structure of buildings, houses, walls and cities (Deuteronomy 6:10; 22:8; Isaiah 25:2; 44:26, 28; Jeremiah 31:38; Ezekiel 13:10; 28:26; 36:36; Ezra 4:4; Nehemiah 6:6). Therefore, the word/deed that was to be “going out” must meet all the specifications covered here, at minimum (BDB 1996; Holladay 1988; Strong 1890).

עַד-מָשִׁיחַ הַנָּגִיד “until messiah the prince” (verse 25) – the word מָשִׁיחַ “messiah” or “anointed one” is never used in the Old Testament with the word נָגִיד “prince”. The term for “anointed” is used for various persons in the Old Testament: (1) the Levitical *priesthood* (Leviticus 4:3, 5, 16; 6:22), *kings* (2 Samuel 1:14, 16; 19:21), (3) *prophets*

(Psalm 105:15), (4) *Cyrus* (Isaiah 45:1), and (5) national *Israel* (Habakkuk 3:13). The term נָגִיד “prince”, among those who were “anointed”, is used in the Old Testament for a “priest” and for a “king”. As will be seen below, this prophecy speaks of Christ, who is both “priest” and “king”. A note needs to be said about Cyrus, of whom Isaiah prophesied (44:28; 45:1) in prediction. Isaiah (44:28) does mention that Cyrus will fulfill God’s purpose, but it does not specify except as to imply a role in the freedom of the Jews. Also, the fact that Cyrus is termed as God’s anointed (Isaiah 45:1) *does not compel* one to interpret the “anointed one” of Daniel 9 as Cyrus, since all kings were “anointed ones” (BDB 1996; cf. Henry 1706; Holladay 1988; cf. Jamieson et al. 1871; Strong 1890).

יִכָּרֵת מְשִׁיחַ “shall messiah be cut off” (verse 26) – with respect to a person as the object, and not a part of himself (Exodus 4:25; Deuteronomy 23:1) or his name (1 Samuel 24:21; Psalm 34:16), the word for “cut off” implies death (2 Kings 9:9; Jeremiah 9:21; 11:19; Ezekiel 21:3, 4). Therefore, this text clearly states that this “messiah” will be *killed* (BDB 1996; cf. Henry 1706; Holladay 1988; Strong 1890).

וְאֵין לוֹ “with no one” (verse 26) – The word אֵין is largely used in the sense of “no one” (person) within the book of Daniel (8:4; 10:21; 11:16, 45) – exceptions being “no” personal blemish (1:4) and “no” personal strength (11:15). There are two possibilities: (1) with *no one* standing against him (8:4; 11:16), or (2) with *no one* supporting him (10:21; 11:45). Since the “messiah” is “cut off” or killed, the second option stands. Therefore, the meaning is: “...shall messiah be cut off with no one supporting him”. This may be an *echo* of the prophecy by Isaiah (63:3, ESV), speaking of Christ, where he says, “I have trodden the winepress alone, and from the peoples no [אֵין] one was with me” (BDB 1996; Holladay 1988; Strong 1890).

עַם נָגִיד הַבָּא “[the] people of a coming prince” (verse 26) – the word נָגִיד “prince” is used only three times in the book of Daniel (*twice* in this vision – verses 24 to 27, and *once* in 11:22 where Gabriel speaks of the “prince of the covenant” which is also called the “holy covenant” in verses 28 and 30). In the absence of contrary evidence, within the vision (9:24-27) or the whole book of Daniel, this is the same “prince” as in verse 25, Jesus Christ. In Daniel עַם “people” is almost exclusively

used to refer to God's people: "my [Daniel] people" (9:20), "the people of the land" (9:6), "thy [God] people" (9:15, 16, 19), "thy [Daniel] people" (9:24; 11:14; 12:1), "the people" (11:32, 33), "the holy people" (8:24; 12:7). Only one exception exists, where Gabriel speaks about those of the "king of the north" (11:15). It appears consistent to view the "people" (9:26) of the coming prince as referring to God's people, especially if the "prince" refers to Christ. These "people" "shall destroy the sanctuary and the city [Jerusalem]" only in the sense that their sins are the cause of God's judgments – as is the case at this time (Jeremiah 3:12; 7:34; 13:16; 15:4; 16:9) (BDB 1996; Holladay 1988; Strong 1890).

וְהִגְבִּיר בְּרִית "and he shall confirm a covenant" (verse 27) – the word וְהִגְבִּיר "and [he shall] confirm [strengthen]" refers back to the "prince" of verse 26. The בְּרִית "covenant" is directly mentioned seven times (9:4, 27; 11:22, 28, 30, 32) in the book of Daniel. It is every time tied to God's people. Based on that evidence, Daniel 9:27 is referring to God's covenant with Israel (BDB 1996; Holladay 1988; Strong 1890).

וּמְנַחָה יִשְׁבֹּת זֶבַח וּמְנַחָה "cause sacrifice and offering to cease" (verse 27) – while the word זֶבַח "sacrifice" is used once in Daniel, the word מְנַחָה "oblation [offering]" is used twice (9:21,27). Both these words are used in the Old Testament to refer to the offerings made at the sanctuary (Leviticus 4:26; 6:23, etc.). Somehow the "prince" stops the sanctuary system from operating, probably through his sacrificial death (Colossians 2:16, 17; Hebrew 10:1-4) (BDB 1996; cf. Henry 1706; Holladay 1988; Strong 1890).

וְעַל כִּנְף שְׂקוּצִים "and because of the extremity of abominations" (verse 27) – the cause of all desolation and judgment is the sinful abominations. But even the one who makes desolation will be judged by God (verse 27). The term שְׂקוּצִים "abominations" in the Old Testament is always associated with idol worship (Deuteronomy 29:17; Jeremiah 4:1; 7:30; 13:27; 16:18; 32:34; Ezekiel 20:7-8, 30; etc.). Therefore, this phrase refers to idolatry (disobedience) that will be the cause of God's indirect judgment on Israel by allowing the "desolator" to destroy the city and the sanctuary (BDB 1996; Holladay 1988; cf. Jamieson et al. 1871; Strong 1890).

Exegetical synthesis

The original reader could understand the “70 weeks” prophecy as probationary time allocated to the Jews. This prophecy was a source of hope and encouragement with the promise of restoration into Judah and also the coming of the Messiah who is King.

However, this prophecy also warns of coming judgment should the Jews not bring in righteousness and fulfill God’s chosen role for them.

The Messiah, while strengthening the covenant with Israel, is herein understood to bring in a new order of things through His death – ceasing the sacrificial system. This text provides both hope and warning centered on the Messiah who is to come.

Contemporary significance (theological and ethical)

Since this study has not covered the historical studies (application of these prophecies), whatever is observed below is only limited to the Biblical texts in question.

The exegesis of Daniel 9:24 indicates congruence with Adventist interpretation to an extent: (1) the “70 weeks” represents a period of 490 years in literal time; (2) the word for “cut off” or “decreed” signifies that this “70 weeks” is part of another period, the identity of which has not been covered in this research, but may be that of Daniel 8 - the 2300 days; (3) this period of “70 weeks” is allocated for the Jewish nation as probationary time; and (4) the anointing of “a most holy” refers to an inauguration of a sanctuary (whether this is a heavenly or an earthly sanctuary is not covered in this study).

The exegesis of Daniel 9:25-27 reveals compatibility with Adventist interpretation to an extent: (1) the “restoration and rebuilding” of Jerusalem is not just physical, or just referring to the Temple, but includes a decree that will “restore” autonomy according to Jewish law (the identity of the decree is not covered in this study); (2) the “anointed” one and “Prince” refers to Christ as the Messiah (whether this refers to His baptism, or not, is not part of this study); (3) to be “cut off” refers to the death of the Messiah – the death of Christ; (4) the “covenant” refers to God’s covenant with

Israel; and (5) the ceasing of the sacrifices and offerings refers to Christ's death as the antitype.

This text (verses 24-27) is theologically valuable in the sense that it reveals a God who in His justice provides ample means and opportunities for His chosen to fulfill His will. He gives hope to the hopeless and warning to the careless, both prior to judgment.

This text also reveals a God who fulfills His promises, while expecting us to play our role. This God will not accept anything less than full surrender to His will.

Ethical responsibilities of repentance (vertical) and missionary work (horizontal) cannot be dismissed or overlooked without incurring the eventual wrath of Jehovah.

6.3 Biblical Evidence (Hebrews)

6.3.1 Introduction

The passage

The chosen passage is Hebrews 9:6-14, 18-26.

This passage has been chosen because of its numerous references to the Day of Atonement. Also, it has been especially used in support of the Adventist position on the pre-Advent judgment.

The objectives

Special but not exclusive interest will be shown to the references to "holy places", "until the time of reformation", "the way", "standing", "first tabernacle", "of bulls and goats and ashes of a heifer", "was inaugurated", "to be purified", "copies of the heavenly things", "true", "once for all" and "end of the ages".

The perspectives

The varying perspectives on Hebrews 9 as a whole appear to be on the: (1) the nature of the sanctuary, and (2) the extent of discussion on the Day of Atonement.

This debate may be reflected on the varying translation of this text, particularly the references to “holy places”.

The large majority argue that there is no material or objective sanctuary reality in heaven. Christ entered into the “most holy place” at His ascension – thus there are no apartments in the heavenly sanctuary, and furthermore some argue that this text discusses the Day of Atonement and places all of its significance at the cross and ascension of Christ (Bruce 1990:229; Ford 2008:20, 99; O’Brien 2010:304-340; Phillips 2006:291, 292).

Adventists, typically, argue that the terms τῶν ἁγίων and τὰ ἅγια should not be translated “the most holy place” but should be translated “the holies”, “the holy places” or “the sanctuary” since they understand the text as not dealing exclusively with the Day of Atonement (contrasting the apartments) but refers to it in connection with the sacrifices. Furthermore the official church argues that there is only a limited-structural parallel between the earthly and heavenly sanctuaries and that the references to Christ’s entrance into the “holy places” include the Inauguration of the heavenly sanctuary at Christ’s ascension (see chapter 5 of this research).

The plan

This study will analyze the context (general, historical, literary structure, theological) of the book of Hebrews as a whole. This study will also conduct exegesis (make a translation and show the meaning to both the original and today’s readers) of the relevant texts.

6.3.2 Context of the book

General background: author, date and audience

It is agreed by many scholars that the author of the book of Hebrews is unknown, simply because he does not identify himself in the book. There are various names which have been historically suggested: Paul, Luke, Clement of Rome, Barnabas, Priscilla, Jude, Apollos, Philip, and Silvanus (Bruce 1990:17, 18; Guthrie 1998:23; O’Brien 2010:3-7). George H Guthrie (1998:26) confirms that all suggestions are mere guesses: “The question of his exact identity is unanswerable; any suggestion

remains a 'best guess'". In concurrence, Peter T O'Brien (2010:8) states: "...we are not able to identify the author".

The date of the book is unknowable with precision. FF Bruce (1990:21; cf. Guthrie 1998:22) locates the letter's date to sometime prior to 65 AD/CE: "...the epistle was written before, but not long before, the outbreak of persecution in Rome in AD 65". Peter T O'Brien (2010:20) chooses to be less precise: "We cannot rule out any date between about A.D. 60 and 90, but much of the evidence supports a time before 70". In light of the insufficiency of evidence, it is wise to be less dogmatic about the precise date.

The identity of the audience of this epistle is likewise unknowable with certainty. The traditional view, relatively unchallenged until the 19th century AD/CE, was that the audience is Jewish-Christian (some have suggested that the audience was Gentile-Christian or mixed ethnically). However there currently seems to be general agreement among evangelical expositors that the audience is largely Jewish-Christian (Bruce 1990:9; Guthrie 1998:19-22; Johnsson 1989:13; O'Brien 2010:9-13;). FF Bruce (1990:4, 9) proposes a more specific identity - they were *Hellenistic* Jewish Christians: "If we think in terms of the Hebrew-Hellenistic division [Acts 6:1], we should naturally classify this epistle as a Hellenistic document.... We may infer from the epistle that they were Hellenists; they knew the Old Testament in the Greek version. It is implied, too, that their knowledge of the ancient sacrificial ritual of Israel was derived from the reading of the Old Testament and not from firsthand contact with the temple services in Jerusalem". The author of this research finds himself compelled to support the Jewish-Christian view.

Historical context: occasion, purpose and milieu

The occasion and purpose of this book is not as clearly communicated as would be liked. However, it is clear from texts like Hebrews 10:24-39 that these believers written to had undergone tremendous stress and pressure through persecution for their faith. Some of them were losing courage and perseverance (6:11-20), and many were in danger of casting the faith away and thus not enjoying the spiritual rest in Christ (3:7-19; 4:1-11).

The writer seems to want to encourage them through previous examples of Biblical heroes (11:1-40) who also underwent persecution and hardship, particularly Christ (12:1-4). The repetitious reference to better things in Christ may also be interpreted to be intended to motivate the readers into greater persevere and faith in Christ.

Literary structure: structure and argument

- I. Jesus as the Son (1:1-3)
- II. Jesus is better than the angels (1: 4-14)
- III. The danger of drifting away (2:1-4)
- IV. Jesus as man
 - i. Jesus as lower than the angels (2:5-9)
 - ii. Jesus as one with mankind (2:10-18)
- V. Jesus is better than Moses (3:1-6)
- VI. God's Rest
 - i. Rest through faith (3:7-19)
 - ii. The promise of a Sabbath-rest (4:1-11)
- VII. The word of God (4:12-13)
- VIII. Jesus as High Priest
 - i. Jesus the great High Priest (4:14-16)
 - ii. High Priest as chosen mediator (5:1-5)
 - iii. Jesus appointed like Melchizedek (5:6, 10)
 - iv. Jesus qualified through obedience in suffering (5:7-9)
- IX. Believers' slowness of growth (5:11-14 and 6:1-10)
- X. The Assurance of God's promises (6:11-20)
- XI. Jesus as High Priest in the order of Melchizedek (7:1-17)
- XII. Better things
 - i. Jesus brings a better hope (7:18-19)
 - ii. Jesus brings a better covenant (7:22)
 - iii. Jesus a better Priest (7:23-28)
- XIII. Jesus ministers in a true sanctuary in heaven (8:1-5)
- XIV. A Better covenant (8:6-13)
- XV. The earthly sanctuary (9:1-5)

- XVI. The Better and all-sufficient blood-sacrifice for a better sanctuary (9:6-27)
- XVII. The insufficiency of earthly sacrifices (10:1-18)
- XVIII. The new and reliable way opened by Christ (10:19-23)
- XIX. Not drawing back
 - i. Let us encourage each other not to draw back to punishment (10:24-31)
 - ii. Former persecutions not to be in vain by drawing back (10:32-39)
- XX. The hall of fame (11:1-40)
- XXI. The need to not be discouraged by pain but to learn from Christ (12:1-12)
- XXII. Holiness (12:13-21)
- XXIII. Believers have come to better things (12:22-29)
- XXIV. Ethical duties (13:1-7)
- XXV. God's consistency (13:8,9)
- XXVI. Going to Jesus (13:10-14)
- XXVII. Ethical duties (13:15-19)
- XXVIII. Concluding Remarks (13:20-25)

Theological: themes and motifs

Perhaps the most prominent theme of the book of Hebrews is the High Priestly Christology of the writer. This theme is introduced as early as in chapter 4 and tends to overlap other related themes of the sufficiency of the blood-sacrifice of Christ, the better covenant, the holy places in the heavens, the better promises, etc.

The immediate thematic-context of the text below is that of Christ's all-sufficient and all-efficient blood-sacrifice.

6.3.3 Exegesis of the passages

The Greek text used for that which follows below is the Westcott-Hort Greek New Testament.

The text and its translation (Hebrews 9)

Hebrews 9:6-14 "[6] ...*And these having been prepared in this manner, the priests go into the first tabernacle through all, completing the services. [7] But into the*

second the high priest goes alone once in the year, not without blood, which he offers for himself and the ignorances of the people. [8] The Holy Spirit indicating by this that the way of the holy place has not yet been revealed, the first tabernacle having standing; [9] which was a similitude for the time then present, according to which both gifts and sacrifices are offered, but as regards conscience, not being able to perfect the one serving, [10] only on foods and drinks and various washings, even ordinances of flesh, until a time of restoration has been imposed. [11] But Christ having appeared a High Priest of the coming good things, through the greater and more perfect tabernacle not made with hands, that is not of this creation, [12] nor through the blood of goats and of calves, but through his own blood, he entered once for all into the holy places, having obtained eternal redemption. [13] For if the blood of bulls and goats, and ashes of a heifer sprinkling those having been defiled, sanctifies to the cleanness of the flesh, [14] by how much more the blood of Christ who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, will cleanse your conscience from dead works, for the serving of the living God”.

Hebrews 9:18-26 “[18] ...From which neither the first [covenant] was dedicated without blood. [19] For every command being spoken by Moses to all the people according to law, taking the blood of the calves and of goats, with water and scarlet wool and hyssop, he sprinkled both the scroll and all the people, [20] saying, ‘This is the blood of the covenant which God enjoined to you. [21] And he likewise sprinkled both the tabernacle and all the vessels of the service with the blood. [22] And almost all things are cleansed by blood according to law, and without blood shedding there comes no remission. [23] It was necessary then, the copies of the things in the heavens be cleansed with these, but the heavenly things themselves by better sacrifices than these. [24] For Christ entered not into the holy places made by hands, figures of the true things, but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us; [25] not that he should offer himself often, even as the high priest enters into the holy places year by year with blood of others; [26] since he must often have suffered from the foundation of the world. But now once at the completion of the ages, he has been revealed for the abrogation of sin through the sacrifice of himself”.

The meaning for the original readers

πρώτην σκηνὴν “first tabernacle” (verse 6) – the word πρώτην “first” is used in the book of Hebrews (8:7, 13; 9:1-2, 6, 8, 15) in reference to time and space. And “tabernacle” σκηνὴν is used in implication of (1) the *entire sanctuary* (8:2, 5; 9:8, 11, 21) and (2) the *individual apartments* (9:2, 3, 6). In verse 6 the “first tabernacle” refers to the first apartment, the Holy Place, because of the contrast between the daily and the yearly services in verse 6 and 7 (Mounce 1993; Strong 1890; Thayer 1996).

δηλοῦντος “signifying” or “indicating” (verse 8) – this word also means “giving [the] understanding”. As used here it refers to that which is discussed in verses 6 and 7 (after describing the contents of the earthly sanctuary from verse 2 through 5) – the ministration of the priests in both the Holy and the Most Holy places of the sanctuary. At this point it is not clear whether he specifically refers to the (1) contrast between the Holy and the Most Holy – the high priest’s movement from one to the other – or (2) to the repetitious ministries – daily and yearly – as shown by the words “regularly” or “always” and “once a year” (cf. verse 25) or (3) to the imperfections of the whole system where the priest [mediator] also has to sacrifice for himself, or (4) to all of the above facts (Mounce 1993; Strong 1890; Thayer 1996).

ὁδόν “[the] way” (verse 8) – this word is only used twice in the book of Hebrews (9:8 and 10:19, 20) in seemingly similar ways; both texts show us a way into “the holy places”. One difficulty lies in the fact that Hebrews (10:20) does not specify the curtain spoken of – it speaks about “through the curtain”. One of two options is possible: (1) this is the same *second* curtain into the Most Holy, spoken of in Hebrews (9:3; cf. 6:19), or (2) this is the *first* curtain into the Holy. However, this difficulty is insignificant in relation to the fact that Christ has entered “the holy [places]” – *including the Most Holy* (Mounce 1993; Strong 1890; Thayer 1996).

τῶν ἁγίων “of the holy places” (verse 8) – this refers to the sanctuary (heavenly) as seen in Hebrews (8:2). The πρώτης σκηνῆς “first tabernacle” (verse 8) here refers to the earthly sanctuary - compared to the “holy places” [“greater and more perfect

tent”] to be revealed (cf. Hebrews 9:11, 21). It is worth mentioning that whenever the author of Hebrews *clearly* refers to the two apartments in distinction from each other with the words πρώτης σκηνῆς “first tabernacle” (for the Holy Place, chapter 9 verses 3 and 6), he designates the Most Holy Place with *specific* terms, ἅγια ἁγίων “Holy of Holies” or “Most Holy” (verse 3), or he uses τὴν δευτέραν “the second [tabernacle]” (verse 6). He does not use the *general* term τῶν ἁγίων “of the holy places” as found here in verse 8 (Mounce 1993; Strong 1890; Thayer 1996).

στάσιν “standing” (verse 8) – this refers to the *position* and *function* of the “first tabernacle” which was to give way to the reality under the “new covenant” (verses 16 and 17); the new dispensation could not *come into effect* until the death of Christ (verses 16, 17) or the “time of restoration” (verse 10) (Mounce 1993; Strong 1890; Thayer 1996).

της μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνης “the greater and more perfect tabernacle” (verse 11) – this can only be the heavenly sanctuary based on several lines of evidence: (1) the parallel with Hebrews 8 verse 2 where the heavenly sanctuary is referred to as a “tabernacle” and one that was not pitched by human hands (cf. verse 24), and (2) the parallel with τὰ ἅγια “the sanctuary” or “the holy places” of verse 12 (Mounce 1993; Strong 1890; Thayer 1996).

ταύρων καὶ τράγων καὶ σποδὸς δαμάλεως “of bulls and goats and ashes of a heifer” (verse 13) – the reference here is to the sacrifice of the heifer (Numbers 19:1-10) and also of those of the Day of Atonement (Leviticus 16:15, 18, 27). As much as the individual animals – bulls and goats – were separately used for various sacrifices, they are only found together on the Day of Atonement. Therefore, the blood of Christ fulfills the typology of these blood-sacrifices (Mounce 1993; Strong 1890; Thayer 1996).

ἐγκεκαίνισται “was inaugurated” or “was dedicated” (verse 18) – this (verses 18-22) refers to the *inauguration* of both the *covenant* and the *sanctuary* by Moses (Exodus 24, 29, 30, 40) (Mounce 1993; Strong 1890; Thayer 1996).

τὰ μὲν ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς “the copies of the heavenly things” (verse 23) – this phrase is a parallel to ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν “copies of the true things” (verse 24) so that the heavenly things are the ones that are real. The ἀληθινῆς “true” tabernacle is also referred to in Hebrews 8 verse 2, thus bonding the two chapters (8 and 9). The ὑποδείγματι “copy” is also σκιά “a shadow” (Hebrews 8:5) of the things to come – *type meeting antitype*. There is a ‘vertical’ (‘vertical’ in location and ‘horizontal’ in time) parallel between the sanctuary on earth and that which is in heaven (Mounce 1993; Strong 1890; Thayer 1996).

καθαρίζεσθαι “to be purified” (verse 23) – through the word οὖν “therefore” or “accordingly” it is clear that this verse is based on the preceding discussion about the dedication of both the covenant and the sanctuary with “blood”. Therefore, the “purification” discussed here is not referring to the Day of Atonement, although the principle also applies to the Day of Atonement (Leviticus 16). Furthermore, this word καθαρίζεσθαι “to be purified”, in a different form, is used in the LXX Bible in connection with the inauguration of the sanctuary (in Exodus 29:36), although it is also used for the Day of Atonement (Leviticus 16:19, 30) (Mounce 1993; Strong 1890; Thayer 1996).

ἅπαξ “once for all” or “once” (verse 26) – this reference to “once” throughout Hebrews 9 (verses 12, 26, 28) is geared towards driving home the fact of the superiority and sufficiency of the blood of Christ; unlike the earthly daily and yearly services, with their repetitiousness, the blood of Christ is only offered once and for eternity (Mounce 1993; Strong 1890; Thayer 1996).

συντελεία τῶν αἰώνων “[the] end of the ages” (verse 26) – the word συντελεία “end” is consistently used in the New Testament to refer to the end of the world (Matthew 13:39, 40, 49; 24:3; 28:20) and should thus be understood here. Obviously, Jesus’s first advent is not in the future but in our past. Therefore, the death of Christ was the *beginning* of the end (Mounce 1993; Strong 1890; Thayer 1996).

Exegetical synthesis

Reading from verse 6, the original readers quickly discern the writer's import in that the earthly ministry of the priests was only designed to be a shadow of the greater and real once-for-all ministry of Christ. Both the daily and the yearly services were repetitious, but the blood of Christ was offered once and for all.

Christ is both Priest and Sacrifice – offering his own blood – and has entered into the real holy places in cutting a way for us to follow. The power of his blood covers all the symbolisms of the old covenant: (1) the blood of the *Day of Atonement* (verses 7, 14 and 25), (2) the blood of the *Red Heifer* (verse 14), (3) the blood of the *Inauguration of the Covenant* (verses 18-22), and (4) the blood of the *Inauguration of the Sanctuary* (verses 18-22).

The intent of the writer is not to give a detailed exposition of any of the above services, but the intent of this text is to show the superiority, all-sufficiency and the all-efficiency of the blood of Christ.

Contemporary significance (theological and ethical)

The exegesis of Hebrews 9:6-10 shows harmony with the Adventist interpretation to an extent: (1) the “first tabernacle” of verse 8 refers to the whole earthly sanctuary in comparison to the “holy places” of heaven; and (2) the earthly sacrificial system was only a type of the ministry of Christ as sacrifice and priest.

The exegesis of Hebrews 9:11-12, 24-25 concurs with Adventism to an extent: (1) “the greater and more perfect tabernacle” is the same as the “holy places” into which Christ has entered to minister; (2) it is Christ's own blood that secures life-eternal for mankind. This text shows to be against the view, about the heavenly sanctuary among Adventists, that Christ has entered only one apartment in heaven (“literalistic parallelism”).

The exegesis of Hebrews 9:13, 14, 18-22 concurs with Adventism in that the concern in the author's mind in chapter 9 is not the Day of Atonement alone as found in Leviticus 16, but the superiority of Christ's blood as typified in various blood offerings: (1) the Red Heifer; (2) those of the Inauguration of the Covenant; and (3) those of the Inauguration of the sanctuary.

The exegesis of Hebrews (9:23) has shown agreement with the Adventist view that even the heavenly sanctuary needed purification through the Inauguration. This text however does not speak directly about the purification of the Day of Atonement, although the principle still applies to it.

The exegesis of Hebrews (9:26) indicated that the death of Christ as a sacrifice on the cross was the *beginning/inauguration* of the end of the world.

This text (Hebrews 9:6-14, 18-26) is as relevant to us today as much as it was at the time of the apostles. It is only the blood of Christ that can give us access to the heavenly throne-room and allow us to receive grace from God.

This text speaks directly against legalism. No act, not matter how valued by man or God Himself, can atone for or contribute in any way to our status of salvation. It is only God's grace, received by faith in Christ's finished work, can save to the uttermost.

6.4 Retroduction of Biblical Evidence

A cosmic pre-advent judgment is brought to view in Daniel 7, securing the condemnation-destruction of the "little horn" and the vindication-deliverance of the saints of the Most High God. This pre-advent judgment is based on records, the existence of which reveals God's transparency, objectivity and justice. These records of human life do not inform God anything except to reveal to heavenly beings what God has done in human life and how humanity has responded.

Daniel 8 presents another angle of condemnation-destruction on the "little horn" and the vindication-deliverance of the sanctuary (and the victims of the "little horn"). The angle in which this judgment is presented here is linked to the sanctuary symbolisms which enrich the meaning of the nature of this judgment, implying some kind of connection to the heavenly sanctuary ministry of Christ.

Daniel 9 presents both a cosmic and a local view of God's judgment. It is cosmic through the sacrifice of the Messiah – causing the sacrificial system to cease. It is also local through the prophesied judgment on Israel – the destruction of both the city and the sanctuary due to Israelite apostasy.

There is a possibility (one which this study cannot venture into because of space limitations) that Daniel 9 is specially connected to Daniel 8: (1) Daniel 8 ended with Daniel confused and without understanding, and Gabriel returns in Daniel 9 with a mission to give Daniel understanding; (2) the use of the word for “cut off” may be in reference to the time prophecy of Daniel 8; (3) both texts have concerns for the sanctuary (earthly and heavenly); and (4) both texts include concerns of Christ as priest and sacrifice.

Hebrews 9 presents the superiority, all-sufficiency and all-efficiency of the blood of Christ. The writer demonstrates how various types of key blood sacrifices found their fulfillment in the blood of Christ which forms the basis for His heavenly ministry on humanity’s behalf.

These four texts (Daniel 7, 8, 9 and Hebrews 9) have Christ as their center. He is revealed as Deliverer, Sacrifice and Priest (thus Judge) of humanity. Everything finds its true meaning, worth and destiny because of Christ.

6.5 Conclusion

This chapter has the objective of analyzing Scripture on key texts considered foundational to the Adventist understanding of the PAIJ.

This has been achieved by the selection and exegesis of Daniel 7 (verses 9, 10, 13, 14), 8 (verses 9-14), 9 (verses 24-27) and Hebrews 9 (verses 6-14, 18-26). While many details in the steps of exegesis have been left out for reasons of space, the meaning of the texts themselves has been derived.

The exegesis of Daniel 7 has shown the existence of a cosmic pre-advent judgment that secures condemnation-destruction of the “little horn” and vindication-deliverance of the saints. This judgment culminates in the coronation of Christ as King at His reception of the eschatological kingdom, at which time the saints of God share in it.

The exegesis of Daniel 8 revealed another angle of the judgment on the “little horn” through a sanctuary context which enriches the meaning of the judgment –

condemnation-destruction for the “little horn” and vindication-deliverance for the sanctuary.

The exegesis of Daniel 9 showed and linked God’s cosmic and local judgments. The same God who secures a new era (through His sacrifice) is the same God who cannot tolerate disobedience. Therefore he judges Israel, and the “desolator”, His instrument of judgment.

Hebrews 9 showed a concern over the sacrifice of Christ that becomes the fulfillment of all blood sacrifices of the old covenant.

While much more research needs to be done, sufficient evidence has been observed to fairly weigh the truthfulness of the Adventist PAIJ.

Chapter 7

CONCLUSION

7.1 Review of the Research

7.1.1 The objectives of the study

This research has achieved the following: (1) It has conducted a study of the origin and development of the Adventist church and its teaching of the PAIJ;

(2) It has studied the foundational/presuppositional theologies that undergird its theology of the PAIJ;

(3) It has studied the actual theology of the PAIJ in all its key aspects;

(4) It has done an exegetical and theological study of the foundational Biblical texts for the purpose of evaluating this theology.

7.1.2 The methodology of the study

To achieve the foregoing objectives, this research has (chapters 2 and 3) analyzed official and supportive historical texts to observe the origin of both the church and its theology on the pre-advent judgment.

This research went on to investigate analytically (chapters 4 and 5) the official and supportive theological books and journal articles as to the foundational theologies and the relatively culminating theology of the PAIJ.

An exegetical and theological study (chapter 6) was thereafter conducted. This step included exegesis synthesis and a dialogical approach in interaction with various views.

7.2 Conclusions of the Research

7.2.1 The Conclusion on the Formation of Seventh-day Adventism

This research concludes that the SDA church was born from the Millerite movement of the early 19th century. It is noted that this church developed from the understanding that the expected event (the Second Coming) of October 22, 1844, was wrong but that the calculations were correct.

No singular individual can be credited with introducing or formulating the distinctive teachings of Seventh-day Adventism, although certain prominent founders do stand out, namely, Joseph Bates, James and Ellen G White. The distinctive teachings (the premillennial Second Coming, the Saturday-Sabbath, the Cleansing of the Sanctuary, and the non-Immortality of the soul) were all originated or derived from outside of the circle of these three pioneers. Joseph Bates is the pioneer who blended these distinctives together.

The Adventist theology of the “remnant” has appeared to have contributed to the Adventist church’s limited partnership with the Ecumenical Movement.

7.2.2 The Conclusion on the Theological Development of the Pre-Advent Investigative Judgment

This research concludes that the Adventist theology of the PAIJ has undergone some shifts and changes in terms of emphasis. There have been some changes in the presentation and expression of this theology – from one of law and faithfulness to one of grace and acceptance based on justification by faith.

These changes are a result of the church’s study and internal pressures from both the “historic” and the “liberal” or “progressive” streams. The “historic” stream places emphasis on theological staticity whereas the “progressive” stream emphasizes theological change.

7.2.3 The Conclusion on the Theological Presuppositions of Pre-Advent Investigative Judgment

This research concludes that Adventism regards Scripture as the sole authority in matters of doctrine and practice. It utilizes the historical-grammatical approach to Scripture and assumes its “full inerrancy”.

The Adventist theology of the PAIJ relies heavily on apocalyptic literature, and employs the historicist approach with the year-day equivalency in some portions of this literature.

Soteriologically, Adventism is Arminian and subscribes to the substitutionary and propitiation-expiation sacrifice of Christ. Justification and righteousness are synonymous, and sanctification is viewed as a result of them. Judgment is seen as both vindicative and condemnatory, depending on one’s relationship with Christ.

The Adventist sees various phases of eschatological judgment, part of which the PAIJ and the Post-Advent Millennial Judgment being based on written fact – the book(s) of heaven. These serve as the basis of objective analysis by the heavenly beings and not God who is omniscient.

7.2.4 The Conclusion on the Pre-Advent Investigative Judgment

This research concludes that Adventist typology regarding the earthly sanctuary is both vertical and horizontal in its parallels with the heavenly. It is “vertical” in that it corresponds with the heavenly sanctuary (conceptually - with limited structural parallels), and “horizontally” in that it is “pre-figurative” and “predictive” of Christ’s ministry.

Adventist theology views the two-phased (daily and yearly) ministries of the earthly priests as finding their antitypical fulfillment in Christ’s also two-phased ministry in the heavenly sanctuary. While the sacrifices of atonement find their fulfillment at the Cross of Christ, the High Priestly ministry in the Most Holy place on the Day of Atonement is viewed as beginning in 1844 to the close of human probation. This last phase is considered as a work of PAIJ, in which God cleanses the sanctuary of the recorded (but pardoned) sins by first revealing to the heavenly beings what He has

done (and how they have responded) in the lives of the saints. This is viewed as part of God's way of vindicating His name from the accusations of the devil that God was unjust.

Adventist theology views compatibility between "justification/righteousness by faith" and "judgment according to works" – the *former* reflecting *a means of salvation* and acceptance with God, the *latter* reflecting *the vindication of that "justification"*.

It has been noted also that Adventist theology does not teach that one needs to have any special "degree" of holiness – ever; the righteousness of Christ that one receives at conversion is sufficient.

7.2.5 The Conclusion on the Exegetical and Theological Study of Key Texts

This research has conducted the exegesis of a limited number of texts, due to space limitations: Daniel 7:9, 10, 13, 14; 8:9-14, 9:24-27 and Hebrews 9:6-14, 18-26.

The exegesis of Daniel 7 and 8 has shown that cosmic judgment secures the condemnation-destruction of the "little horn" and vindication-deliverance of the saints. The judgment on the "little horn" is expressed from different contexts (Daniel 8 having a sanctuary context which enriches the meaning of the judgment). The exegesis of Daniel 9 showed and linked God's cosmic and local judgments. Cosmic judgment is seen by the reference to Christ's sacrifice, but the local judgment by the reference to the judgment on Israel's city and sanctuary.

Other areas for future research are (1) the extent of the relationship between Daniel 8 and Leviticus, particularly chapter 16, and (2) the extent of the relationship between Daniel 8 and 9, particularly the prophetic timelines.

Hebrews 9 showed a concern over the sacrifice of Christ that becomes the fulfillment of all blood sacrifices of the old covenant. Therefore, the authors concern was shown to have not been the exposition of any particular ceremony (like the Day of Atonement, the Inauguration of the Covenant, etc.), but his purpose was to show the superiority of the blood of Christ.

7.3 The Validity of the Conclusions

The validity of these conclusions depends on two things: (1) the accuracy of the presuppositions brought into the research, and (2) the extent of research done.

The author of this research considers the results of this research accurate, pending further investigation into the presuppositions brought into the study and the related areas of this topic.

7.4 The Significance of the Conclusions

It seems important to comment on the significance of this research, particularly the implications for the Adventist theology of the PAIJ.

The researcher needs to do further research into such areas as are (1) the extent of the relationship between Daniel 8 and Leviticus, particularly chapter 16, and (2) the extent of the relationship between Daniel 8 and 9, particularly the prophetic timelines. Therefore the results of this research are not sufficient to pass any verdict on the whole theology of the PAIJ.

Although the researcher does not agree with every interpretation of the Biblical texts by Adventist scholars, he finds *general* agreement with their views of these texts.

In response to the hypotheses stated at the Introduction of this research: (1) the first one appears to have been correct in that this research reveals the theology of the PAIJ to be a result of serious Scriptural engagement, rather than a mere “face-saving” device resulting from a sense of shame and imagination; (2) the second one is not satisfactorily affirmed, due to the limited nature of this research (see above, in this section) – both the “year-day equivalency” and the “historicist” approach to Biblical apocalyptic have not been directly studied (evaluated) in this research, although the exegetical results seem to favour their validity.

It is the hope of the researcher that the findings of this research will contribute positively to the ongoing debate over this topic. The purpose is that the Christian church’s faithfulness to Scripture advances.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Andreasen ML 1947. *The Sanctuary Service*. Washington, DC, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Andreasen NA 1986. Translation of nisdaq/katharisthesetai in Daniel 8:14. In FB Holbrook (ed.), *Symposium on Daniel*, 475-496. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

_____ 1989. The Heavenly Sanctuary in the Old Testament. In FB Holbrook (ed.), *The Sanctuary and the Atonement*, 63-79. Collegedale, USA: The College Press.

_____ 2000. Death: Origin, Nature, and Final Eradication. In R Dederen (ed.), *Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology*, 314-345. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Andrews JN 1853. The Sanctuary. *The Review and Herald*. Online article. Accessed from www.adventistarchives.org/docs/RH/RH18530203-V03-19_B.pdf#view=fit, 2010-08-01.

_____ 1873. *History of the Sabbath and the First Day of the Week*. Online

- book. Accessed from www.adventistarchives.org/docs/HOS/HOS/index.djvu, 2010-08-01.
- Baldwin DD 1989. William Miller's Use of the Word "Atonement". In FB Holbrook (ed.), *Doctrine of the Sanctuary: A Historical Survey*, 159-170. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.
- Baldwin JG 1978. *Daniel*. Downers Grove, Illinois, USA: InterVarsity Press.
- Baldwin JT 2006. Faith, Reason, and the Holy Spirit in Hermeneutics. In GW Reid (ed.), *Understanding Scripture: An Adventist Approach*, 15-24. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.
- Ballenger AF 1909. *Cast Out for the Cross of Christ*. Online book. Accessed from www.bible.ca/7-1909-ballenger-cast-out-for-the-cross.htm, 2010-08-01.
- Bates J 1847. *The Seventh-day Sabbath: A Perpetual Sign (2nd ed.)*. Online book. Accessed from www.manybooks.net/titles/batesj2726627266.html, 2010-08-01.
- _____ 1868. *The Autobiography of Elder Joseph Bates*. Battle Creek, Michigan, USA: Steam Press of the Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association.
- Beem T 2008. *It is Ok not to be a Seventh-day Adventist*. Seattle, Washington, USA: BookSurge Publishing.
- Bennett D 1986. The Stone Kingdom of Daniel 2. In FB Holbrook (ed.), *Symposium on Daniel*, 331-377. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.
- Blanco J 2000. The Sanctuary and the Mission of the Church. *Journal of the*

Adventist Theological Society. Online article. Accessed from www.atsjats.org/publication_file.php?pub_id=178&journal=1&type=pdf, 2010-08-01.

Blazen IT 1986. Justification and Judgment. In FB Holbrook (ed.), *70 Weeks, Leviticus, Nature of Prophecy*, 339-388. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

_____ 2000. Salvation. In R Dederen (ed.), *Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology*, 271-313. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Bliss S 1853. *Memoirs of William Miller*. Boston: Joshua V Himes.

Bradford CE 2000. Stewardship. In R Dederen (ed.), *Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology*, 651-674. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Brown F, Driver R and Briggs A 1996. *Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon*. Massachusetts, USA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Bruce FF 1990. The Epistle to the Hebrews. In G Fee (ed.), *The New International Commentary of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, Michigan, USA: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Brunt JC 2000. Resurrection and Glorification. In R Dederen (ed.), *Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology*, 347-373. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Caesar LO 2006. Hermeneutics and Culture. In GW Reid (ed.), *Understanding*

Scripture: An Adventist Approach, 271-282. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Cairus AE 2000. The Doctrine of Man. In R Dederen (ed.), *Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology*, 375-417. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Canale FL 2000. Doctrine of God. In R Dederen (ed.), *Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology*, 105-157. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

_____ 2006. Revelation and Inspiration. In GW Reid (ed.), *Understanding Scripture: An Adventist Approach*, 47-72. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Canright DM 1914. *Seventh-day Adventism Renounced*. Nashville, USA: Gospel Advocate Company.

Christoffel L 2007. Evangelical Adventism – *Questions on Doctrine's* Legacy. Paper presented at the Questions on Doctrine 50th Anniversary Conference, 24-27 October 2007. Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan, USA.
Accessed from www.god.andrews.edu/docs/09_larry_christoffel.pdf, 2010-07-31.

Corson R 2002. Progressive and Traditional Adventists Examined. *Adventist Today*. Online article. Accessed from www.atoday.com/magazine/2002/11/progressive-and-traditional-adventists-examined, 2010-07-31.

Crosier ORL 1846. The Sanctuary. *The Day-Star Extra*. Online article. Accessed

From www.sdadefend.com/Our%20Firm%20Foundation/Crosier-sanctuary.pdf, 2010-08-01.

_____ 1850. The Sanctuary. *The Advent Review* (vol. 1, no. 3). Auburn, New York, USA: Published by Hiram Edson, David Arnold, Geo. W. Holt, Samuel W Rhodes and James White.

Damsteegt PG 1989. Among Sabbatarian Adventists (1845-1850). In FB Holbrook (ed.), *Doctrine of the Sanctuary: A Historical Survey*, 17-55. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Daniel and Revelation Committee 1992. To the Reader. In FB Holbrook (ed.), *Symposium on Revelation – Book I*, xiii-xiv. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Davidson JA 2004. Word Made Flesh: The Inspiration of Scripture. *Journal of the Adventist Theological Seminary*. Online article. Accessed from www.atsjats.org/publication_file.php?pub_id=16&journal=1&type=pdf, 2010-08-01.

Davidson RM 1984. Typology and the Levitical System – 1. Online article. Accessed from www.andrews.edu/~davidson/Publications/Sanctuary/typology&levitical_system_2.pdf, 2010-05-20.

_____ 1989. Typology in the Book of Hebrews. In FB Holbrook (ed.), *Issues in the Book of Hebrews*, 121-186. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

- _____ 2000. Biblical Interpretation. In Dederen R (ed.), *Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology*, 57-104. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.
- _____ 2002. Inauguration or Day of Atonement? A Response to Norman Young's "Old Testament Background to Hebrews 6:19-20 Revisited". Online article. Accessed from www.andrews.edu/~davidson/Publications/Sanctuary/inauguration_ot_bkgd_hew.pdf, 2010-05-20.
- _____ 2006. Interpreting Old Testament Prophecy. In GW Reid (ed.), *Understanding Scripture: An Adventist Approach*, 183-202. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.
- Dederen R 1989. Atoning Aspects of Christ's Death. In FB Holbrook (ed.), *The Sanctuary and the Atonement*, 199-127. Collegedale, USA: The College Press.
- _____ 2000. The Church. In R Dederen (ed.), *Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology*, 538-580. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.
- _____ (ed.) 2000. *Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology*. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.
- Donkor K 2006. Is Scripture Historically Conditioned? Online article. Accessed from www.adventistbiblicalresearch.org/documents/Is%20Scripture%20Historically%20Conditioned.pdf, 2010-08-01.
- Douglass HE 2007. The QOD Earthquake – Attempted Merger of Two Theological

- Tectonic Plates. Paper presented at the Questions on Doctrine 50th Anniversary Conference, 24-27 October 2007. Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan, USA. Accessed from www.qod.andrews.edu/docs/11_herbert_douglass.pdf, 2010-07-31.
- Douty NF 1964. *The Case of D.M. Canright*. Grand Rapids, Michigan, USA: Baker Book House.
- Du Preez R 2006. Interpreting and Applying Biblical Ethics. In GW Reid (ed.), *Understanding Scripture: An Adventist Approach*, 285-303. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.
- Duffie D 1989. Contemporary Evangelical Views of the Atonement. In FB Holbrook (ed.), *The Sanctuary and the Atonement*, 333-347. Collegedale, USA: The College Press.
- Edson H 1921. *The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* (vol. 98, no. 25). Online article. Accessed from www.adventistarchives.org/docs/RH/RH19210623-V98-25_B.pdf#view=fit, 2010-08-07.
- Everts E 1857. Communication from Bro. Everts. *The Review and Herald*. Online article. Accessed from www.adventistarchives.org/docs/RH/RH18570101-V09-09_B.pdf#view=fit, 2010-08-01.
- Ferch AJ 1986. Authorship, Theology, and Purpose of Daniel. In FB Holbrook (ed.), *Symposium on Daniel*. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.
- _____ 1986. Commencement Date for the Seventy Week Prophecy. In FB

Holbrook (ed.), *70 Weeks, Leviticus, Nature of Prophecy*. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Fletcher WW 1932. *The Reason for My Faith*. Sydney: William Brooks & Co.

Ford D 2007. *In the Heart of Daniel*. New York, USA: iUniverse.

Ford D and Ford G 2008. *For The Sake of the Gospel: Throw out the Baby Water but Keep the Baby*. New York: iUniverse.

Fowler JM 2000. Sin. In R Dederen (ed.), *Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology*, 233-269. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Gane R 1997. Judgment as Covenant Review. *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society*. Online article. Accessed from www.atsjats.org/publication_file.php?pub_id=269&journal=1&type=pdf, 2010-08-01.

_____ 2007. Christ at His Sanctuary: Toward Adventist-Evangelical Dialogue. Online article. Accessed from www.adventistbiblicalresearch.org/World%20Evangelical/Gane,%20Christ%20at%20his%20sanctuary.pdf, 2010-04-18.

General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists 2005. *Seventh-day Adventist Church Manual*. Hagerstown, Maryland, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

General Conference Committee 1986. Methods of Bible Study. Online article. Accessed from www.adventist.org/beliefs/other-documents/other-doc4.html,

2010-08-07.

Goldingay JE 1989. *Daniel*. World Biblical Commentary 30. Nashville, USA: Thomas Nelson.

Gordon PA 2000. *The Sanctuary, 1844 and the Pioneers*. Nampa, Idaho, USA: Pacific Press Publishing Association.

Gulley NR 2003. *Systematic Theology: Prolegomena* (vol. 1). Berrien Springs, Michigan, USA: Andrews University Press.

Guthrie GH 1998. *Hebrews*. The NIV Application Commentary. Grand Rapids, Michigan, USA: Zondervan.

Hasel GF 1986. Interpretations of the Chronology of the Seventy Weeks. In FB Holbrook (ed.), *70 Weeks, Leviticus, Nature of Prophecy*, 3-63. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

_____ 1986. The "Little Horn," the Heavenly Sanctuary and the Time of the End: A Study of Daniel 8:9-14. In FB Holbrook (ed.), *Symposium on Daniel*, 378-461. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

_____ 1989. Studies in Biblical Atonement – I: Continual Sacrifice, Defilement/Cleansing, and Sanctuary. In FB Holbrook (ed.), *The Sanctuary and the Atonement*, 81-105. Collegedale, USA: The College Press.

_____ 1989. Studies in Biblical Atonement – II: The Day of Atonement. In FB Holbrook (ed.), *The Sanctuary and the Atonement*, 107-121. Collegedale, USA: The College Press.

_____ 2000. Divine Judgment. In R Dederen (ed.), *Handbook of Seventh-day*

Adventist Theology, 815-855. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Hasel FM 2006. Presuppositions in the Interpretation of Scripture. In GW Reid (ed.), *Understanding Scripture: An Adventist Approach*, 27-46. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Henry M 1706. *Matthew Henry Commentary on the Whole Bible*. Online book. Accessed from www.biblestudytools.com/commentaries/matthew-henry-complete/daniel/7.html, 2010-09-10.

_____ 1706. *Matthew Henry Commentary on the Whole Bible*. Online book. Accessed from www.biblestudytools.com/commentaries/matthew-henry-complete/daniel/8.html, 2010-09-10.

_____ 1706. *Matthew Henry Commentary on the Whole Bible*. Online book. Accessed from www.biblestudytools.com/commentaries/matthew-henry-complete/daniel/9.html, 2010-09-10.

Heppenstall E 1972. *Our High Priest: Jesus Christ in the Heavenly Sanctuary*. Washington, DC, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

_____ 1989. Subjective and Objective Aspects of the Atonement. In FB Holbrook (ed.), *The Sanctuary and the Atonement*, 3-36. Collegedale, USA: The College Press.

Hill AE 2008. *Daniel*. The Expositor's Bible Commentary 8. Grand Rapids, Michigan, USA: Zondervan.

Holbrook FB 1989. The Israelite Sanctuary. In FB Holbrook (ed.), *The Sanctuary and*

the Atonement, 3-36. Collegedale, USA: The College Press.

_____ 1998. Biblical Doctrine of Inspiration and Authority. Online article.

Accessed from www.adventistbiblicalresearch.org/documents/

[InspirationandAuthority.htm](http://www.adventistbiblicalresearch.org/documents/InspirationandAuthority.htm), 2010-04-18.

_____ 2000. The Great Controversy. In R Dederen (ed.), *Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology*, 980-1008. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Holladay WL 1988. *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*.

Grand Rapids, Michigan, USA: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Jamieson R, Fausset AR, Brown D 1871. *Commentary Critical and Explanatory on*

the Whole Bible. Online book. Accessed from [www.biblestudytools.com/](http://www.biblestudytools.com/commentaries/jamieson-fausset-brown/daniel/daniel-7.html)

[commentaries/jamieson-fausset-brown/daniel/daniel-7.html](http://www.biblestudytools.com/commentaries/jamieson-fausset-brown/daniel/daniel-7.html), 2010-09-10.

_____ 1871. *Commentary Critical and Explanatory on*

the Whole Bible. Online book. Accessed from [www.biblestudytools.com/](http://www.biblestudytools.com/commentaries/jamieson-fausset-brown/daniel/daniel-8.html)

[commentaries/jamieson-fausset-brown/daniel/daniel-8.html](http://www.biblestudytools.com/commentaries/jamieson-fausset-brown/daniel/daniel-8.html), 2010-09-10.

_____ 1871. *Commentary Critical and Explanatory on*

the Whole Bible. Online book. Accessed from [www.biblestudytools.com/](http://www.biblestudytools.com/commentaries/jamieson-fausset-brown/daniel/daniel-9.html)

[commentaries/jamieson-fausset-brown/daniel/daniel-9.html](http://www.biblestudytools.com/commentaries/jamieson-fausset-brown/daniel/daniel-9.html), 2010-09-10

Johnsson GW 1989. Day of Atonement Allusions. In FB Holbrook (ed.), *Issues in the*

Book of Hebrews, 105-120. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing

Association.

_____ 1989. Hebrews: An Overview. In FB Holbrook (ed.), *Issues in the Book of Hebrews*, 13-33. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

_____ 1989. The Heavenly Sanctuary – Figurative Or Real? In FB Holbrook (ed.), *Issues in the Book of Hebrews*, 105-120. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

_____ 2000. Biblical Apocalyptic. In R Dederen (ed.), *Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology*, 784-813. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

_____ (ed.) 2000. Report on Hope International and Associated Groups. Online article. Accessed from www.adventistreview.org/2000-1538/hope-international.html, 2010-07-31.

Jones EB 1943. *Forty Bible-Supported Reasons Why You Should Not Be a Seventh-day Adventist* (2nd ed.). Minneapolis.

Jones-Haldeman M 2001. Progressive Adventism. *Adventist Today*. Online article. Accessed from www.atoday.com/magazine/2001/09/progressive-adventism, 2010-07-31.

Kelly RE 2005. *Exposing Seventh-day Adventism*. San Jose, California, USA: Writer's Club Press.

Kiesler H 1989. An Exegesis of Selected Passages. In FB Holbrook (ed.), *Issues in the Book of Hebrews*, 53-77. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

- Kirkpartick L 2007. A Wind of Doctrine Blows Through the Church: The Alternative Hermatology of *Questions on Doctrine*. Paper presented at the Questions on Doctrine 50th Anniversary Conference, 24-27 October 2007. Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan, USA. Accessed from www.god.andrews.edu/docs/16_larry_kirkpatrick.pdf, 2010-07-31.
- Kis MM 2000. Christian Lifestyle and Behavior. In R Dederen (ed.), *Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology*, 675-722. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.
- Klingbeil GA 2006. The Text and the Canon of Scripture. In GW Reid (ed.), *Understanding Scripture: An Adventist Approach*, 91-108. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.
- Knight GR 2000. *A Search for Identity: The Development of Seventh-day Adventist Beliefs*, Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.
- _____ 2004. *Joseph Bates: The Real Founder of Seventh-day Adventism*. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.
- _____ (ed.) 2003. *Questions on Doctrine* (annotated edition). Berrien Springs, Michigan, USA: Andrews University Press.
- Koranteng-Pipim S 1996. *Receiving the Word*. Coldwater, Michigan: Remnant Publications.
- Kuntaraf JO and Liwidjaja-Kuntaraf K 2008. Emphasizing the Wholeness of Man. *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society*. Online article. Accessed from www.atsjats.org/publication_file.php?pub_id=340&journal=1&type=pdf, 2010-

07-31.

LaRondelle HK 2000. The Remnant and the Three Angels' Messages. In R Dederen (ed.), *Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology*, 857-891. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Loughborough JN 1905. *The Great Second Advent Movement: Its Rise and Progress*. Southern Publishing Association.

Martin WR 1960. *The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House.

Martin WR 1965. *The Kingdom of the Cults*. Minneapolis, USA: Bethany Fellowship.

Maxwell CM 1989. The Investigative Judgment: Its Early Development. In FB Holbrook (ed.), *Doctrine of the Sanctuary: A Historical Survey*, 119-157. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Miller SR 1994. *Daniel*. The New American Commentary 18. Nashville, Tennessee, USA: B&H Publishing Group.

Moskala J 2004. Toward a Biblical Theology of God's Judgment: A Celebration of the Cross in Seven Phases of Divine Universal Judgment (An Overview of a Theocentric-Christocentric Approach). *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society*. Online article. Accessed from www.atsjats.org/publication_file.php?pub_id=22&journal=1&type=pdf, 2010-07-31.

Mounce WD 1993. *The Analytical Lexicon to the Greek New Testament*. Grand Rapids, Michigan, USA: Zondervan Publishing House.

- Mouton J 2001. *How to succeed in your Master's and Doctoral Studies: A South African guide and resource book*. Pretoria, South Africa: Van Schaik Publishers.
- Mueller E 2006. Guidelines for the Interpretation of Scripture. In GW Reid (ed.), *Understanding Scripture: An Adventist Approach*, 111-132. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.
- Nam D 2000. The New Earth and the Eternal Kingdom. In R Dederen (ed.), *Handbook of Seventh-Day Adventist Theology (vol. 12)*, 947-968. Hagerstown: Review and Herald Publishing Association.
- Nam J 2007. *The Questions on Doctrine Saga: Contours and Lessons*. Paper presented at the Questions on Doctrine 50th Anniversary Conference, 24-27 October 2007. Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan, USA. Accessed from www.qod.andrews.edu/docs/02_julius_nam.pdf, 2010-07-31.
- Neufeld DF (ed.) 1976. *Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopaedia*. Revised by DE Mansell and BJ Van Dolson. Washington, DC, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.
- Nichol FD (ed.) 1976. *The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary (vol. 4)*. Washington, DC, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.
- _____ (ed.) 1976. *The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary (vol. 7)*. Washington, DC, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.
- O'Brien PT 2010. *The Letter to the Hebrews*. The Pillar New Testament

Commentary. Grand Rapids, Michigan, USA: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Paulien JK 2003. The End of Historicism? Reflections on the Adventist Approach to Biblical Apocalyptic – Part One. *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society*.

Online article. Accessed from

www.atsjats.org/publication_file.php?pub_id=25&journal=1&type=pdf, 2010-08-01.

_____ 2006. The Hermeneutics of Biblical Apocalyptic. In GW Reid (ed.),

Understanding Scripture: An Adventist Approach, 245-268. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

_____ 2007. Questions on Doctrine and the Church: Present and Future. Paper presented at the Questions on Doctrine 50th Anniversary Conference, 24-27 October 2007. Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan, USA.

Accessed from www.god.andrews.edu/docs/21_jon_paulien.pdf, 2010-07-31.

_____ 2008. A New Look at the Year-Day Principle. Online audio file. Accessed from www.atsjats.org/site/1/podcast/spirit_prophecy_jon_paulien.mp3, 2010-07-31.

Paulsen J 1992. Sanctuary and Judgment. In FB Holbrook (ed.), *Symposium on Revelation – Book II*, 275-294. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Pfandl G 2004. The Authority of the Ellen G. White Writings. Online article. Accessed

from www.adventistbiblicalresearch.org/documents/AuthorityEGWwritings.pdf,

2010-08-01.

_____ 2006. Ellen G. White and Hermeneutics. In GW Reid (ed.), *Understanding Scripture: An Adventist Approach*, 309-326. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Phillips RD 2006. *Hebrews*. Reformed Expository Commentary. New Jersey, USA: P&R Publishing.

Reid GW 2000. Health and Healing. In R Dederen (ed.), *Handbook of Seventh-Day Adventist Theology (vol. 12)*, 751-782. Hagerstown: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Rice GE 2000. Spiritual Gifts. In R Dederen (ed.), *Handbook of Seventh-Day Adventist Theology (vol. 12)*, 610-650. Hagerstown: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Rodriguez AM 1986. Transfer of Sin in Leviticus. In FB Holbrook (ed.), *70 Weeks, Leviticus, Nature of Prophecy*, 169-197. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

_____ 1986. Significance of the Cultic Language in Daniel 8:9-14. In FB Holbrook (ed.), *Symposium on Daniel*, 527-549. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

_____ 2000. The Sanctuary. In R Dederen (ed.), *Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology*, 375-417. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

_____ 2002. The Heavenly Books of Life and of Human Deeds. *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society*. Online article. Accessed from www.atsjats.org/publication_file.php?pub_id=59&journal=1&type=pdf, 2010-07-31.

_____ 2006. The Use of the Modified Version of the Historical-Critical Approach by Adventist Scholars. In GW Reid (ed.), *Understanding Scripture: An Adventist Approach*, 339-350. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Salom AP 1989. Sanctuary Typology. In FB Holbrook (ed.), *Issues in the Book of Hebrews*, 199-218. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Seventh-day Adventist Editors 1957. *Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine*. Washington, DC, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Schwantes SJ 1986. *ereb boqer* of Daniel 8:14 Re-Examined. In FB Holbrook (ed.), *Symposium on Daniel*, 462-474. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Shea WH 1986. Literary Form and Theological Function in Leviticus. In FB Holbrook (ed.), *70 Weeks, Leviticus, Nature of Prophecy*, 131-168. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

_____ 1986. Theological Importance of the Preadvent Judgment. In FB Holbrook (ed.), *70 Weeks, Leviticus, Nature of Prophecy*, 323-332. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

- _____ 1986. Unity in Daniel. In FB Holbrook (ed.), *Symposium on Daniel*, 165-255. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.
- _____ 1992. *Selected Studies on Prophetic Interpretation*. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.
- _____ 2000. Creation. In R Dederen (ed.), *Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology*, 418-455. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.
- _____ 2001. Supplementary Evidence in Support of 457 B.C. as the Starting Date for the 2300 Day-Years of Daniel 8:14. *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society*. Online article. Accessed from www.atsjats.org/publication_file.php?pub_id=94&journal=1&type=pdf, 2010-08-02.
- Smith KG 2008. *Academic Writing and Theological Research*. Johannesburg, South Africa: South African Theological Seminary Press.
- Smith U 1898. *Looking Unto Jesus*. Battle Creek, Michigan: Review and Herald.
- Specht WF 1989. Christ's Session, Enthronement, and Mediatorial and Intercessory Ministry. In FB Holbrook (ed.), *The Sanctuary and the Atonement*, 145-175. Collegedale, USA: The College Press.
- Standish CD and Standish RR 1989. *Deceptions of the New Theology*. Rapidan, Virginia, USA: Hartland Publications.
- _____ 2000. *The Gathering Storm and the Storm Burst*. Rapidan, Virginia, USA: Hartland Publications.
- _____ 2006. *Half a Century of Apostasy – the New*

- Theology's Grim Harvest*. Narbethong, Victoria, Australia: Highwood Books.
- Standish RR 2007. *A History of Questions on Doctrine: Fidelity or Compromise?*
Paper presented at the Questions on Doctrine 50th Anniversary Conference,
24-27 October 2007. Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan, USA.
Accessed from www.god.andrews.edu/docs/03_russell_standish.pdf, 2010-08-02.
- Steinmann AE 2008. *Daniel*. Concordia Commentary: A Theological Exposition of
Sacred Scripture. Saint Louis, USA: Concordia Publishing House.
- Strand KA 1992. Foundational Principles of Interpretation. In FB Holbrook (ed.),
Symposium on Revelation – Book I, 3-34. Hagerstown, USA: Review and
Herald Publishing Association.
- _____ 2000. The Sabbath. In R Dederen (ed.), *Handbook of Seventh-day
Adventist Theology*, 493-537. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald
Publishing Association.
- Strong J 1890. *A Concise Dictionary of the words in the Greek Testament*. Online
book. Accessed from [www.heraldmag.org/olb/contents/dictionaries/
SGreek.pdf](http://www.heraldmag.org/olb/contents/dictionaries/SGreek.pdf), 2010-08-02.
- _____ 1890. *A Concise Dictionary of the words in the Hebrew Bible*. Online book.
Accessed from www.heraldmag.org/olb/contents/dictionaries/SHebrew.pdf,
2010-08-02.
- Thayer J 1996. *Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Coded with
Strong's Concordance Numbers*. Massachusetts, USA: Hendrickson

Publishers.

Thompson AL 1991. *Inspiration: Hard Questions, Honest Answers*. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

_____ 2009. *Beyond Common Ground: Why Liberals and Conservatives Need Each Other*. Nampa, Idaho, USA: Pacific Press Publishing Association.

Timm AR 2006. Historical background of Adventist Biblical Interpretation. In GW Reid (ed.), *Understanding Scripture: An Adventist Approach* (vol. 1). Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

_____ 2007. Questions on Doctrine: History and Impact in the South American Division. Paper presented at the Questions on Doctrine 50th Anniversary Conference, 24-27 October 2007. Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan, USA. Accessed from www.qod.andrews.edu/docs/06_alberto_timm.pdf, 2010-07-31.

Treyer AR 1986. The Day of Atonement as Related to the Contamination and Purification of the Sanctuary. In FB Holbrook (ed.), *70 Weeks, Leviticus, Nature of Prophecy*, 198-256. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

_____ 1989. Antithetical Or Correspondence Typology? In FB Holbrook (ed.), *Issues in the Book of Hebrews*, 187-198. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Van Bemmelen PM 2000. Revelation and Inspiration. In R Dederen (ed.), *Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology*, 22-57. Hagerstown, USA: Review and

Herald Publishing Association.

_____ 2006. The Authority of Scripture. In GW Reid (ed.),
Understanding Scripture: An Adventist Approach, 75-87. Hagerstown, USA:
Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Veloso M 1989. Doctrine of the Sanctuary and the Atonement As Reflected in the
Book of Revelation. In FB Holbrook (ed.), *The Sanctuary and the Atonement*,
177-198. Collegedale, USA: The College Press.

_____ 2000. The Law of God. In R Dederen (ed.), *Handbook of Seventh-day
Adventist Theology*, 457-491. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald
Publishing Association.

Vyhmeister NJ 2000. Who are Seventh-day Adventists? In R Dederen (ed.),
Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology, 375-417. Hagerstown, USA:
Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Wade L 2000. "Son of Man" comes to the Judgment in Daniel 7:13. *Journal of the
Adventist Theological Society*. Online article. Accessed from
www.atsjats.org/publication_file.php?pub_id=121&journal=1&type=pdf, 2010-
08-01.

Wallenkampf AV 1989. Challengers to the Doctrine of the Sanctuary. In FB Holbrook
(ed.), *Doctrine of the Sanctuary: A Historical Survey*, 197-216. Hagerstown,
USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Webster EC 2000. The Millennium. In R Dederen (ed.), *Handbook of Seventh-day
Adventist Theology*, 927-946. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald

Publishing Association.

Weiss H 1975. Revelation and the Bible: Beyond Verbal Inspiration. *Spectrum* (vol. 7, no. 3). Online article. Accessed from www.spectrummagazine.org/files/archive/archive06-10/7-3weiss.pdf, 2010-07-31.

White AL 1985. *The Early Years* (vol. 1). Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

_____ 1847. To the Remnant Scattered Abroad. *A Word to the "Little Flock"*. In GR Knight (ed.), *Earliest Seventh-day Adventist Periodicals*. Berrien Springs, Michigan, USA: Andrews University Press.

_____ 1860. *Spiritual Gifts* (vol. 2). Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

_____ 1868. *Testimonies for the Church* (vol. 1). Nampa, Idaho, USA: Pacific Press Publishing Association.

_____ 1882. *Early Writings*. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

_____ 1889. *Testimonies for the church* (vol. 4). Nampa, Idaho, USA: Pacific Press Publishing Association.

_____ 1889. *Testimonies for the church* (vol. 5). Nampa, Idaho, USA: Pacific Press Publishing Association.

_____ 1893. *Steps to Christ*. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

- _____ 1890. *Patriarchs and Prophets*. Nampa, Idaho, USA: Pacific Press Publishing Association.
- _____ 1896. *Thoughts from the Mount of Blessings*. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.
- _____ 1898. *The Desire of Ages*. Nampa, Idaho, USA: Pacific Press Publishing Association.
- _____ 1900. *Christ's Object Lessons*. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.
- _____ 1903. *Education*. Nampa, Idaho, USA: Pacific Press Publishing Association.
- _____ 1911. *The Great Controversy*. Nampa, Idaho, USA: Pacific Press Publishing Association.
- _____ 1915. *Life Sketches of Ellen G White*. Nampa, Idaho, USA: Pacific Press Publishing Association.
- _____ 1938. *Counsels on Sabbath School Work*. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.
- _____ 1958. *Selected Messages* (Book 2). Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.
- White J 1847. The Judgment. *A Word to the "Little Flock"*. In GR Knight (ed.), *Earliest Seventh-day Adventist Periodicals*. Berrien Springs, Michigan, USA: Andrews University Press.
- _____ 1850. The Day of Judgment. *The Advent Review* (no. 4). In GR Knight (ed.),

Earliest Seventh-day Adventist Periodicals. Berrien Springs, Michigan, USA:
Andrews University Press.

_____ 1851. The Parable, Matthew, XXV 1-12. *Second Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* (vol. 1, no. 13). Online article. Accessed from www.adventistarchives.org/docs/RH/RH18510609-V01-13_B.pdf#view=fit, 2010-08-07.

_____ 1857. The Judgment. *The Review and Herald*. Online article. Accessed from www.adventistarchives.org/docs/RH/RH18570129-V09-13_B.pdf#view=fit, 2010-08-01.

_____ 1868. *Life Incidents*. Berrien Springs, Michigan, USA: Andrews University Press.

Wikipedia, 2010. Desmond Ford. Online article. Accessed from www.wikipedia.org, 2010-02-21.

_____, 2010. Desmond Ford. Online article. Accessed from www.wikipedia.org, 2010-02-22.

_____, 2010. Progressive Adventism. Online article. Accessed from www.wikipedia.org, 2010-02-03.

_____, 2010. Walter Martin. Online article. Accessed from www.wikipedia.org, 2010-03-07.

Winandy P 1986. The Meaning of *Kipper* in Daniel 9:24. In FB Holbrook (ed.), *70 Weeks, Leviticus, Nature of Prophecy*, 119-130. Hagerstown, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Young EJ 1949. *The Prophecy of Daniel*. Grand Rapids, Michigan, USA: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

APPENDUM

“Rules of interpretation” by William Miller (Bliss 1853:69-71):

1. No word should be ever overlooked in Scripture, but all should have their proper effect on the subject presented in the Bible. His foundation text for this notion was Matthew 5:18;
2. No part of Scripture is unnecessary, and Scripture may be understood through diligent application and study. The basis text was 2 Timothy 3:15-17;
3. There is nothing that God has revealed in Scripture that can or will be hidden from those who ask for divine assistance by faith. The proof texts were Deuteronomy 29:29; Matthew 10:26, 27; 1 Corinthians 2:10; Philippians 3:15; Isaiah 45:11; Matthew 21:22; John 14:13, 14; 15:7; James 1:5,6; 1 John 5:13-15;
4. To correctly comprehend biblical teaching, one must bring together all the scriptures relevant to the topic, and then let every word have its proper influence; if you succeed in forming a theory without any contradiction, you will not be in error. He used the following texts in support of this idea: Isaiah 28:7-29; 35:8; Luke 24:27, 44, 45; Romans 16:26; James 5:19; 2 Peter 1:19, 20.
5. Since Scripture is its own rule, it must be allowed and used as its own interpreter and expositor. The proof texts were: Psalm 19:7-11; 119:97-105; Matthew 23:8-10; 1 Corinthians 2:12-16; Ezekiel 34:18, 19; Luke 11:52; Matthew 2:7, 8.
6. Scripture contains predictive prophecies through visions, figures and parables; these are often repetitive in different forms. An understanding of them requires that one combines all in one. These were supported by: Psalm 89:19; Hosea 12:10; Habakkuk 2:2; Acts 2:17; 1 Corinthians 10:6; Hebrews 9:9, 24; Psalm 78:2; Matthew 13:13, 34; Genesis 41:1-32; Daniel 2, 7, 8; Acts 10:9-16.
7. Visions are always mentioned as such. Example: 2 Corinthians 12:1.
8. Figures in Scripture are consistently figurative in meaning, and as such are used in prophecy to predict future things, events and times. The examples Miller used were mountains, meaning governments, Daniel 2:35, 44; beasts, meaning kingdoms, Daniel 7:8,17; waters, meaning people, Revelation 17:1, 15; day, meaning year, cf. Ezekiel 4:6.
9. The parables of Scripture are used as illustrations of subjects, and must be explained in the same way as figures, by the subject and the Bible. Mark 4:13 was somehow significant to him for this rule.
10. The significance of figures is sometimes twofold or more, as “day” is used in three different ways: a) an indefinite period, example in Ecclesiastes 7:14; b) a definite period, a day for a year, example in Ezekiel 4:6; c) a thousand years, with 2 Peter 3:8 as an example. The correct construction will harmonize with Scripture.
11. If a word makes sense on its own, and does not violate laws of nature, it is then to be understood literally, otherwise it is figurative. Example: Revelation 12:1, 2; 17:3-7.

12. In order to ascertain the meaning of a figure, one should trace the word through the Bible, and when one finds it explained, one can then substitute that explanation for the word used; if it makes sense, look no further, or else look again.
13. In order to know whether the correct historical event has been identified as fulfilling prophecy, one needs to consistently connect every word in the prophecy to its literal fulfillment; this should be done until every word is satisfied. These texts are cited: Psalm 22:5; Isaiah 45:17-19; 1 Peter 2:6; Revelation 17:17; Acts 3:18.
14. The towering rule above all is that the student of Scripture should have faith in Christ and His word – a faith that holds on to heavenly things supremely above all else.

Millerites who claimed the prophetic gift prior to Ellen G White

- **William Ellis Foy**

He was a tall colored man who joined the Millerites. He had visions relating to the Millerite movement in 1842 and 1844 prior to the Disappointment. There is no evidence that the visions confirmed the coming of Christ to be on the expected date, although they did have a role in changing his opposing views against the movement. He related his visions to some. His tombstone dates his death to 1893 (Neufeld 1976:474, 478; White¹³⁸ 1985:488, 489).

- **Hazen Foss**

He was a young man who received a vision of warning and encouragement for the Millerites in late September or early October 1844. He declined to relate the vision and in a second one was warned that if he refused God would choose someone else. He declined again fearing *the Millerite leaders who had taken a stand against such manifestations*. He then allegedly heard a voice that said “*You have grieved away the Spirit of the Lord*”. Out of fear and grief he then tried to relate the vision but could not remember it until he later heard Ellen G White relate the same vision. He then encouraged her to obey the Spirit of God, unlike himself. He lived until 1893 and seemed to have lost interest in religious matters (Neufeld 1976:473, 474)

¹³⁸ Arthur L White