

THE NATURE OF OLD TESTAMENT PROPHECY

AND

HERMENEUTICS

Desmond Ford

"It shall greatly helpe ye to understande Scripture,
If thou mark not only what is spoken or wrytten,
But of whom, and to whom,
With what words, at what time,
Where, to what intent, with what circumstances,
Considering what goeth before and what followeth."

Miles Coverdale

"If thou shalt discern the ages the Scriptures shall be open to you."

Augustine

". . .in what may be termed the externals of interpretation, that is to say, the meaning of words, the connexion of sentences, the settlement of the text, the evidence of facts, the same rules apply to the Old and New Testaments, as to other books."

Benjamin Jowett

Good News Unlimited
P.O. Box GN, Auburn, California 95603
(916) 823-9690

Every fact essential for the exegesis of Scripture is found within Scripture itself. That "the Bible is its own expositor" is the grand divine provision of a simple hermeneutical prophylactic — not the extra-canonical gifts of the Spirit, priests, church-councils, Ptolemy's canon, or history books. This self-authenticating principle, if applied with rigor and insight, will swiftly solve almost all the doctrinal problems traumatizing any church.

— Desmond Ford

Excellent books on hermeneutics by scholars such as Terry, Ramm, Berkhof and others are so readily available that there is little purpose in here accumulating a mere mass of quotations and sources. Our purpose rather is to succinctly summarize the acknowledged principles of interpretation which have immediate bearing on the exegetical task that has confronted Adventism since 1844. Does Daniel 8:14 point to a work of investigative judgment in heaven commencing in 1844? -- that is the issue to be resolved by legitimate use of the relevant hermeneutical criteria.

TO WHAT EVENTS DID OLD TESTAMENT PROPHECY POINT? NEW TESTAMENT PROPHECY?

The fact that the Old Testament does not present us with a predictive pattern of two advents of Christ set forth in their interrelationships should make us pause as we deal with this topic. For example, why is it that in Daniel we have repeated presentations of the coming of the kingdom of heaven but presentations that are without a bifurcation between the kingdoms of grace and glory? Why is there no apparent stress on the first coming of Christ in most Adventist expositions of Daniel two and seven? The obvious key to the riddle has already been suggested--the Old Testament only knows of a single kingdom of God--not a kingdom spelled out as having two phases.

John Bright reminds us that "the expectation of the coming redemption is expressed repeatedly in the Old Testament in passages which make no explicit mention of the Messiah."¹ Indeed, the vast majority of biblical scholars contend that Messiah is never found in the Old Testament as a title for the Coming One. H. H. Rowley reminds us that

"there cannot be the slightest suggestion that by the careful study of the Old Testament anyone could have written the New before its context of history took place."² "Hence to the prophets the beginning and the consummation of the Messianic Age could be linked together" though "to the church that stood between the beginning and the consummation a period divided the two."³

Old Testament prophecy did point to the coming kingdom of heaven (Dan 2:44, 45; 7:27; 12:1-3) often expressed as the Day of the Lord, a day of Israel's justification and fulfillment when her enemies would be destroyed and she would reign with Yahweh "king over all the earth" (Zec 14:5-9). This would, according to Isaiah, be accomplished through the Servant of the Lord, but we are never told it would be accomplished in two phases with millenniums between. Thus the Old Testament nowhere spells out the coming of a Christian Era centuries long.

This view, of course, is not new to Adventism. Our own SDA Bible Commentary in its article "The Role of Israel in Old Testament Prophecy" draws repeatedly on Ellen G. White to show that God's ideal plan was for his promises of world-wide spiritual dominion to be fulfilled following the Babylonian exile. The whole earth was to be prepared for the first advent which would have been speedily followed by the consummation.⁴

An important clue to the mystery of sin's prolongation is offered us by E. G. White, when in commenting upon apocalyptic predictions, she reminds us that all "the promises and warnings of God are alike conditional" (cited by Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary 4:34). As the International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia points out in its article on prophecy:

. . . it is not the case that a genuine prophecy must be fulfilled

like an edict of fate. Such prophecy is not an inevitable decree of fate, but is a word of the living God to mankind, and therefore conditioned ethically. . . .⁵

Caird, Knox, Fairbairn, Olshausen, etc--in other words scholars old and new, have agreed on the conditional nature of prophecy, including apocalyptic. Such has ever been the Seventh-day Adventist understanding also, as Richard W. Coffen pointed out in an article some years ago.⁶ Such a belief in conditionality is obvious from Adventism's most representative writer.⁷

We have not dwelled on subsidiary themes of Old Testament prophecy but only on those relevant to our present investigation, namely the predictions of the Kingdom of God and the Servant of Yahweh through whom that kingdom would be established. New Testament prophecy has the same theme--the Kingdom of God but with this dramatic difference: now for the first time there is seen the distinction of the kingdom inaugurated by the first advent and the kingdom consummated by the second.

USE AND PURPOSE OF TYPES AND SYMBOLS IN THE BIBLE

Very little needs to be said upon this topic, for most classical exegetes are agreed both on the pervading nature of typology and symbolism in Scripture and also on the hermeneutical principle that neither should ever be used to establish doctrine. Doctrine must be established from didactic portions of Scripture though once there found, illustration can be drawn from both types and symbols. Certainty in such applications can only be found if endorsement is found in the words of an inspired canonical writer (e.g. 1 Cor 5:7; Heb 7:1-4; Jn 1:29; 3:15, etc.). Adventists through all their history have so taught, as can be found by their comments on the rich man and Lazarus parable.

Those familiar with the teachings of the Shepherd's Rod movement, Mormonism, Roman Catholicism, and Dispensationalism are aware of the cultic perversion of Scripture by movements lacking a plain "Thus saith the Lord" for such peculiar distinctives as the Assumption of Mary, eternal hell-fire, the secret rapture, the discovery of the Book of Mormon, the return of Israel to Palestine, etc. Such ideas can find support only from inferential reading of Scripture--not from legitimate exegesis. Thus Adventist writers for decades have sounded warnings such as the following:

The interpretation of symbols and figures must be clearly established on the authority of Scripture itself. . . . The interpretation of figures and symbols requires a clear concept of the nature of things on which the figures are based. No symbol may be interpreted in such a way as to set it at variance with the plain, literal teachings of Scripture. It is important to ascertain the central truth each parable or type is designed to teach, and to avoid attempting to assign every detail of the narrative or type a particular meaning.⁸

Others, who have an active imagination, seize upon the figures and symbols of Holy Writ, interpret to suit their fancy, with little regard to the testimony of Scripture as its own interpreter, and then they present these vagaries as the teachings of God's word.⁹

The truths most plainly revealed in the Bible have been involved in doubt and darkness by learned men, who, with a pretense of great wisdom, teach that the Scriptures have a mystical, a secret, spiritual meaning not apparent in the language employed. These men are false teachers.¹⁰

By way of example of false use of types, let us ask what is to prevent some today doing as others did after 1844 and claim that none should work as the Day of Atonement was the strictest of Sabbaths? They could also infer from the type that all who do work should be "cut off."

To non-Adventist scholars the doctrine of the investigative judgment is a classic instance of inferential interpretation rather than exegesis. The fact that Seventh-day Adventists draw so heavily upon

types and parables to establish it rather than direct didactic passages of Scripture betrays it. It should be closely observed that the New Testament passages traditionally used by Adventists such as Acts 3:19; 1 Pe 4:17; 1 Ti 5:24-25 are almost never used today in defense of the teaching. For the most part they have been given up. Inevitably, in time, the rest must also be relinquished. The science of hermeneutics guarantees this.

WHAT ARE BIBLICALLY VALID METHODS OF PROPHETIC INTERPRETATION?

With John Calvin, scientific exegesis of Scripture began, but only in the early nineteenth century did such exegesis become common. Since that time there has been agreement among Jews, Catholics, Protestants, and unbelievers as to the principal methods. These methods or principles are not esoteric but springing from common sense as pertaining to the understanding of all literature taking into account time and place factors as well as linguistic and stylistic matters. Moses Stuart in his preface to his commentary on Revelation gave an admirable summary over a century ago as he spoke of his manner of interpreting apocalyptic or other biblical literature:

I take it for granted, that the writer had a present and immediate object in view, when he wrote the book; and of course I must regard him as having spoken intelligibly to those whom he addressed. In order to find out his meaning, I have endeavoured to resort, as I would in all other cases, to the idiom; to the times in which the author lived; to the events then passing or speedily about to take place; to the circumstances in which he and his readers were placed, and which called forth his work; to the adaptation of the book to these circumstances; and (in a word) to all that is local and belongs to the times in which it was written, whether it be peculiarities in the mode of expression, thought, reasoning, or feeling, or anything else which would influence an author's style or manner of arranging his composition. My aim has been to abide by this method of interpretation, throughout the work. At the same time I have never forgotten, that the author is virtually a poet and also a prophet; for my belief is, that he is truly both, and therefore I have aimed never to lose sight of either character.¹¹

We have no intention of occupying space and time in this presentation by documenting the obvious. Our own Adventist works such as Problems in Bible Translation, A Symposium of Biblical Hermeneutics (and its accompanying Handbook) have echoed the well-accepted principles set forth by such scholars as Ramm, Terry, and Berkhof. We will but briefly summarize the principles, but first note the salutary warning of Ramm:

. . . everything essential to salvation and Christian living is clearly revealed in Scripture. Essential truth is not tucked away amongst incidental remarks, nor is it contained in passages whose meanings are yet sealed mysteries.

The real doctrinal meat of the Bible is those passages where doctrine is dealt with extensively. For example, the Deity of Christ is explained at some length in John 5; the doctrine of sin in Romans 1-3; the resurrection in 1 Cor. 15; the relationship of law and grace in Galatians. In an extensive discussion of a doctrine we can get our bearings and determine our meanings.

When we use verses as pegs to hang doctrinal beliefs upon we violate this principle. Baptismal regeneration may not be taught in John 3:5 simply because the word "water" occurs.¹²

The historic Protestant method of exegesis according to Ramm and others is literal, cultural, and critical. That is to say, such exegesis takes into account the "basic, customary, social designation" of each word of the text. Such a designation is apparent only when the "total ways, methods, manners, tools, and institutions with which a given people. . . . carry on their existence" is known. By "critical" is meant not "sceptical" but "explicit." That is to say a "critical" interpretation is supported and made evident by obvious lexical, historical, contextual support. Thus we are protected from arbitrary, dogmatic, or speculative views. Says Ramm:

The standing protest of Protestantism to Catholicism is that Catholicism may dogmatically define the meaning of a text or the meaning of a doctrine, and the justification is the claim of the Church to be an infallible teacher. Can the Scriptures mean one thing when interpreted by adequate criteria of justification and

another when made the subject of official interpretation? Is the case so completely closed that forever and ever water in John 3:5 means baptism? Strict Protestant interpretation will never build upon that which is not capable of justification by acceptable canons.¹³

The acknowledged hermeneutical principles used by evangelical Protestant scholars (and here summarized from Ramm), usually include the following:

1. The priority of the original languages.
2. The principle of the accommodation of revelation, i.e. anthropomorphic character.
3. The principle of progressive revelation (see Carnell's chapter on this in his Case for Orthodox Theology). E.g. the Trinity is not clearly taught in the Old Testament and neither is monogamy or the evil of slavery. Nor is total abstinence from alcohol to be found anywhere in Scripture, though believed in by this writer and most of his readers.
4. The principle of historical propriety. Maas: "The true sense of the Bible cannot be found in an idea or thought historically untrue."
5. The principle of ignorance. Admit some passages are not clear enough to justify dogmatism of interpretation.
6. The principle of differentiating interpretation from application--"interpretation is one; application is many".
7. The checking principle. Check our exegetical conclusions by every other cross-checking help available--e.g. the conclusions of others on the same passage.

Ramm quotes Spurgeon:

"you are not such wiseacres as to think or say that you can expound Scripture without assistance from the works of divines and learned men, who have labored before you in the field of exposition. . . It seems odd, that certain men who talk so much of what the Holy Spirit reveals to themselves, should think so little of what he has revealed to others."¹⁴

8. The principle of induction. Has our conclusion grown out of the text or been injected into it by us?
9. The principle of preference for the clearest interpretation "Occam's Razor" affirms the same in philosophy.
10. The principle of the unity of the sense of Scripture. This, says Ramm, denies neither typology nor multiple fulfillment in predictive prophecy but warns us against in any way denying the original meaning of a passage.
11. The principle of the analogy of faith. Obscure Scriptures find their key often in other Scriptures for the Bible is a harmonious system of truth.

Ramm adds to these fundamental principles such specifics as lexical evidence and grammatical interpretation, defining of literary forms, reading within literary and historical contexts, use of cross-references, and interpreting figurative language. We would add that the sensus plenior of Scripture should also be included but ever remembering that its very name implies consistency with all the foregoing principles. Those wanting a shorthand summary of exegetical principles should remember the key words of all true exegesis: lexical, grammatical, contextual, historical, according to the analogy of faith. In summary of hermeneutical principles we should also affirm our belief that Adventism is correct in affirming along with modern conservative evangelical scholars "that there exists a basic continuity between prophetic and

apocalyptic eschatology and that henceforth essentially the same hermeneutical principles must be applied to both phases of eschatology."¹⁵

To indicate briefly the relevance of Ramm's principles we wish to indicate the pertinent results of applying them to the problem of the traditional Adventist interpretation of Daniel 8:14. This treatment will be illustrative only, not exhaustive.

1. The priority of the original language. Nitzdaq (Daniel 8:14) just does not have any immediate linguistic connection with Leviticus 16. It is a perfectly appropriate apocalyptic term for vindication but has no direct bearing on ritual procedures such as cleansing on the Day of Atonement.
2. The principle of historical propriety. There is no evidence in either the Old or the New Testaments that a prolonged investigative judgment was believed in or taught, by either Jew or Christian.
3. The checking principle leads us to parallel the symbolic climax of Daniel 8 with the climaxes of the other chain prophecies of Daniel such as 2:44,45; 7:27; 12:1-3. This would indicate that all of these climaxes, including Daniel 8:14, point to the ushering in of the Kingdom of God.
4. The principle of induction. All of those Adventist scholars asked by the questionnaire of 1960's put out at F. D. Nichol's suggestion agreed that the idea of investigative judgment was not to be found in the literary or historical context of Daniel 8:14. It may be wrongly read into the passage, but it certainly cannot be legitimately deduced from it.
9. The principle of preference for the clearest interpretation. The context of 8:14 makes it clear that the promise is that

of judgment upon unbelievers ("the little horn") and the rectification of evil in order that God's kingdom might reign supreme and his people be freed from oppression.

10. The principles of historical and literary context lead us to acknowledge that there is nothing either in the verses surrounding 8:14 or the events of Daniel's day to suggest the propriety of the investigative judgment as the meaning of the promise given to Daniel in response to the question of 8:13. The traditional Adventist interpretation ignores the question itself (for example it is not even quoted in Great Controversy) as well as the historical circumstances surrounding the prophet and his people--circumstances calling for deliverance and restoration and vindication--not investigation.

The situation with Daniel 9:24-27 as a support for arriving at the date 1844 is similarly lamentable when tested by the normal rules of exegesis. There is, for example, no clear linguistic evidence that chathak means "cut off from." Scholars find the root to be cut--and it can be understood as cut out, cut up or cut off.¹⁶ Only cut is certain and the fact is that its normal meaning in Jewish usage was "decree" or "divide" or "determine." Secondly, there is no scriptural or historical evidence that the decree of 9:25 has anything to do with the punctiliar point of 457 B.C.¹⁷ It is impossible to prove that the Artaxerxes of Ezra 7 is Artaxerxes the first.¹⁸ In fact the majority of recent scholars reject that identification. Nothing in Scripture itself is definitive as to which of the three Artaxerxes of history is intended in Ezra 7. Furthermore, his decree, according to Ezra 6:14, was a temple decree, and the evidence of the wording in Ezra 7 about the beautifying of the house of God supports this. It is quite clear from Scripture's records of the decades prior to 457 B.C. that the city had already been partly restored by the returning exiles. The devastation mentioned in Nehemiah 1 was almost certainly a recent one, not that of over 100 years before. See

Beegle's discussion in Prophecy and Prediction, chapter nine, for its detailed criticism of traditional SDA positions on Daniel 8 and 9.¹⁹

Calvin, centuries ago, showed exegetical acumen when he pointed out the historical, literary, and chronological junction between the decree of Cyrus in answer to Daniel's prayer which led to the restoration foretold in 9:25 and the decree promised in that verse. Calvin recognized that the only king spoken of in Scripture as restoring Jerusalem was Cyrus (see Is 44:28; 45:13). He further recognized the use of round numbers by Scripture and the symbolic nature of the number seven. But the worst blemish in the traditional Adventist exegesis remains to be named.

We have usually claimed that the shabuim of 9:24 means weeks of days. This is certainly not correct. Lexicographer after lexicographer, scholar after scholar (including our own Dr. G. Hasel) has pointed out that the word simply means a heptad of something and not necessarily a heptad of days.²⁰ Thus there is no year-day principle to be found either here or in 8:14. [The SDABC of 1955 claimed Daniel 9:24 as evidence for the year-day principle but the revised edition of 1977 revokes the claim and denies it.] The latter passage of course does not even mention days but refers to the tamid round of evening and morning in harmony with the context of 8:13.

The writer does believe that Daniel 8:14 points to the antitypical Day of Atonement--namely the ushering in of the Kingdom of God. Evidence for this is found in the third chapter of the Glacier View manuscript. But such an interpretation has nothing to do with the peculiar teaching of an attenuated pre-advent judgment--something unknown to any writer of Scripture and to Christendom in general. When the principles listed in this paper are applied also to the sole New Testament chapter which discusses (1) the significance of the two apartments of the sanctuary (first apartment symbolic of Jewish age and the second of Christian age Heb 9:6-10); (2) the actual cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary (by the sacrifice of

the cross, Heb 9:23-26); (3) the antitypical Day of Atonement (the whole Christian age but particularly the cross event, Heb 9:8,12,25); then our case against the investigative judgment is confirmed as fully as any doctrinal issue could hope to be. We await with interest any presentation of the traditional belief which endeavors to take seriously the acknowledged hermeneutical principles cherished by evangelical Christians and others.

We have dealt briefly with conditionality on page 3. Representative Adventist writers such as E. G. White have always acknowledged that prophecy, including apocalyptic prophecy, is conditional. Hans Larondelle has rightly affirmed that the doom foretold by Daniel 9:26-27 fell because the Jewish nation refused to repent.²¹

COULD THE SECOND ADVENT HAVE TAKEN PLACE IN THE FIRST CENTURY?

The preceding principles applied to the following verses answer this question in the affirmative (Mt 24:34; 19:23; 16:28; Jn 21:23; Acts 3:19, 20; Rom 13:11,12; 1 Cor 7:29-31; 10:11; Heb 1:1; 9:26; 10:37; 1 Pe 4:7; 1 Jn 2:18; Jas 5:1-3,8,9; Rev 1:1,3). Let it be observed that there are more than a dozen recorded instances of Christ's use of "this generation" and it always means his contemporaries. The world-wide proclamation of the gospel was the condition not fulfilled by the early church. See the Glacier View Manuscript chapter three for an extended treatment of this matter and also Crisis! volume one.

We believe Oscar Cullmann to be correct when he says that "The missionary work of the Church is the eschatological foretaste of the kingdom of God, and the Biblical hope of the 'end' constitutes the keenest incentive to action." "The Holy Spirit, and the World-Mission: these are the 'signs' of the final phase...." "...the end will not come until the gospel has been preached to all nations." "...the coming of the Kingdom does not depend upon the success of this 'preaching' but upon the fact of the proclamation itself." "...a great deal could be said for the

view...by Calvin, according to which 'the withholding thing' in 2 Th 2:6 is the eschatological missionary message."²² Classical commentaries on the Pauline corpus and the Apocalypse usually point out that both writers expected the end in their day.

Nowhere does the New Testament suggest the necessity of many centuries of delay before the return of our Lord. The symbols of the growth of the kingdom are a rapidly growing mustard herb and the working of yeast not the slow maturing of an oak (see Mt 13:31-33). Thus to suggest that Daniel 8:14 involved the necessity of a Christian age almost 2,000 years in length contradicts everything else on the subject revealed in both Testaments. Parallel to this chronological misunderstanding is the view that can read Revelation 14:7 in a first century document describing what was then happening and project its fulfillment to the nineteenth century and simultaneously wrench its application from the wicked (Babylon: "in one hour is thy judgment come" Rev 18:10) and apply it to the saints. The essence of apocalyptic is now recognized to be the promise of a soon coming judgment upon evil that the saints and God himself might be vindicated. The author of the Bible's closing apocalypse only ever uses "judgment" in connection with the lost--never the saints, and he is promising the denouement to his own contemporaries (see 1:3; 22:20; etc) did Jesus himself (Mk 9:1; Lu 21:28,31,32,34,36).

Had William Miller understood hermeneutics as set forth by such contemporaries as Moses Stuart he could never have used as evidence the following "proofs" for 1844. Even F. D. Nichol admits that the terms "far-fetched" and "fanciful" apply to a number of them. Here is Nichol's summary, and with it we close our study of hermeneutics by this example of what happens when the true principles are ignored. Seventh-day Adventism, of course, has already repudiated most of these arguments.

1. Miller understood the "seven times" of punishment upon the Jews, threatened in Leviticus 26:21, as describing a prophetic period of 2,520 years, beginning in 677 B.C., and thus ending in

A.D. 1843. By the same method of reasoning, and taking the same starting date, Miller used the text in Deuteronomy 15:1,2, regarding the "seven years," at the end of which release should come to all in bondage. The people of God were to be delivered from their bondage in 1843. Parallel to this, in his mind, was the passage in Ezekiel 39:9,10.

2. God was six days in creating the earth and then rested the seventh day. This, Miller believed, prefigured Christ's work in laboring six figurative days in creating a new heavens and earth and finally resting on the seventh day, when the millennium begins. These figurative days, not to be confused with the "days" of prophetic periods, he declared, were a thousand years taking 2 Peter 3:8 as his proof....

3. The Jewish year of jubilee came every fifty years, when liberty was to be proclaimed throughout the land. Miller reasoned that seven jubilees would bring a complete or perfect Sabbath. Now, viewed in prophetic values for time, this would mean 2,450 years. He began his reckoning of this period from 607 B.C., "when the Jews ceased the keeping of the Sabbaths and jubilees, at the close of Josiah's reign." Hence the period would end in 1843.

4. He took the statement in Hosea 6:1-3, "after two days will He revive us; in the third day he will raise us up, and we shall live in His sight"; gave a figurative value of a thousand years to a day; and saw in the two days a two-thousand-year period of distress for God's children beginning in 158 B.C. and ending in 1842. Thus 1843 would be "the first year in the 3d thousand years, or 3d day of the Lord." Miller was led into this fanciful reasoning because of the widely accepted fallacy resident in the creation-millennium analogy discussed under No. 2.

5. He took the statement in Daniel 12:6,7, regarding "a time, times, and a half," which according to widely accepted prophetic views ended in 1798, and observed that the context of the prophecy dealt with events right down to the resurrection. He believed therefore that the final work of scattering "the power of the holy people" called for a certain extension of time, or sufficient to reach to 1843.

6. He took the statement in Daniel 12:11-13 regarding the 1,335 days of prophetic time, and starting in A.D. 508, "from the taking away of pagan Rome," again reached the 1843 date.

7. He took the statement of Christ in Luke 13:32. "Behold, I cast out devils, and I do cures today and tomorrow, and the third day I shall be perfected"; made the days analogous to the days in Hosea; and hence reached the same conclusion.

8. He interlocked the prophecies of the fifth and sixth trumpets in Revelation 9, ending the time of the sixth trumpet in 1840, after which the seventh trumpet, the final one, sounds. He did not make this so specific as some other lines of reasoning, but prefaced his statement with the general declaration, "The trumpets are also a revelation of time."

9. He took the statement in Revelation 11:3 regarding the two witnesses prophesying 1260 days, and terminated this period in 1798. He then tied this with the statement in verses 14 and 15 of the same chapter, which led him to conclude that the end should be expected not long after 1798.

10. He took the statement in Revelation 12:6, 14, where again the prophetic period of 1260 days is mentioned. Consistently with his other lines of evidence he ended this period in A.D. 1798, and then declared that "this also harmonizes with the witnesses, and the trumpets," comparing Revelation 11:15 with chapter 12, verse 10.

11. He took the statement in Revelation 13:5, where the same 1260-day prophecy is presented under the phrase "forty and two months." He ended this period, of course, in 1798. Then he noted what he believed was a certain relationship between that period and the 1335-day prophecy, which he carries down to 1843.

12. He took the statement in Revelation 13:18, which states that "the number of the beast" is 666. He understood this to mean 666 years. "This text shows the number of years that Rome would exist under the blasphemous head of paganism, after it was connected with the people of God by league, beginning B.D. 158, add 666 years, will bring us to A.D. 508, when the daily was taken away. Then add Daniel 12:12, the 1,335 to 508, makes the year 1843.²³

He who reads Miller today cannot but be impressed that this godly man in many ways was as removed from hermeneutics as now understood as the north pole from the south. Moses Stuart saw this in the nineteenth century. Could it be that our own partiality for our tradition has long hindered us from recognizing what Stuart so clearly discerned?

Can we in good conscience ignore the treasures of insight the last century and a half have brought in such areas as the nature of apocalyptic and the methods of correct exegesis? To read Hiram Edson, Crosier, Uriah Smith today is like entering a time machine and retreating to a very distant and (as regards hermeneutics) a very barbarous time. If the church fails to acknowledge these facts which are clearly seen by non-Adventist scholarly observers, is there any hope for her in the twenty first century? Can she be said to be following Him who is not only the Way and the Life but also the Truth? Should we not give more than lip service to the fact that "the truth and the glory of God are inseparable"? ²⁴

REFERENCES

1. John Bright, The Kingdom of God (Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1952), p. 18.
2. H. H. Rowley, The Unity of the Bible (London: 1953), pp. 99-100.
3. Ibid., p. 110.
4. The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary, Volume 4 (Washington, D.C., Review and Herald, 1955), pp. 29-34.
5. The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia, Volume 4 (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. Eerdmans, 1949), p. 2461.
6. In Spectrum, Richard W. Coffen, "John's Apocalypse: Some Second Thoughts on Interpretation," VIII=1: pp. 27-31, 1976.
7. E. G. White, The Desire of Ages (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1940), p. 577; E. G. White, The Great Controversy (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1950), p. 19; E. G. White, Prophets and Kings (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1943), p. 46. These statements are based on Christ's words in Lk 19:42-44 and through Jeremiah 7:7,25.
8. Problems in Bible Translation, published by the committee on Problems in Bible translation appointed by the General Conference Committee of the Seventh-day Adventist Church (Washington D.C.: Review and Herald), pp. 84-93.
9. E. G. White, The Spirit of Prophecy, Volume 4 (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1884).
10. White, Controversy, p. 598.
11. Moses Stuart, The Apocalypse (Edinburgh, Scotland: MacLachlin, 1867), p. vi.
12. Bernard Ramm, Protestant Biblical Interpretation (Boston, MA: 1956), pp. 122-124.
13. Ibid., p. 102.
14. Ibid., p. 119
15. Hans Larondelle, "Interpretation Principles of Prophetic and Apocalyptic Eschatology," p.27. Xeroxed article distributed to SDA extension schools following the U.S.A. symposiums on hermeneutics.
16. Both one of the first instances of scientific exegesis and one of the last agree on this. Moses Stuart wrote regarding chathak "The literal meaning is to cut, but it does not necessarily involve the adjunct idea to cut off." See also the Anchor Bible on Daniel 9:24.
17. After quoting Ezra 7 Hengstenberg writes: "In this description of Ezra, the whole extent of his royal authority is contained. It refers solely and exclusively to the sphere of religious worship, and it is with great truth that Schultz has said: 'the hands of Ezra the priest were only loosed in matters connected with the temple; in every other respect they were still firmly bound.'" Christology of the Old Testament, (Virginia: Macdonald, 1854), p. 885. This dictum has been echoed by most subsequent conservative commentators on Daniel including Young, Leupold, Walvoord, etc.

18. The vast majority of modern O.T. scholars acknowledge this. See the new Peake, ICC, The Century Bible, The Anchor Bible, etc.

19. We add as an appendix Beegle's critique.

20. See the marginal reference to Dan 9:24 in NASB: units of seven. Even the renowned historicist Elliott had the following to say on this matter:

I do not rest in this argument on the parallel of Daniel's celebrated prophecy of the seventy weeks; although to an English reader it would appear the case of a prophecy expressed in terms of weeks of seven days each, which yet in the fulfilment have proved confessedly to be weeks each of seven years:--and for this reason, because the Hebrew word *shabua* rendered a week, has been shewn to be a word etymologically of ambiguous meaning, signifying any septenary, and applicable to seven years as well as seven days.--Nor indeed is this a case of symbolic prophecy; and consequently on that account too not a parallel one with those we have been discussing.

Dr. M'Caul in his learned Pamphlet against the Morning Watch has stated,--1st, that in ninety out of ninety-four cases in which the Old Testament uses the word *shabua*, as we do a week, in the sense of seven days, there are added the explanatory and additional words "of days;" so that there remain only four examples in which the word used by itself has this meaning:--2ndly, that in one of these four,--that which occurs in Gen. xxix. 27, 28, "Fulfill her week, and we will give thee this also for the service which thou shalt serve with me yet seven other years, and Jacob did so, and fulfilled her week,"--the meaning is not undisputed; Josephus and some other ancient interpreters having understood the week (Dr. M'Caul thinks improperly) of the second septenary of years of Jacob's service. Further, he observes, that though the *shabua* is not actually used by itself in the Old Testament for weeks of years, yet the notice of sabbaths of years in Levit. xxv. 8. ("Thou shalt number seven sabbaths of years unto thee, seven times seven years,") implies weeks or septenaries of years to have been familiar to the Jews.--Mr. Maitland had previously stated that in the Mishna (which however was not compiled til the 2nd Century of the Christian aera) *shabua* was used by itself for weeks of years, as well as of days.--So that on the whole the phrase seventy *shabuas* might probably have fallen on Jewish ears, in Daniel's prophecy, with the ambiguity that "seventy septenaries," would to ours, rather than with the definite sense of seventy weeks.--Its ambiguity is recognized by Chrysostom.

E. B. Elliott, Horae Apocalypticae, Volume 4 (London: Seeleys, 1847), pp. 229-230.

Dr. William Shea's oral contention to the contrary finds no support from the testimony of Hebraists. See any classical commentary on Daniel as well as all Hebrew lexicons. Particularly note the discussion in the third chapter of the Glacier View Manuscript.

21. Larondelle, "Interpretation," p. 29.
22. Oscar Cullman, "Eschatology and Missions in the New Testament" in The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology, edited by C. K. Barrett (Cambridge, MA: 1956), pp. 409-421.
See also the Glacier View manuscript. Printed volume is entitled Daniel 8:14, The Day of Atonement, and the Investigative Judgment.
See pp. 178-188.
23. F. D. Nichol, The Midnight Cry (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1944), pp. 522-524.
24. White, Controversy, p. 597.

APPENDIX I
MINORITY REPORT
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON DANIEL

4-19-66

Some members of the Committee on Daniel believe that a minority report will provide a useful perspective for evaluating the work of the committee thus far, and constructive suggestions for the future. This minority report is submitted with sincere appreciation for the good spirit in which the work of the committee has been conducted, and for the able leadership provided by the chairman.

The work of the committee centered on problems arising out of the Seventh-day Adventist interpretation of Daniel 8:14. Members of the committee agree that the Adventist application of Daniel 8:14 to 1844, to a sanctuary in heaven, to its cleansing on the antitypical day of atonement, and to the investigative judgment is valid. However, they were not able to reach agreement on the best method of defending and presenting the Adventist application of the prophecy.

The Committee on Daniel came into being in the wake of a survey conducted in 1958 in which thirty of the leading Bible teachers and editors of the denomination (including all such teachers in the Seminary, and the heads of Bible and biblical language departments in all of our colleges and the two universities) expressed the opinion that our present method of dealing with the problem is inadequate, and that a stronger and more convincing presentation of the Adventist position is necessary in order to meet both questions arising in the minds of our own members, and criticisms of the Adventist interpretation by biblically literate non-Adventists. The minority entered upon the work of the committee with the expectation that it would face up to these problems and look for a sound and adequate solution to them, in the belief that unless this was done the committee would forfeit the respect of the many teachers, students, and members who are earnestly looking for a solution to these

problems, and in the fear that failure to do so would have the effect of disappointing them and weakening their faith in the validity of the Advent message. However, the committee has not come to grips with the most crucial of these problems, and scarcely seems to be aware of them. Several members of the committee have specifically suggested that these problems be dismissed, and have proposed that the committee content itself with a statement that would reassure our members, but without touching on these problems or offering a solution to them.

The minority offered an approach to Daniel that takes all of the problems into consideration and that proposes a method of dealing with them. This method: (1) follows accepted principles of exegesis, (2) accords fully with both the Bible and the Spirit of prophecy, (3) results in the historic Adventist explanation of the points in question, (4) leaves no unanswered questions about the interpretation of Daniel, and (5) defends the Adventist position on a basis that even biblically literate non-Adventists will recognize as consistent within itself and with generally accepted Protestant principles of interpretation. The minority suggested that committee members who did not see light in the method outlined, propose another that would deal adequately with the facts and that would provide a more satisfactory solution to the problems, but no other system of interpretation has been presented to the committee. For practical purposes the problem stands exactly where it was four years ago.

The majority were of the opinion that the Adventist interpretation of Daniel can be drawn from, and based directly on, the book of Daniel itself. The minority were of the opinion that the attempt to do this is responsible for the problems we now face in our interpretation of Daniel--problems for which as yet we as a denomination have no adequate answer. In the opinion of the minority, the only valid and tenable solution is to accept the reinterpretation of Daniel provided by Christ and the various New Testament writers, and later by Ellen G. White, which provide us with an inspired application of Daniel's message to our time. At the same time, the minority stressed the importance of listening intently

to what the Bible writers including Daniel, guided by the Holy Spirit, are trying to tell us, as the first step in whatever pattern of interpretation is followed. The method proposed by the minority is that followed in the Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary, in the 1963 missionary book of the year, and in the Sabbath School lessons on Daniel scheduled for the first quarter of 1967.

The minority believes the experience of this committee over the past four years demonstrates that it is unrealistic to expect men who are fully occupied at other tasks, to devote sufficient time to work of this kind in order to provide the denomination with the help it needs in finding a clarification of the theological problems that now confront it. The unresolved problems in our interpretation of the book of Daniel and other prophecies, and certain other major theological problems that call for careful study, suggest the desirability of establishing a Seventh-day Adventist Institute of Biblical Studies along the lines of the Geo Science Institute, with a staff of at least two men competent in biblical studies, under the direction of the General Conference. This institute would be assigned the task of coordinating the best efforts of the denomination in a long-range endeavor to find better and more effective ways of presenting our message to the world.

APPENDIX II
DEWEY BEAGLE, PROPHECY AND PREDICTION,
CHAPTER 9, "THE VISIONS OF DANIEL"

111

The Vision from Gabriel

Then Gabriel gave Daniel the vision in 9:24-27. This unit is one of the most thoroughly debated passages in the Bible. The late J. A. Montgomery declared, "The history of the exegesis of the 70 weeks is the Dismal Swamp of OT criticism" (*A Commentary on Daniel*, p. 400). So much has been written on the subject and there are so many different points of view, we will get swamped as well unless we stay with the main issues.

There are two basic groups of interpreters and each group has its specific way of translating the passage. The translation which most conservatives appeal to is represented by the *New American Standard Bible* (NASB), while liberal scholars have general agreement with the *Revised Standard Version* (RSV). In order to get an overall impression of the passage and to make possible easy comparison of the two versions we will put them in parallel columns:

RSV

24 Seventy weeks of years are decreed concerning your people and your holy city, to finish the transgression, to put an end to sin, and to atone for iniquity, to bring in everlasting righteousness, to seal both vision and prophet, and to anoint a most holy place.

25 Know therefore and understand that from the going forth of the word to restore and build Jerusalem to the coming of an anointed one, a prince, there shall be seven weeks. Then for sixty-two weeks it shall be built again with squares and moat, but in a troubled time.

26 And after the sixty-two weeks, an anointed one shall be cut off, and shall have nothing; and the people of the prince who is to come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary. Its end shall come with a flood and

NASB

24 Seventy weeks (units of seven) have been decreed for your people and your holy city, to finish the transgression, to make an end of sin, to make atonement for iniquity, to bring in everlasting righteousness, to seal up vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most holy place.

25 So you are to know and discern *that* from the issuing of a decree to restore and rebuild Jerusalem until Messiah the Prince, *there will be* seven weeks and sixty-two weeks; it will be built again, with plaza and moat, even in times of distress.

26 Then after the sixty-two weeks the Messiah will be cut off and have nothing, and the people of the prince who is to come will destroy the city and the sanctuary. And its end *will come* with a flood; even to the end

to the end there shall be war; desolations are decreed.

27 And he shall make a strong covenant with many for one week; and for half of the week he shall cause sacrifice and offering to cease; and upon the wing of abominations shall come one who makes desolate, until the decreed end is poured out on the desolator.

there will be war; desolations are determined.

27 And he will make a firm covenant with the many for one week, but in the middle of the week he will put a stop to sacrifice and grain offering; and on the wing of abominations *will come* one who makes desolate, even until a complete destruction, one that is decreed, is poured out on the one who makes desolate.

Translation Problems

The first problem is the translation "weeks of years" in the RSV. Some scholars object because the literal Hebrew word is a "heptad, unit of seven" as in NASB. They prefer to interpret the periods of weeks in a symbolic way and not get tied down to specific years. Most scholars accept the meaning "weeks of years" and so multiplying 70 x 7 we get 490 years as the period of the vision.

While both translations mention periods of 7, 62, and 1 weeks, the NASB combines 7 and 62, thus forming a 69-week period, at the end of which Messiah the Prince would come. This translation is based on a Greek translation which was pre-Christian, but not the old Septuagint translation. Apparently someone after the Maccabean period combined the two periods to give more time for a priestly Messiah to appear for the 70th week.

The RSV translation, on the other hand, is based on the punctuation of the present Hebrew text. Here "an anointed one, a prince" comes at the end of 49 years. He is a different person from the "anointed one" who is "cut off" at the end of the 62-week period. The conservatives are clearly fudging when in 9:26 they translate "the Messiah" because the Hebrew has no definite article. The RSV is correct in rendering "an anointed one." But the conservatives reject the punctuation of the Hebrew text because the marks were added by Jewish scholars after A.D. 700. They reason that since the Jews did not accept Jesus as their Messiah, their interpretation of the passage cannot be trusted.

All the arguments for the 7 + 62 combination are strained. The Hebrew had the word for "nine" and had the writer intended to indicate a 69-heptad period he would have done so directly. Moreover, since most of the conservatives who follow the combined translation interpret the building of Jerusalem to be completed within the 49-year period, then nothing happens during the 62 weeks! *If it were not for the fact that the conservatives need the 69 weeks to come down to Jesus, they would be arguing against it too.*

The Most Natural Interpretation

The simplest and most natural interpretation is to take the Hebrew text as we have it. The 62-week period of 434 years is a problem, however, because so little is said about this longest period. It is quite clear that this middle section did not figure prominently in the original vision. It is the first and third periods which are crucial, therefore our interpretation should focus on the 7 weeks and the 1 week. If these fit historical situations accurately then it is hardly possible that the period in between would be exactly 434 years.

An Anointed One, A Prince

But before we can begin measuring off the periods we must determine where to begin. The plain fact is that *in our Bible there is no explicit decree or order from God or man* "to restore and build Jerusalem." It is a general statement from Gabriel and so the next best thing is to identify the "anointed one" who was a prince.

The Hebrew word translated "prince" is *nagid* and it is used in the sense of "military leader" to describe Saul (1 Sam. 9:16; 10:1) and David (1 Sam. 25:30; 2 Sam. 5:2). Is. 45:1 refers to Cyrus as Yahweh's "anointed one." Since he was a *nagid* and had such a crucial role in making it possible for the Jews to return to Palestine, he is certainly a fitting candidate for the role. He conquered Babylon in 539 B.C., but he came to the rescue of the Jews with his decree in 538. Figuring back 49 years we come to 587.

The latest evidence indicates that Jerusalem was destroyed in the summer of 586, therefore the interval was only 48 years. But with the two systems of reckoning a king's reign differing only by one year, Daniel's data may have indicated a 49-year period. In either case, it

was considered a 7-week unit. Evidently it was reasoned that the minute the city was flattened God issued orders in his heavenly council for its restoration.

A more attractive alternative to Cyrus is the legitimate Zadokite high priest Joshua (Jeshua) who came to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel. This is the view of F. F. Bruce (*Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts*, p. 61). We have noted that they probably came up after the original group of exiles led by Sheshbazzar, but the way the Hebrew text reads would have led most Jewish readers in the Maccabean period to think that Joshua left Babylon in 538. Since the Hebrew word *nagid* was used also of the priest who had charge of the temple (Jer. 20:1), it applies equally well to Joshua.

An Anointed One Cut Off

The next identification to determine is the "anointed one" cut off at the end of the 62-week period. The obvious figure is the Zadokite high priest Onias III, who was slain in 171 B.C. by the order of Menelaus, the wicked priest appointed by Antiochus. This makes a 367-year period, 67 years short of the ideal 434, but as noted above, there is no reason to expect the middle period to measure out exactly. Bruce comments similarly: "That the actual count of years from 538 B.C. to 171 B.C. (the date of the murder of Onias) is considerably less than 434 (or 62 heptads) is not of great importance when we are dealing with schematic numbers" (*Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts*, p. 61). With this interpretation the 62-week period is bracketed by the first and the last of the legitimate high priests after the exile. In other words, Gabriel's vision is involved with priestly Messiahs, not Davidic or kingly ones such as Jesus was claimed to be.

The Prince

The prince who started the 70th week of the vision was Antiochus. He ravaged the city of Jerusalem and the temple, and made war against the saints of the Most High. He made a covenant for a week with the Hellenistic Jews, but they were not the majority and so the reference in 9:27 to "many" is a difficulty. In any case, the week would figure 171-164 B.C. Then he caused sacrifices to stop for half a week, 168-165. This 3 1/2 years would be equal to "a time, two

times, and half a time" of 7:25, and come to 1,260 or 1,274 days depending on whether the calendar used had 360 or 364 days a year.

The actual length of the desecration was 3 years 10 days, as we have noted, but we could hardly expect any closer projection when dealing with multiples of seven. Furthermore, we must remember that Maccabean Daniel was writing during this last half of the 70th week. The details in 9:27 are so fuzzy, there is no clean termination for the period. The Hebrew text is very difficult to interpret and it is certain that this favorite vision suffered very much at the hands of copyists and editors over the years. Those who apply the vision to Jesus have the same problem because they cannot fit all the details into their scheme either.

What is clear is that the 70th week did not work out as expected and the Messianic kingdom did not come. Therefore, in the Maccabean or Hasmonean period there began a series of deferred hopes and reinterpretations of the last week. *This fact undoubtedly accounts for the Greek translation which is the basis for the Messianic interpretation of most conservatives.* Concerning these postponements Bruce comments:

First this heptad appears to have been identified with the seven years interregnum in the high-priesthood between Alcimus and Jonathan (160-153 B.C.); then the chronology of the post-exilic period was recast so as to make the last heptad begin with the accession of Alexander Jannaeus in 103 B.C.; later still, when Alexander's reign proved to last much longer than seven years, the last heptad seems to have been expanded to cover the whole period of the Hasmonean (and even postHasmonean) high-priesthood" (*Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts*, p. 61).

Symbolic Interpretation

Some of the conservative interpretations of Dan. 9:24-27 will be considered in later chapters, but we should describe a few here in order to get an idea of the variation.

One type thinks in terms of "heptads" and not "weeks of years." Since these units are not assigned exact numerical value, this method is usually designated the "symbolical interpretation." The first period of 7 heptads extends from 538 B.C. to the first coming (advent) of Christ, the "anointed one." The second period of 62 heptads is the time of the visible church here on earth. The last heptad is the time of tribulation,

the last period of history. It begins with the advent of the Antichrist and closes with his defeat and the second advent of Christ.

The symbolical approach is too vague and general to inspire confidence and it results in some crucial differences between interpreters of the same type.

Historical-Symbolical Interpretation

A modified symbolical approach is that of Edward J. Young. He insists on "sevens" instead of "weeks of years" and no numerical values are assigned. On the other hand, he fits his interpretation into a historical framework of the past; therefore his understanding might be called "historical-symbolical interpretation."

His starting point is 538 B.C., the year of Cyrus' decree, even though the instructions were to rebuild the temple, not the city. The 49-year period would end at 489, much earlier than Nehemiah's time (445) when the walls were rebuilt. "True enough," Young admits, "but the burden of proof rests with those who insist that sevens of years are intended. Of this I am not convinced. If the sevens are regarded merely as a symbolical number, the difficulty disappears" (*The Prophecy of Daniel*, p. 206).

Young notes that *after* the 62 sevens, two events are to occur: "Whether or not these two events fall within the 70th seven is not immediately stated. One of them is the death of the Messiah and the other follows as a consequent, the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple by the Roman armies of Titus" (*The Prophecy of Daniel*, p. 220).

Jesus, as the "anointed one," makes a covenant for many and by his death "in the half (middle)" of the 70th seven he causes sacrifices to cease. The "people of the prince" are the Romans who help Titus destroy Jerusalem. This occurred in A.D. 70 and thus did not take place within the 70 sevens.

The basic objection to Young's interpretation is the one common to most conservative scholars: it follows the odd 7 + 62 combination and makes all the references to "an anointed one" apply to Jesus.

Historical-Messianic Interpretation

A recent, clear presentation of the basic traditional view is the article "The Seventy Weeks of Daniel 9:24-27" by Gerhard F. Hasel

(*The Ministry*, May 1976, pp. 5D-21D). He does not think the decree to rebuild Jerusalem should be understood as coming from God, therefore he looks for a royal decree. The decree of Cyrus in 538 B.C. had to do with the temple, not the city, and the same was true of the edict of Darius (Ezra 6:1-12). Hasel thinks the order given Ezra by Artaxerxes I in 457 B.C., the seventh year of his reign, is the proper starting point.

A copy of the official letter is found in Ezra 7:11-26. But there is *not one word* in the letter or the context about building anything. Ezra "the scribe skilled in the law of Moses" (7:6) is authorized to take a group of exiles back to Palestine. He is given money to buy animals for sacrificing in the temple and he is entrusted with the spiritual oversight of the Jews. He will teach those who are ignorant of the ways of God and those who are disobedient will be judged by him.

The Decree of Artaxerxes

Where does Hasel find a basis for his claim? He refers to Ezra 4:7-23 where it is reported to Artaxerxes that the Jews are "finishing the walls and repairing the foundations of Jerusalem" (4:12). Hasel comments:

If this report comes from the time later than the decree of the seventh year of Artaxerxes I, namely a period of uncertain political conditions for the Persian monarch after the Egyptian revolt of 448, then one may safely conclude that the decree issued in 457 B.C. related to the restoration and rebuilding of Jerusalem (*The Ministry*, May 1976, p. 15D).

But one cannot "safely" come to Hasel's conclusion because after Artaxerxes heard the report of rebuilding he said, "Therefore make a decree that these men be made to cease, and that this city be not rebuilt. until a decree is made by me" (Ezra 4:21). Artaxerxes had authorized Ezra to start a religious reform, not rebuild the city, and so he ordered the fortification of the city stopped. If Hasel is right, then Artaxerxes was schizophrenic. There is no evidence that Artaxerxes ever followed through and authorized Ezra to rebuild Jerusalem.

The Broken Walls of Jerusalem

Hasel makes a second try by referring to the report which Nehemiah got about the broken-down walls and burned gates of

Jerusalem (Neh. 1:3). "This implies," he comments, "that the city had been rebuilt, which could hardly have started before 457, because the decrees of both Cyrus and Darius related only to the building of the Temple" (*The Ministry*, May 1976, p. 15D). It implies nothing of the kind, unless you want to believe it.

Attempts to rebuild walls were interpreted by ancient kings as fortification in preparation for revolt and they seldom authorized such activity. The Jews needed walls to protect themselves from raids and harassment by their neighbors. But these enemies were there to check what was going on and so the unofficial attempts to rebuild the walls were stopped before much could be accomplished. The battered walls and burned gates reported to Nehemiah were the rubble left from Nebuchadnezzar's destruction. The returning exiles built the temple and constructed homes in area cleared of debris, but they did little with the wall system.

A third try by Hasel is Ezra's thanks for God's love in granting "some reviving to set up the house of our God, to repair its ruins, and to give us a wall in Judea and Jerusalem" (Ezra 9:9). The whole context is spiritual and has to do with the rebuilding of the temple. There was no wall around Judea; therefore the verse cannot be interpreted in a physical sense. Ezra had brought the law of Moses and taught the people a way of life. That was a "wall of protection" for the Jews of Jerusalem and Judea even though they had no walls for physical security.

Hasel makes a fourth try by quoting from Ezra 6:14 a reference to the "decree of Cyrus, Darius, and Artaxerxes. Then he comments, "Ezra considered the third decree to be the culmination of the three decrees" (*The Ministry*, May 1976, p. 15D). The whole verse is talking about the completion of the temple in March, 515 B.C., *fifty years before Artaxerxes came to the throne*. The appearance of his name is an editorial mistake due to the passage in Ezra 4:7-23, which Hasel himself admits is misplaced. The editor did not know that the account was out of order and so he associated Artaxerxes with the earlier kings Cyrus and Darius. This notation has nothing to do with what Ezra thought.

The 49-Year Period

In other words, Hasel is building his foundation on four broken reeds and instead of supporting his theory they puncture it. Or to put

it another way, if you add four zeroes you get zero. *There is not one bit of solid evidence to show that in 457 B.C. there was a royal decree, or even one from God, ordering the rebuilding of Jerusalem.* Gerhard Hasel has done as thorough a job as possible under the difficult circumstances. This critique of his views should not be taken as an attempt to "hassle" him personally. The examination is really a refutation of all the conservatives who try to start the 490 years in 458 or 457 B.C.

Starting with 457, however, Hasel comes down to 408 for the end of the 7 weeks. But he has to comment, "The paucity of information surrounding the period of about 400 B.C. inevitably precludes any verification of the accuracy of the date of 408 B.C. for the restoration of the city of Jerusalem" (*The Ministry*, May 1976, p. 15D). It is certainly strange that Gabriel picked an unknown period of Jewish history, both in the Bible and Josephus, for the shift from the first to the second period of his vision. Daniel probably did not have any information about the time either. Thus, Hasel is in trouble at the beginning and the end of the 49-year period.

Jesus and Daniel 9:24-27

Nevertheless, Hasel figures down 434 years and arrives at A.D. 27, the year of Jesus' baptism. This event, marking the beginning of his public ministry, was the start of the 70th week of 7 years. In the middle of the week, 3 1/2 years later in A.D. 31, Jesus "put a stop to the sacrifice through the termination of his ministry by his death on the cross" (*The Ministry*, May 1976, p. 16D).

Then Hasel comments: "The last half of the week comes to an end with (1) the death of Stephen (Acts 9:1), (2) the scattering of the Christians from Jerusalem, (3) the carrying of the gospel to the Gentiles, and possibly (4) the conversion of Paul" (*The Ministry*, May 1976, p. 16D). Hasel admits that his theory cannot account for the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 even though he thinks the "prince" mentioned in Dan. 9:27 was Titus.

The historical-Messianic interpretation is, in Hasel's opinion, "the only interpretation that can claim a perfect agreement between the prophecy of Daniel 9:24-27 and history, even to the year. Yet it is possible that this precise correlation between prophecy and history could be a major stumbling block to its acceptance by the modern rationalistic mind" (*The Ministry*, May 1976, p. 16D).

The "major stumbling block" is not the precision. It is the fact that his two pegs at the beginning and ending of the 49-year period are impossible, and therefore the whole computation collapses.

There is an even more compelling reason why the traditional attempt to relate Dan. 9:24-27 to Jesus is misguided: *neither Jesus nor the New Testament writers understood it that way*. If the traditionalists are correct, this vision is one of the most perfect predictions of Jesus in all of Scripture. Yet not one clause or verse of the unit is quoted by Jesus or the NT writers *as support for Christ's ministry and death*. The only reference is Jesus' prediction that there would be another "desolating sacrilege" (Matt. 24:15; Mk. 13:14). In other words, the theory developed after the early church period.

The Predictions of Maccabean Daniel

Before leaving the book of Daniel it is necessary to look at the closing part of the fourth vision. We noted in the last chapter that history broke off at Dan. 11:39. In 11:40-45 Maccabean Daniel predicted that Ptolemy VI, king of Egypt, would foolishly provoke another war with Antiochus. The Syrian king would rout him, conquer Egypt, then extend his campaign west into Libya and down south into Ethiopia. Rumors from the northeast would bring him home, but en route he would meet his death "between the sea and the glorious mountain," that is, on the coastal plain of Palestine, the country he had ravaged. The problem is that none of these things happened.

In 12:1 the scene shifts to an apocalyptic vision in which the most terrible time of persecution comes on the nations. But those whose names are found written in the book will be delivered by Michael, the patron angel of the Jews. Many will be resurrected from the dead, "some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt" (12:2). But "those who are wise shall shine like the brightness of the firmament; and those who turn many to righteousness, like the stars for ever and ever" (12:3). This will be the glorious kingdom of God.

With the completion of the angel's message, Maccabean Daniel is told to "shut up the words, and seal the book, until the time of the end" (12:4). When he inquires how long that would be, he is told "a time, two times, and half a time" (12:7). This is the same period of

time the "little horn" would have the saints in his control (7:25). It appears that Daniel has expanded the persecution of Antiochus into a cosmic picture of tribulation among all the nations. It will last 3 1/2 years, about 1,260 days.

But the reign of Antiochus lasted longer than that. Either Daniel or someone else postponed the hope by revising the figure to 1,290 days (12:11). This addition of 30 days was the one lunar month which would have been added in 3 1/2 years to keep the lunar calendar in phase with the solar calendar. Later still, the time was revised to 1,335 days, an extra 45 days or 1 1/2 months (12:12). We have no clear idea why the writer happened to pick 45 days more.

In any case, the dream had to be postponed further yet, until finally the hope of God's kingdom was picked up by the New Testament.

APPENDIX III
INTERPRETATIVE PILLARS OF THE INVESTIGATIVE JUDGMENT DOCTRINE AND
RELATED MATTERS WHICH CANNOT BE SUBSTANTIATED BY 20TH CENTURY
HERMENEUTICS

"Let all prove their positions from the Scriptures and substantiate every point they claim as truth from the revealed Word of God."

Ellen G. White, Evangelism, p. 256.

1. That sacrificial blood polluted the sanctuary.
2. That the sanctuary was defiled only by confessed sins.
3. That the blood of the sin offerings of the common people went into the sanctuary.
4. "The pattern" shown to Moses was either a picture of the real sanctuary above, or at least a miniature of it.
5. That the blood on the Day of Atonement cleansed a previous blood record from the daily offerings. (This is not to question that it symbolically cleansed the sanctuary and the people.)
6. That when priests partook of the flesh of the offerings they thereby carried a record of sin within themselves, and thereby defiled the sanctuary.
7. That the N.T. teaches that the relationship between the ministries of the heavenly sanctuary and the earthly was essentially one of parallelism rather than also of contrast in key areas.
8. That the N.T. teaches that there is a two-part apartment sanctuary in heaven.
9. That the N.T. teaches any symbol of division (such as a veil) in the heavenly sanctuary.
10. That Christ's priesthood paralleled that of Aaron rather than that of Melchizedek (remembering Christ came of the tribe of Judah not Levi).
11. That the N.T. teaches any equivalent in heaven for the limited

access ministry of the priests in the first apartment.

12. That the judgment of Daniel 7 is an investigation of the sins of God's people.
13. That the justifying of the sanctuary in Dan 8 has reference to the despite done to that sacred place by the sins of God's people.
14. That Hebrews teaches there are two phases to Christ's priesthood in the heavenly sanctuary.
15. That Daniel or Revelation teach there are two phases to Christ's priesthood in the heavenly sanctuary.
16. That anywhere in the Bible teaches there are two phases to Christ's priesthood in the heavenly sanctuary.
17. That the O.T. anywhere teaches that there would be a lengthy period between the two advents.
18. That the N.T. teaches anywhere that there would be a lengthy period between the two advents.
19. That anywhere in Scripture prescribes the year-day principle as a tool for exegeting apocalyptic prophecies.
20. That the atonement of Christ reconciling the race to God and taking away the guilt of sin was not completed at the cross.
21. That there is any difference in Scripture between the forgiveness of sin and the blotting out of sin.
22. That Acts 3:19 is any different to Acts 2:38 in its basic thrust
23. That the blotting out of sins in Acts 3:19 applies to something millenniums later than the forgiveness of sins promised in Acts 2:38.
24. That 1 Pe 4:17 applies to an event millenniums later than the fiery trials testing the church in Peter's day.
25. That 1 Ti 5:24,25 applies to an investigative judgment millenniums after the time Paul wrote these words.
26. That the N.T. anywhere teaches a prolonged investigative judgment prior to the coming of Christ.
27. That the cleansing of the sanctuary referred to in Heb 9:23 had then to do with a future rather than a past event.
28. That the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary referred to in Heb. 9:23

is anything other than the purification of sins spoken of in 1:3 of the same book--namely Christ's death for the sins of the world.

29. That Heb 9:6-12 in applying the meaning of the two apartments applies the first as a type of Christ's heavenly ministry and the second to a ministry yet millenniums in the future.
30. That Heb 9:6-12 is giving any other emphasis than this: that what the first apartment was to the second so the whole earthly sanctuary was to the heavenly and that the first apartment in representing the earthly entirety prefigured the Jewish age of limited access whereas the second apartment represented the Christian era of unlimited access to the presence of God.
31. That Heb 9:6-12 is not affirming that the first apartment symbolized the time of the first covenant and the second the time of the second (new) covenant.
32. That Heb 9:6-12 is not affirming that the daily service of gifts and sacrifices was typical of the era when men did not find spiritual perfection as regards purity of conscience, whereas the cleansing from sin typified by the service of the second apartment pointed to the Christian era wherein "the worshippers once purged should have no more conscience of sins" (10:2).
33. That the emphasis of Heb 9 is not on the work of the high priest in the second apartment as typifying Christ's fulfillment of the Day of Atonement type by the cross-resurrection-ascension event.
34. That the references to the offering of blood in Heb 9 (in the second apartment on the Day of Atonement, 9:7) at the time of the dedication of the first sanctuary and the inauguration of the covenant (9:19) and the sprinkling of the unclean to cleanse them by the red heifer ceremony did not all point to the cross, and similarly vv. 22-25.
35. That Heb 9:23 and its reference to the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary is pointing to 1844 rather than the cross.
36. That "within the veil" means anything other than its typical O.T. use--the most holy place within the second veil.

37. That the term sanctuary as found in 8:2 of necessity means an antitype with two apartments though ta hagia characteristically elsewhere in the same book means only that apartment where the high priest went once a year on the Day of Atonement.
38. That "tabernacle" in Heb 9 means of necessity a structure with two apartments.
39. That the term "the sanctuary" (9:2 A.V.; 9:12,24,25, N.E.B.) means any more than just one apartment--the first or the second.
(9:12 has different greek
40. That "tabernacle" in 9:2, 3, 6, 8; 8:2 necessarily means more than one apartment.
41. That any of the usages of the plural hagia with the article ever means anything other than the most holy place in type or antitype.
42. That Heb 10:19-20 does not mean that the ta hagia lies beyond the second veil.
43. That "the holiest of all" (ta hagia) of Heb 9:8 is not the equivalent of "the second" apartment mentioned in the previous verse.
44. That the supposed parallel between 9:7,12,25 is purely imaginary.
v. 7 into the second the high priest once every year not without blood went (entered).
v. 12 into the ta hagia he (Christ our high priest, v. 11) by his own blood entered.
v. 25 into the ta hagia every year the high priest entered.
45. That though Heb 13:11 is talking of the Day of Atonement and the high priest's offering, ta hagia here does not mean the most holy place.
46. That because hagia is plural it must apply to more than one apartment though the same word is used of the first apartment only in Heb 9:2.
47. That Heb 8:5 teaches that every distinctive feature of the type is matched by the antitype despite such denials as 7:27,28; 7:11-21; 9:10-15,24; 10:11-14.
48. That Christ entered a two-apartment building IN heaven rather than "into heaven itself" (9:24).

49. That there is anything at all in Hebrews which clearly teaches there was yet a special priestly work to be performed subsequent to the cross.
50. That anyone reading Hebrews could come up with the investigative judgment doctrine.
51. That "the going forth of the commandment" in Dan 9:25 does not mean the issuing of the commandment but a time some months later after Ezra's travels had ceased.
52. That "the going forth of the commandment" refers to the decree of Ezra 7 (which speaks of the beautifying of the temple and of religious reforms but not of building the city).
53. That the Artaxerxes of Ezra 7 is necessarily Artaxerxes I.
54. That exegetes through the centuries have been agreed that "the going forth of the commandment" in Dan 9:25 clearly means the commandment of Artaxerxes I.
55. That the word translated "determined" in this context actually means "cut off from" though it is a different word to that later used to mean "cut off" in the same passage.
56. That scholarship is not agreed that the meaning of this word as used in Jewish literature is decreed, determined, or something similar.
57. That it can be proved that each section of the seventy weeks prophecy closed on the Day of Atonement.
58. That it can be proved that Christ died A.D. 31.
59. That it can be proved that Stephen was stoned A.D. 34.
60. That it can be proved that Jerusalem had been rebuilt by 408 B.C.
61. That it can be proved that Christ was baptized in A.D. 27.
62. That the word translated "cleansed" in Dan 8:14 matches the word translated "cleansed" in Lev 16.
63. That the term "judgment" in Revelation or in any of John's writings applies as a threat to true believers or to any process that has true believers at the center.

64. That the chronological structure of the SDA interpretation of Revelation re: 538, 1776, 1780, 1798, 1833, Aug. 11, 1840, and 1844 can be exegetically demonstrated.
65. That "the hour, day, month, and year" of Rev. 9:15 refer to a period of time rather than a point.
66. That the sounding of the seventh angel (11:15) does not apply to the end of the world but to 1844.
67. That the signs in the sun, moon, and stars, and the great earthquake in the Gospels and Revelation and the O.T. prophets do not apply to the end of the world but to events centuries before.
68. That Rev 11 points particularly to the French Revolution.
69. That "when they shall have finished their testimony" really means "when they are near to the time when they shall finish their testimony."
70. That there was ever a banning of the Bible in France for three and a half years.
71. That the "deadly wound" applies to a political event associated with the French general Berthier and the Pope rather than the fulfillment of Gen 3:15.
72. That the climax of the symbols in Dan 8 (v. 14) points to an event long before that indicated by the climax of the parallel prophecies of chs. 2, 7, 9, and 12.
73. That the shut door in the parable in the second advent sermon (Mt 25) does not point to the end of the world but rather to an event in the nineteenth century.
74. That the cry "behold the bridegroom cometh" likewise points to a nineteenth century event.
75. That the shut door of this parable also means an open door beginning a new phase of ministry in heaven.
76. That while E. G. White affirmed that the cleansing of the sanctuary, and the coming of the Son of Man, and the coming of the bridegroom (Mt 25) all apply to the same event--and that the coming of the bridegroom is the end of the world (Christ's Object

Lessons) this should not be understood as meaning that the cleansing of the sanctuary and the coming of the Son of Man (Dan 7) are also fulfilled at the second event.

77. That historicism is recognized by 20th century apocalyptic scholars as the mode of interpreting the prophecies of Daniel and Revelation.
78. That any of the following assumptions related to Dan 8:14 and the investigative judgment can be exegetically sustained:
 - (a) That Dan. 8:4 speaks of 2300 days. (While Dan 12 repeatedly uses the Hebrew word for days, it is not to be found in 8:14. Instead we have the ambiguous "evening-morning" which most apply to the evening and morning burnt offerings. Thus instead of 2300 days, if these exegetes are correct, only 1150 days are in view.)
 - (b) That these 2300 "days" equal 2300 years. (Though it is quite impossible to prove that the year-day principle is a biblical datum, and even if we could, days are not mentioned in either 8:14 or 9:24, so there is no basis to apply the principle in these instances.)
 - (c) That these 2300 years begin centuries before the "little horn" began his attack on the sanctuary. (Though in the context, the 2300 has been understood by many as applying to the length of time the little horn is trampling the sanctuary underfoot and suspending its daily offerings.)
 - (d) That the 2300 years begin at the same time as the seventy weeks (though there is no Scripture to say so). The Hebrew chathak means "cut" or "decree," and there is no way of proving that the cutting off of the 490 from 2300 is intended.
 - (e) That the 2300 days end with the beginning of the antitypical Day of Atonement (though the Day of Atonement revolved around the sacrifice for sin, an event we believe took place about eighteen centuries earlier. The divesting of his glorious robes by the high priest prefigured the incarnation of Christ

which did not take place in 1844. The book of Hebrews clearly applies the Day of Atonement in antitype to Christ's priestly offering of himself on Calvary, though the Christian era is included as we wait for our high priest to come out.)

- (f) That the work symbolized by the second apartment of the sanctuary was not to begin till over 1800 years after the cross (though Heb. 9:8, 12, 24, 25; 10:19, 20; 6:19, 20 says Christ entered "within the veil" at his ascension). The sprinkling of the blood on the mercy seat took place immediately after its shedding.

Most of these points are indispensable for the traditional teaching on the investigative judgment. Many of them are like links in a chain. If one snaps the whole thing is useless. Who amongst SDA scholars is prepared to support such links by grammatico-historical exegesis and present his work through the scholarly journals or presses of our time? Are we in earnest about wishing to convince the world, or are we seeking only to convince ourselves? Can we in good conscience imperil the well-being of other brethren who rightly question what cannot be scripturally sustained? Does not following him who is the Truth call for changes in belief and practice?

J. W. Montgomery, after giving his parable of the man who believed he was dead and refused to be convinced of his living status despite his ability to bleed, warns all of us:

This parable illustrates that if you hold unsound presuppositions with sufficient tenacity, facts will make no difference at all, and you will be able to create a world of your own, totally unrelated to reality and totally incapable of being touched by reality. Such a condition (which the philosophers call solipsistic psychiatrists call autistically psychotic, and lawyers call insane) is tantamount to death because connection with the living world is severed. The man in the parable not only thought he was dead, but in a very

real sense, he was dead because facts no longer meant anything to him. (Cited by C. H. Pinnock, Set Forth Your Case, p. 87.)

We would like to add that more important than any of the preceding is this: it cannot be proved that God's purpose in raising up the SDA church and its gifted messenger E. G. White was to teach the world regarding historical chronological data and heavenly geography. It cannot be proved otherwise than that God's purpose was rather to draw attention to the neglected truths of the advent, the law and sabbath, the nature of man, and the everlasting gospel and that like every genuine Christian movement since the cross some doctrinal errors arising out of human finitude constitute the swaddling clothes surrounding the divinely given baby of truth--swaddling clothes that need to be discarded that the glory of heaven's message and Christ the messenger might now be seen by the needy world.

APPENDIX IV
TYPICAL DOCTRINAL POSITIONS ONCE HELD BY SDAs, BUT NOW REJECTED
BY MOST ADVENTIST SCHOLARS

(The following were coined before the correct use of hermeneutics became understood in Adventism)

1. The "shut door" of Mt 25 pointed to the close of probation for all except Adventists in 1844.
2. The first angel's message ceased in 1844.
3. The second angel's message ceased not long after the first.
4. Christ was a created being, not equal with the Father.
5. The Holy Spirit was a power not a person equal with the Father.
6. Christ possessed a sinful nature at birth like ours.
7. The work done at the cross was not the Atonement.
8. The Daily of Dan 8 was pagan Rome.
9. The last power of Dan 11 was Turkey soon to come to her end.
10. Armageddon pointed to a middle-east conflict rather than a religious struggle.
11. Dan 12:4 pointed to an increase in travel and communication and scientific inventions.
23. "This generation" of Mt 24:34 meant the generation which saw the signs in the heavens.
13. The "heathen" of Joel 3 to be awakened meant the powers of the East such as China and Japan.
14. "Within the veil" meant within the first veil.
15. The year-day principle is explicitly stated in Numbers 14:34 and Eze 4:6.
16. The investigative judgment is concerned only with those who have claimed Christ as savior and had their names written in the Book of Life--not with antichrist or the wicked in general.
17. Rev 9:15 points to Aug. 11, 1840.
18. There are two literal apartments in the heavenly sanctuary.
19. E.G.W. was an original writer not dependent upon uninspired sources.
20. The E.G.W. comments on religious history such as the Reformation

includes details gained from visions.

21. Not the little horn but the sins of the saints defiled the sanctuary.
22. "Cleansed" in Dan 8:14 has to do with cleansing the record of the saints' sins not the defilement of the little horn.
23. Heb 8 & 9 used with Dan 8 and 9 is the basis of our sanctuary teachings.
24. The Father, not Christ, is the judge.
25. Sacrificial blood of sin offerings polluted the sanctuary.
26. The law in Galatians is the ceremonial law only.
27. The term righteousness by faith in the Paulines includes sanctification.
28. The 1335 days began 508 A.D. and finished 1843.
29. The investigative judgment concerns only those whose names have once been entered in the Book of Life.
30. The Sabbath of the fourth commandment should be kept from 6.00 p.m. to 6.00 p.m.

NB Not all SDA ministers or even administrative leaders are aware or agree with all these changes. Some still believe with a former General Conference president that "Seventh-day Adventists have never taken a stand upon Bible exegesis which they have been compelled to surrender." (G.I. Butler, A Circular Letter to All State Conference Committees and Our Brethren in the Ministry, (1888).)

APPENDIX V
TYPICAL HISTORICAL INTERPRETATIONS OF PROPHECY ADOPTED
(NOT ORIGINATED) BY E. G. WHITE IN GREAT CONTROVERSY NO
LONGER SUPPORTED BY MODERN EXEGESIS

All these interpretations were coined prior to the era of scientific exegesis. None of the classic commentaries on Revelation since the 1840's have presented the Apocalypse as a chart of twenty centuries of specific historical events. In general they have insisted that every part of the Revelator's closing book had meaning and value for the people initially addressed--the Christian believers of the first century, and that the whole content (which is but an expansion of Christ's Olivet discourse) could have been fulfilled in that generation. Today exegetes stress that the prophetic visions from Patmos are generic in nature, setting forth God's unchanging ways in dealing with the world, as he offers it the gospel, and the world's unchanging response--both of which are illustrated afresh each century and will find their consummation in the final crisis--a crisis which will correspond in principle to Christ's passion week. See Crisis volumes I and II for details of modern exegesis of the book of Revelation.

It is highly significant that L. E. Froom while indicating in his Contents for volume IV of Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers that his work would embrace the first half of the twentieth century, gave no more than a page and a half to this era--the period of the most intense and wide-spread biblical exegesis the world has ever known--a period which in the light of advanced biblical knowledge repudiated the inadequate prophetic hermeneutic of preceding years.

1. The seven trumpets portray historical events between the first and nineteenth centuries including such episodes as the barbarian attacks on Rome and the rise and fall of the Ottoman empire.
2. The signs in the sun, moon, and stars were fulfilled in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Likewise the great earthquake of Rev. 6.

3. Papal Rome is the first beast of Rev 13 and USA is the second.
4. The French Revolution is the subject of Rev 11.
5. The Miller Revival of the nineteenth century is the subject of Rev 10.
6. That August 11, 1840 saw the fulfillment of Rev 11:15.
7. That the seventh trumpet began to sound in the 1840's.
8. That the opening of the heavenly temple to reveal the ark was fulfilled in the nineteenth century.
9. That Mt 25:1-13 had its fulfillment in the nineteenth century.
10. That the deadly wound of Rev 13:3 was fulfilled in the eighteenth century.
11. That the forty-two months of Revelation apply to 538-1798.
12. That Rev 14:7 only began to have its fulfillment in the Miller movement and applies to an investigative judgment.
13. The coming of the bridegroom was fulfilled in the nineteenth century fulfilling not only Mt 25 but also Rev 19 and Dan 7:14.
14. The 2300 evening-mornings of Dan 8:14 stretch from 457 B.C. to 1844.

Observe the constant tendency to find fulfillment in the age of the expositor, causing a grand lacunae for the time of increasing crisis--the twentieth century. While "many have run to and fro and knowledge has been increased" among SDA Bible scholars the supportive exegetical work on most of the above has dwindled from the stream in the nineteenth century to less than a trickle. Virtually no SDA is writing articles supporting the above for scholarly theological journals outside of Adventism. Similarly they are not writing scholarly books in support of traditional prophetic positions. Even when SDAs do publish on the Scriptures involved they do not as a rule say what nineteenth century Adventists said. See for example the works on Revelation by Kenneth Strand. What is characteristic of SDA scholarship today as regards the above topics is silence. This is a far cry from the claim of G. I. Butler who in 1888 wrote "Every year we have more and more evidence that we are right in our interpretation of the great prophetic themes which distinguish us as a people." A Circular Letter.

The 1919 Bible conference questioned several of the above positions including

the current exegesis of Rev 9:15, Rev 11 and 13, and some elements of the Dan 8 SDA interpretation. Adventist scholars at that gathering asserted the prominence of Antiochus Epiphanes in the prophecies of Daniel and questioned the so-called supremacy of the Papacy from 538-1798. W. E. Prescott for example could find no evidence to support October 22 of 1844. A G.C. committee rejected categorically the traditional exposition of trumpets and questioned other phases of Uriah Smith's interpretation in Daniel and Revelation, while a later G.C. committee could come to no agreement on the key dates associated with the 2300 day prophecy. For example Grace Amadon's support of traditional positions was rejected by Edwin Thiele. Froom who was supposed to bring out a detailed support of traditional SDA chronology associated with 1844 failed to do so. Froom originally supported Amadon but was challenged by Thiele. The chief doctrinal controversy in the early nineteenth century among SDAs saw the new view of the daily lead to an interpretation of the cleansing of the sanctuary quite different to that given in The Great Controversy. Prescott, Daniels and many others saw the cleansing of the sanctuary as the lifting up of the gospel so long trodden down by Rome. See Spicer's book on the advent Movement.

A recent graduate from a doctoral program wrote to friends as follows:

I have become impressed with the 1844 revival experience, in the light of Paul Schwarzenau's idea that every theology, no matter how much it claims to be based on careful exegesis of the text, is shaped by a profound spiritual experience, which sets the questions it seeks to answer, and to a certain extent the answers which it gives to those questions. He sees "the Great Disappointment" in this context vis à vis SDAs. The same was true of Paul and Martin Luther and John Wesley. I am coming to see that the most useful question, therefore, is not, "What is truth?" but rather, "Where is God at work?" The question "What is truth?" can send martyrs to the stake. IT CAN ALSO light the martyr's fires. If this seems a bit more Erasmian than Lutheran, so be it.

This comment we believe to be a very wise one. It stresses an aspect of truth too often passed by--that God can be at work amidst the imperfect reasonings of imperfect saints, that he is not dependent upon perfection to achieve that which is good. However, the statement also has its dangers

if understood to mean that the question "What is truth?" should be sacrificed because of sentimental attachment to causes where God was obviously at work despite imperfections.

We believe The Great Controversy to be a spiritual masterpiece despite factual inaccuracies. Its author tells us the purpose of her composition in the introduction--to draw spiritual lessons from the past which illuminate the conflict awaiting the church of the future. This purpose she fulfilled excellently. The punch-line theme of G C is the coming crisis of church and state totalitarianism threatening conscience and truth. Many are the Christian writers who since E.G.W.'s death (and in a few instances before that event) have given the same warning. The same is true of many non-Christian observers of the trends of our time. In the former category are such as C. S. Lewis, Francis Schaeffer, Dostoyesky, and many commentators on Rev 13, including Swete and the Jewish writer Will Herberg. Sociologists such as Riesman, Whyte, and others sound similar warnings.

Let us shun the Greek error that knowledge is virtue and cling rather to the Jewish perception that the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom. But let us also be conscious of what we are doing and beware of claiming objective truth where it does not exist in our desire to support the eternal superiority of spirituality over intellectualism.

APPENDIX VI
THE APOTELESMATIC PRINCIPLE

Had the foregoing essay been directed particularly to the hermeneutic peculiar to prophecy it would have given considerable space to the apotelesmatic principle. I defined this principle in the Glacier View manuscript as follows:

The apotelesmatic principle is a convenient term for referring to the concept that a particular prophecy in outline or as regards a dominant feature may have more than one application in time.

Daniel 8:14, The Day of Atonement and the Investigative Judgment (Casselberry, FL: Euangelion Press, 1980), p. 302.

Since G. M. Price wrote his The Greatest of the Prophets decades ago the term apotelesmatic has been known to Adventist readers. The SDABC asserts that the "Scriptures abound with illustrations of prophecies having dual application." See its comments on Dt 18:15; Is 7:14; Mt 24; Joel 2:28; Mal 4:5,6; 2 Th 2, etc. On the last passage the commentary says: "Partially fulfilled in Paul's day, much more so during the dark ages, but its complete fulfillment occurs in the days immediately prior to the return of Jesus." E. G. White frequently employs the apotelesmatic principle. See DA 628, GC 22, 25 etc.

Seventh-day Adventists who have always employed the principle to such passages as Joel 2:28, Mal 4:5,6, Mt 24 did not themselves discover this hermeneutic. It has been continually applied since the writing of the New Testament and can be found in the Fathers, the early Protestants, non-churchmen such as Bacon and in moderns such as Ramm (who speaks in PBI of the "possibility of multiple fulfillment") and Berkhof ("the fulfillment of some of the most important prophecies is germinant...each fulfillment being a pledge of that which is to follow...it is perfectly correct to speak of a two or threefold fulfillment.")

Jesus employed this principle as he applied Old Testament prophecies

about the Kingdom of God to both inaugurated and consummated eschatology. See for example his use of Dan 7:9-13 in connection with both advents.

Chapter five of the Glacier View manuscript gives a fuller exposition of this subject as does also the Daniel commentary printed by SPA. (See pp. 31, 49, 58, 69, 99, 141, 155, 187, 191, 196, 207, 216, 246, 259, 272, 283, 289-294.) It is thus quite apparent that the SDA Church had no objection to this principle prior to the Glacier View meeting.