

THE "SANCTUARY DOCTRINE" – ASSET OR LIABILITY?

Raymond F. Cottrell, D. Div.

"The 'sanctuary doctrine' – Asset or liability" was first delivered to the second JIF symposium in 02-04 November 2001 and again publicly on 09 February 2002 at the Assoc. of Adventist Forums meeting in San Diego, CA

The traditional interpretation of Daniel 8:14 with its sanctuary and investigative judgment, which gave birth to Seventh-day Adventism and accounts for its existence as a distinct entity within Christendom, has been the object of more criticism and debate, by both Adventists and non-Adventists, than all other facets of its belief system combined. The same is true with respect to church discipline on doctrinal grounds, defections from the church, and the diversion of time, attention, and resources from Adventism's perceived mission to the world.

It has been repeatedly and consistently demonstrated that an ordained minister may believe that Christ was a created being (and not God in the full sense of the word), or that a person can earn salvation by faithfully observing the Ten Commandments, or that Genesis 1 is not a literal account of creation a mere six thousand years ago – without being disciplined and forfeiting his ministerial credentials. But it has also been repeatedly and consistently demonstrated that an ordained minister may not conscientiously question the authenticity of the traditional interpretation of Daniel 8:14, even in his thoughts, without his ministerial credentials being revoked. As noted below, in several instances as much as half a century of faithful service to the church has not been sufficient to mitigate this result.

Accordingly, it is appropriate to review the origin, history, and methodology of the sanctuary doctrine, to examine it on the basis of the *sola Scriptura* principle and recognized principles of exegesis, and to explore procedures by means of which to avoid repeating the traumatic experiences of the church with it in the past – to learn from experience.

Insofar as possible this paper avoids technical hermeneutical terminology, including the transliteration of Hebrew words used by Bible scholars. The transliteration used is designed to enable persons not familiar with biblical Hebrew to approximate the Hebrew vocalization. Except as otherwise noted, Bible quotations cited are from the New Revised Standard Version (NRSV). The paper proceeds as follows:

ORIGIN AND HISTORY OF THE SANCTUARY DOCTRINE

1. Formation of the Sanctuary Doctrine
2. Ellen G. White and the Sanctuary Doctrine
3. Six Church Leaders Who Questioned the Sanctuary Doctrine
4. Continuing Casualties of the Sanctuary Doctrine
5. Non-Adventist Reaction to the Sanctuary Doctrine
6. My Personal Encounter With the Sanctuary Doctrine

A SOLA SCRIPTURA EXAMINATION OF THE DOCTRINE

7. "Rightly Explaining the Word of Truth," 2 Timothy 2:15.
8. "Rightly Explaining" Daniel 8:14
9. Flaws in the Traditional Sanctuary Doctrine

10. The Sanctuary Doctrine and *Sola Scriptura*
- DOCTRINAL OBSCURANTISM AND ITS REMEDY
11. Obscurantism and the Sanctuary Doctrine
12. The Daniel and Revelation Committee
13. A Permanent Remedy for Obscurantism
14. The Authenticity of Adventism

1. Formation of the Sanctuary Doctrine

Pioneer Seventh-day Adventists inherited their identification of the year 1844 as the terminus of the 2300 "days" foretold in the KJV of Daniel 8:14 from William Miller. Formerly an avowed skeptic, he was converted in 1816 and eventually became a Baptist lay preacher. He devoted his first two years as a born-again Christian to a diligent study of the Bible, which eventually came to a focus on Daniel 8:14 and the conclusion that it foretold the second coming of Christ "about the year 1843."

According to the Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia Miller "repeatedly declared that his prophetic views were not new," but insisted that he came to his conclusions exclusively through his own study of the Bible and reference to a concordance. In volume 4 of his *Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers* Le Roy Edwin Froom notes that Miller was by no means the "originator" of the idea that the 2300 "days" were prophetic years ending about 1843, and that it is "a simple historical fact that the origin of the view of the 2,300 years as ending at that time, and its wide circulation, was wholly prior to and independent of William Miller."¹

By what process did Miller, this formidable array of Bible students, and pioneer Adventists arrive at 1843/44 as the terminus of the 2300 "days" of Daniel 8:14? Relying on the 1611 King James translation of the Bible (the only one then available), they

- (1) identified its "sanctuary" as the church on earth,
- (2) accepted the KJV interpretation of erev boquer (literally, "evening morning") as "days,"
- (3) adopted the "day-for-a-year" principle in Bible prophecy and thus construed the 2300 "days" as prophetic years,
- (4) took the seventy "weeks" of Daniel 9:24-27 as the first segment of these 2300 years,
- (5) identified the cessation of sacrifice and offering for the last half of the seventieth of the seventy "weeks" (verse 27) as referring to Jesus' crucifixion,²
- (6) figuring back from the crucifixion, they identified the decree of the Persian king Artaxerxes Longimanus in his seventh year (Ezra 7) as that alluded to in Daniel 9:25, thus locating the commencement of the 2300 years in 457 B.C.,
- (7) with 457 B.C. as their starting point, terminated them "about the year 1843,"
- (8) adopted the KJV interpretation of nitsdaq (literally, "set right" or "restored") as "cleansed," and
- (9) concluded that the cleansing of the sanctuary of Daniel 8:14 meant the cleansing of the church on earth (and thus the earth itself) by fire at the second coming of Christ.

When the great disappointment of October 22, 1844 proved conclusively that Miller's identification of the "sanctuary" in Daniel 8:14 as the church on earth and the nature of its

cleansing as by fire at the second coming of Christ,³ were in error, pioneer Adventists re-identified the "sanctuary" of verse 14 as that of the Book of Hebrews in heaven,⁴ and its cleansing as the heavenly counterpart of the cleansing of the ancient sanctuary on the Day of Atonement.⁵

Retaining, however, the presumed validity of October 22, 1844 as the fulfillment of Daniel 8:14 and the concept that it implied the soon return of their Lord, the disappointed Adventist pioneers assumed that human probation had indeed closed on that fateful day, and that only those who at that time awaited His return were eligible for eternal life. They referred to this concept as "the shut door" in the parable of the Ten Virgins.⁶ They soon mated the "shut door" theory to the idea that the sanctuary of Daniel 8:14 was the sanctuary in heaven, of the book of Hebrews, that the "shut door" was the "door" between its holy and most holy apartments, that on October 22 Christ had closed His ministry in the holy place and entered upon His high priestly ministry in its most holy place, and referred to His ministry there as an "investigative judgment."

For several years the "little flock" of pioneer Seventh-day Adventists "scattered abroad" believed that the investigative judgment phase of Christ's ministry would be very brief (not more than five years or so at the most),⁷ following which He would immediately return to earth. The eventual accession of new, non-1844, members to the "little flock" proved to be convincing evidence that the door of mercy remained open, and by the early 1850's they abandoned the "shut door" aspect of the sanctuary-in-heaven interpretation of Daniel 8:14.

This completed the traditional Adventist interpretation of Daniel 8:14, the sanctuary, and the investigative judgment, which was thereafter commonly referred to as "the sanctuary doctrine" set forth in every statement of beliefs, most recently as article 23 of the 27 Fundamental Beliefs adopted at the 1980 session of the General Conference in New Orleans.

2. Ellen G. White and the Sanctuary Doctrine

The ultimate argument in defense of the traditional interpretation of Daniel 8:14 every time questions have been raised concerning it, has been Ellen White's explicit affirmation of it. As a presumably infallible interpreter of Scripture her support always settled the matter. For instance, in 1888, forty-four years after the great disappointment of October 22, 1844 she wrote: "The scripture which above all others had been both the foundation and the central pillar of the advent faith, was the declaration, 'Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.'"⁸ She devoted an entire chapter in *The Great Controversy* to a defense and explanation of the sanctuary doctrine.⁹ Eighteen years later, in 1906, she wrote again: "The correct understanding of the ministration in the heavenly sanctuary is the foundation of our faith."¹⁰

In order to understand these two statements in their historical context it is important to remember that she and many others then living had personally experienced the great disappointment of October 22, 1844. Her statements about it were absolutely historically accurate. The experience was still vivid in her own mind and in the minds of many others.

In both of these statements Ellen White is simply stating historical fact; she is not exegeting Scripture. In 1895 she wrote: "In regard to infallibility, I never claimed it; God alone is infallible."¹¹ "The Bible is the only rule of faith and doctrine. ... The Bible alone ... [is] the foundation of our faith. ... The Bible alone is to be our guide. The Holy Scriptures are to be accepted as an authoritative, infallible revelation of [God's] will. ... We are to receive God's word as supreme authority."¹² Numerous similar statements could be cited.¹³ It is important to remember that she never considered herself an exegete of the Bible. Upon numerous occasions when asked for what her questioners proposed to accept as an authoritative, infallible interpretation of a disputed Bible passage she refused, and told them to go to the Bible themselves for an answer.

It is also vital to remember that in Ellen White's 47,000¹⁴ or so citations of Scripture she makes use of the Bible in two distinct ways: (1) to quote the Bible when narrating the Bible story in its own context, and (2) to apply Bible principles in her counsel to the church today--out of its biblical context.

A clear illustration of this two-fold use of the Bible is her series of comments on Galatians 3:24: "The law was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ."

(1) In 1856 she identified that law as the ceremonial law system of ancient times, and specifically not the Ten Commandments.¹⁵

(2) In 1883 she again identified that "law" as "the obsolete ceremonies of Judaism."¹⁶

(3) In 1896 she wrote: "In this Scripture, the Holy Spirit through the apostle is speaking especially of the moral law."¹⁷

(4) In 1900 she wrote: "I am asked concerning the law in Galatians. ... I answer: both the ceremonial and moral code of Ten Commandments."¹⁸

(5) In 1911 she again identified the law in Galatians as exclusively "the obsolete ceremonies of Judaism."¹⁹

In these three reversals (ceremonial law exclusively, Ten Commandments exclusively, both the ceremonial law and the Ten Commandments, ceremonial law exclusively) was she contradicting herself or did she repeatedly change her mind? Neither! A careful reading of each statement in its own context makes evident that

(1) when she identifies the law in Galatians as the ceremonial law system of ancient times she is commenting on Galatians in its own historical context, and

(2) when she applies the principle involved to our time she does so out of its biblical context.

The principle involved in Paul's day and in ours is identical: the Galatians could not be saved by a rigorous observance of the ceremonial laws; nor can we be saved by a rigorous observance of the Ten Commandments! The two contradictory definitions of the law in Galatians are both valid and accurate! A careful examination of Ellen White's thousands of quotations from, or allusion to, the Bible makes evident that her historical statements regarding Daniel 8:14 are historically accurate with respect to the 1844 experience and not a denial of what the passage meant in Daniel's time.

We may think of the heavenly sanctuary explanation of the great disappointment as a prosthetic device, a spiritual crutch that enabled the "little flock" of Adventist pioneers

"scattered abroad" to survive the great disappointment of October 22, 1844 and not lose faith in the imminent return of Jesus, as so many others did. That explanation was the best they could do, given the proof-text method on which, of necessity, they relied. With the historical method at our disposal today, we no longer need that crutch and would do well to lay it up on the shelf of history. It is counterproductive in our witness to the everlasting gospel today, to biblically literate Adventists and non-Adventists alike.

3. Six Church Leaders Who Questioned the Sanctuary Doctrine

For about forty years the sanctuary doctrine raised no known eyebrows or protests. But on an average of every fifteen or twenty years or so since 1887 an experienced, respected, and trusted church administrator or Bible teacher has called the attention of fellow church leaders to flaws in the traditional interpretation of Daniel 8:14, forfeited his ministerial credentials, and either been disfellowshipped or voluntarily left the church. With one or two possible exceptions none of them had either spoken or taught their doubts regarding the biblical authenticity of the sanctuary doctrine, but were fired for thinking such thoughts and sharing them with fellow church leaders! Furthermore, none of them were novices, but experienced administrators or Bible teachers. Three of them had served the church faithfully for more than half a century each.

The first church leader of record to question the sanctuary doctrine was Dudley M. Canright, in 1887. Granted that he might have been more tactful and patient, but for more than twenty years he had served the church as a minister, able evangelist, administrator, and sometime member of the General Conference Committee, and had earned the right to a fair hearing of his views. But "the brethren" either did not listen or did not understand, apparently both. He voluntarily left the church and became as bitter and effective an opponent of Adventism as he had formerly advocated it.

Canright forthwith published a book, *Seventh-day Adventism Renounced*, to warn people about the errors of Adventism. It has been translated into scores of languages and is still used effectively to warn people against Adventism. An honest, knowledgeable Adventist reading the book today would have to admit that much of his tirade against the sanctuary doctrine was---and still is---justified.²⁰

Like Canright, Albion F. Ballenger had served the church faithfully for many years, and in 1905 was an administrator in charge of the Irish Mission. He was an able speaker and writer, and a diligent student of Scripture. Like Canright, Ballenger had never mentioned his views on the sanctuary in public, but a committee of twenty-five the General Conference appointed to hear him reported that he entertained views regarding the ministry of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary contrary to that of the church. He acknowledged the possibility that he might be wrong, and pleaded for someone to point out from the Bible where he was wrong, but no one did, either then or later.

The church withdrew his ministerial credentials and disfellowshipped him because of what he believed, not for anything he had said or done. Twenty-five years later W. W. Prescott (a member of the GC ad hoc committees appointed to meet with the dissidents) commented in a letter to W. A. Spicer, then president of the General Conference: "I have waited all these years for someone to make an adequate answer to Ballenger, Fletcher and others on their positions re. the sanctuary but I have not seen or heard it." Ballenger subsequently explained his views in the book *Cast Out for the Cross of Christ*. "No one," he lamented, "who has not experienced it can realize the soul anguish that overwhelms one who, in the

study of the Word finds truth which does not harmonize with that which he has believed and taught during a whole lifetime to be vital to the salvation of the soul."²¹

After some twenty years as an ordained minister, foreign missionary, and eventually Bible teacher at Avondale College in Australia, in 1930 William W. Fletcher voluntarily resigned from the ministry and severed his connection with the church, under administrative pressure, solely because of his views regarding errors in the traditional interpretation of Daniel 8:14. Two years later he published *Reasons for My Faith*, setting forth his views on the sanctuary and Christ's ministry as our great High Priest. An objective reading of both the Bible and *Reasons* will conclude that Fletcher's understanding of the former was superior to that of his critics.²²

Louis R. Conradi served the church faithfully for fifty-two years, much of the time as vice-president of the General Conference for the Central European Division. He was an avid Bible scholar and student of history as well as an able administrator, and wrote extensively. He was highly respected by his fellow administrators. For more than thirty years questions grew in his mind regarding the traditional interpretation of Daniel 8:14, which he first shared with a few church leaders in 1928 and which eventually led to a formal hearing before an ad hoc committee of thirty-three members appointed by the General Conference, forfeiture of his ministerial credentials, and his voluntary separation from the church in 1931.

Thereupon he united with the Seventh Day Baptists, who issued him ministerial credentials, gave him permission to preach Seventh-day Adventist teachings, and made him their official representative in Europe. To his death he expressed confidence in the fundamental integrity of Adventism despite errors in the sanctuary doctrine.²³

William W. Prescott was a versatile person who, over a service lifetime for the church of more than half a century (1885-1937), distinguished himself as a writer, editor, publisher, educator, administrator, and Bible Scholar. Like Conradi, his study of the Bible led to a recognition of serious flaws in the sanctuary doctrine to which, however, he never gave public expression. He retained full confidence in the basic credibility of the Advent message. His one "mistake" was in 1934 when he shared his views with some of "the brethren" from headquarters, who turned against him. Unlike Conradi, however, he remained with the church, never forfeited his ministerial credentials, but returned to Washington, D.C. where he fellowshiped with his critics and participated actively in various General Conference activities.

After many years of service to the church Harold E. Snide was teaching Bible at Southern Junior College (now Southern Adventist University). A third-generation Adventist and a diligent student of Bible prophecy, he encountered problems with the traditional interpretation of Daniel, especially in connection with Christ's ministry as set forth in the book of Hebrews. He went to the leaders in Washington with the problems that troubled him, but found no help. The conflict between the traditional interpretation of Daniel 8:14 and Scripture proved to be a traumatic experience that eventually, about 1945, led him to withdraw from the church. Mrs. Snide remained a loyal Adventist, however, and went to live with her parents in Takoma Park where I became acquainted with her.

The experience of R. A. Greive was unique in that, as president of the Queensland Conference in Australia, he never questioned the sanctuary doctrine. His concern was to encourage the experience of justification and righteousness by faith as presented in the books of Romans and Hebrews, and its counterpart the sinless perfection of Jesus Christ.

Church leaders in the division office, however, accused him of thereby being in conflict with the concept of an investigative judgment as the cleansing of the sanctuary referred to in Daniel 8:14 and explained in Hebrews 9.

If, as Paul wrote in Romans 8:1, there is "now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus," how can a record of those sins be preserved and reviewed during the course of an investigative judgment? Greive asked. He also pointed out that, according to Hebrews 7:27 and 9:6-12, Christ completed His equivalent of the first apartment ministry on the cross and entered upon His equivalent of the second apartment ministry when He ascended to heaven, not eighteen centuries later. At his trial Greive agreed to go as far as his "enlightened conscience" would allow in order to have harmony with his brethren, but for them that was not far enough. In 1956 his credentials were withdrawn and he withdrew from the church.²⁴

Think of the time, attention, and cost of disciplining these six administrators and Bible scholars, listed above, has diverted from the mission of the church to the world! Think also of the distress and heartache these six have experienced and often expressed. Think, as well, of the damage some of them have done to the church!

4. Continuing Casualties of the Sanctuary Doctrine

Like an airplane unexpectedly entering a region of clear air turbulence, in 1945 Dr. Desmond Ford began to encounter exegetical problems in the traditional Adventist interpretation of Daniel 8:14, the sanctuary, and the investigative judgment. He set out to put all of the disparate pieces together in a coherent pattern that would resolve the problems, that would be faithful to reliable principles of exegesis, and that left him a dedicated Seventh-day Adventist with complete confidence in the integrity of the church as an authentic witness to the everlasting gospel.

Over the next ten or fifteen years Ford discovered that some of his contemporaries and others before him had wrestled with the same problems. In his definitive 991-page Glacier View document, *Daniel 8:14, the Day of Atonement, and the Investigative Judgment*, he names twelve Adventist Leaders with whom he had discussed the problems, in person or by correspondence. He devoted his master's and one of his doctoral dissertations to the subject. His published commentaries on the Books of Daniel and the Revelation total more than two thousand pages. He has probably devoted more scholarly study to the subject and written more extensively on it than any other person in history.

During his long tenure as head of the theology department at Avondale College in Australia he trained half or so of the ministers in Australia. In the classroom and by his personal example he inspired thousands of young people for Christ. He was always in demand as a speaker, and thousands testify to a clearer understanding and appreciation of the gospel as a result of his witness to it. His theme ever was---and still is---salvation by faith in Jesus Christ.

Ford never discussed the controversial aspects of the sanctuary doctrine in public---until October 27, 1979, as an exchange professor at Pacific Union College, when several members of the faculty invited him to discuss his views on the sanctuary question in an open meeting one Sabbath afternoon. Thirty-four years of silence on the subject surely reflect commendable pastoral and scholarly restraint. The PUC presentation "was positive on the providential role of Adventists and Ellen White." However, three retired ministers

present detected what they perceived to be heresy and reported their version of his remarks to the chairman of the college board.

In view of the fact that Ford was still an employee of Avondale College in Australia and due to return to Avondale at the close of the 1979-1980 school year, the chairman logically referred the matter to the General Conference. In August 1980 115 leading administrators and Bible scholars from around the world (at an administrator's estimated cost of a quarter of a million dollars) were summoned to Glacier View²⁵ in Colorado, to serve as the Sanctuary Review Committee. They were specifically instructed not to evaluate Ford's beliefs with respect to Daniel 8:14, the sanctuary, and the investigative judgment by the Bible itself, but as set forth in the statement of Twenty-seven Fundamental Beliefs, which the church had already determined to be normative. Several weeks later the Australasian Division withdrew his ministerial credentials.

Procedures at Glacier View consisted of a reaffirmation of the traditional Adventist interpretation of Daniel 8:14. But Ford was given no opportunity to present the reasons for his "apotelesmatic" interpretation of it, which provided for the traditional Adventist interpretation being one of several fulfillments of the prophecy, but not the fulfillment. Again--as always--the church neglected to examine the reasons for dissent from the traditional interpretation of Daniel 8:14 and merely reaffirmed it in stentorian tones. As a matter of fact, the consensus report voted at the close of the week-long conference tacitly agreed with Ford on six major points of exegesis. Later, some forty Bible scholars signed a document known as the Atlanta Affirmation, remonstrating with Neal Wilson for the way the church had treated Ford at, and after, Glacier View.

In his involuntary "retirement" Ford has continued to proclaim the gospel, in a ministry he called "Good News Unlimited." Unlike Canright, Ballenger, and others before him who had embarked on vendettas against the church, Ford has remained a dedicated Seventh-day Adventist at heart and retained his church membership.²⁶

Ford, now retired in his native Queensland, Australia, is the lone survivor of numerous traumatic encounters with the traditional interpretation of Daniel 8:14. We could wish that such encounters with the sanctuary doctrine were a thing of the past. But a new generation of victims is repeating their traumatic experiences all over again. If the past is any index to the future they will be repeated indefinitely unless and until the church faces up to the facts objectively and deals realistically and responsibly with them in harmony with the sola Scriptura principle.

It is said that more than 150 ordained ministers, mostly in Australia, forfeited their ministerial credentials in the aftermath of the Ford affair. Hundreds of lay persons, mostly in the United States, left the church and formed effervescent "fellowships" as a result.

Dale Ratzlaff was pastor of the Watsonville church in the Central California Conference and a Bible teacher at nearby Monterey Bay Academy when, in 1981, he was abruptly fired by the Conference for expressing a conviction shared by a majority of the forty or so Bible scholars at Glacier View, that administration had misjudged and mistreated Desmond Ford the year before. The elders of the Watsonville church invited Dr. Fred Veltman of Pacific Union College and me to meet with the church the following Sabbath, in which we endeavored to pour oil on the troubled waters.

Ratzlaff left the Adventist church and wandered about (both geographically and ideologically) for a few years following which he embarked on what he calls Life Assurance

Ministries, first in Sedona and now in Glendale, Arizona, with the objective of warning Adventists and others against the church. First came a 350-page polemic against the Sabbath, and in 2001 the 384-page *Cultic Doctrine of Seventh-day Adventists*, which he describes as "an appeal to SDA leadership." His target in *Cultic Doctrine* is the traditional Adventist Interpretation of Daniel 8:14, the sanctuary doctrine, and the investigative judgment. In 1999 he began publishing *Proclamation*, a bi-monthly journal dedicated to warning Adventists and others against Adventism. Here in the West, Dale's crusade is having at least a measure of success. He is also publisher of Dr. Jerry Gladson's 383-page *A Theologian's Journey From Seventh-day Adventism to Mainstream Christianity* (copyright 2001).²⁷

Dr. Jerry Gladson had the very considerable misfortune to serve on the faculty of Southern Adventist College (now University). Had he been teaching at any of the other eight Adventist colleges or universities in North America he would probably still be an Adventist minister and teacher. Southern operates as an agency of Southern Bible belt obscurantism. Furthermore it was (and still is) to an appreciable extent, dependent on the largesse of committed ultra-fundamentalists, who insist that the college operate on ultra-fundamentalist principles. Again the target was the traditional sanctuary doctrine and the charge what Gladson thought about it, not anything he had taught in his classes.

Then dean of the Adventist Theological Seminary Dr. Gerhard F. Hasel, a former student and teacher at Southern and the ruthless personification of Adventist obscurantism, played an active role in the lynching of Dr. Gladson, a role in which Hasel had already distinguished himself at the Seminary. The head of the religion department at Southern, responsible for the ultimate coup de grace, was as closed-minded and ruthless as Torquemada, a role in which he had already distinguished himself as director of the Biblical Research Institute of the General Conference. What chance did Dr. Gladson have for a fair evaluation and adjudication of the charges against him? Finally, the chairman of the college board distinguished himself as either a committed obscurantist or a willing instrument of the far Adventist right.

Jerry Gladson was not fired nor were his ministerial credentials withdrawn. He remained an ordained minister until they expired and were not renewed. Instead, a witch-hunting climate was created in which departure proved to be the lesser of two evils. There was no formal hearing. No one tried to understand his reasons for thinking as he did, or cared. The Pharisees were in control, and that was that. An anomalous situation indeed!²⁷

Janet Brown became a Seventh-day Adventist in 1985. As a lay person she was an avid Bible student, and as such "began to notice more and more problems and inconsistencies between SDA teachings and the Bible." For a time she ignored these "cracks in the armor of Adventism," but as "the evidence really began to pile up" she felt that she could no longer "remain honest" with herself and continue as a Seventh-day Adventist. To her, the investigative judgment resembles Roman Catholic purgatory inasmuch as it keeps people in suspense as to their standing before God and "makes no sense biblically." In 1995 she left the Adventist church and operates a website devoted to opposing it.²⁸

Don W. Silver of Ashland Kentucky is another lay person who left Adventism recently, primarily because of the sanctuary doctrine, which he vehemently opposes. Evidently well-educated, he speaks with fervor and pin-point logic. His wife, like him well-educated, teaches at nearby Marshall University and remains a faithful Adventist and a leader in the

local Adventist church. Their two grown daughters have followed their father into agnosticism.²⁹

Other contemporary illustrations of opposition to the sanctuary doctrine and resulting apostasy might, of course, be cited. I know personally of other employees of the church who have been fired for the same reason, of lay people who have left the church, and of families that have been broken up as a result. The sanctuary problem is still with us, late and soon, and is touching the lives of sincere Seventh-day Adventists.

5. Non-Adventist Reaction to the Sanctuary Doctrine

It was the sanctuary doctrine based on Daniel 8:14 that made us Seventh-day Adventists and that remains, today, the keystone of our distinctive belief system and our mission to the world. Of it, Ellen White wrote: "The Scripture which above all others had been both the foundation and central pillar of our faith was the declaration, 'Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed'"³⁰ and "The correct understanding of the ministration in the heavenly sanctuary is the foundation of our faith." "Not one pin is to be removed from that which the Lord has established. The enemy will bring in false theories, such as the doctrine that there is no sanctuary. This is one of the points on which there will be a departing from the faith."³¹

When, in the mid-1950's, Walter Martin and Donald Grey Barnhouse explored Adventist teachings in depth with persons appointed by the General Conference, they concluded that, with two exceptions, we are in harmony with the gospel: (1) our sanctuary doctrine, and (2) the role we popularly ascribe to Ellen White as an infallible interpreter of Scripture, in contradiction of her own explicit statements to the contrary. The former, they concluded, violates the Reformation principle *sola Scriptura*.³² Of it, Barnhouse wrote: The [sanctuary] doctrine is, to me, the most colossal, psychological, face-saving phenomenon in religious history. ... We personally do not believe that there is even a suspicion of a verse in Scripture to sustain such a peculiar position, and we further believe that any effort to establish it is stale, flat, and unprofitable. ... [It is] unimportant and almost naïve.³³

Such is the usual reaction of non-Adventist Bible scholars and other biblically literate non-Adventists to our sanctuary doctrine.³⁴

6. My Personal Encounter With the Sanctuary Doctrine

I first encountered problems with the traditional interpretation of Daniel 8:14, professionally, in the spring of 1955 during the process of editing comment on the Book of Daniel for volume 4 of the *SDA Bible Commentary*. As a work intended to meet the most exacting scholarly standards, we intended our comment to reflect the meaning obviously intended by the Bible writers. As an Adventist commentary it must also reflect, as accurately as possible, what Adventists believe and teach. But in Daniel 8 and 9 we found it hopelessly impossible to comply with both of these requirements.³⁵

In 1958 the Review and Herald Publishing Association needed new printing plates for the classic book *Bible Readings*, and it was decided to revise it where necessary to agree with the *Commentary*. Coming again to the Book of Daniel I determined to try once more to find a way to be absolutely faithful to both Daniel and the traditional Adventist interpretation of

8:14, but again found it impossible. I then formulated six questions regarding the Hebrew text of the passage and its context, which I submitted to every college teacher versed in Hebrew and every head of the religion department in all of our North American colleges---all personal friends of mine. Without exception they replied that there is no linguistic or contextual basis for the traditional Adventist interpretation of Daniel 8:14.³⁶

When the results of this questionnaire were called to the attention of the General Conference president, he and the Officers appointed the super-secret Committee on Problems in the Book of Daniel, of which I was a member. Meeting intermittently for five years (1961-1966), we considered 48 papers relative to Daniel 8 and 9, and in the spring of 1966 adjourned sine die, unable to reach a consensus.³⁷

The Commentary experience with Daniel already mentioned led me into an unhurried, in-depth, spare-time, comprehensive study of Daniel 7 to 12 that continued without interruption for seventeen years (1955-1972), in quest of a conclusive solution to the sanctuary problem. My objective was to be fully prepared with definitive, objective, biblical information the next time the question should arise during the course of my ministry for the church.

Among other things I memorized, in Hebrew, all relevant portions of Daniel 8 to 12 for instant recall and comparison (60 verses), conducted exhaustive word studies³⁸ of more than 150 relevant Hebrew words Daniel uses, throughout the Old Testament, studied the Hebrew grammar and syntax in detail, made a minute analysis of contextual data,³⁹ compared ancient Greek and Latin translations of Daniel,⁴⁰ investigated relevant apocryphal and New Testament passages,⁴¹ traced Jewish and Christian interpretation of Daniel from ancient to modern times,⁴² and made an exhaustive study of the formation, development, and subsequent Adventist experience with the traditional sanctuary doctrine.⁴³ Eventually I incorporated the results of this investigation into an 1100 page manuscript which I later reduced to 725 pages but decided not release for publication until an appropriate time.

The above considerations conclusively demonstrate that our traditional interpretation of Daniel 8:14, the sanctuary, and the investigative judgment as set forth in Article 23 of Fundamental Beliefs does not accurately reflect the teaching of Scripture with respect to the ministry of Christ on our behalf since His return to heaven.⁴⁴ Accordingly, it is appropriate (1) to note wherein Article 23 is thus defective,⁴⁵ (2) to revise the article so as to reflect Bible teaching on this aspect of His ministry accurately, and (3) to suggest a process designed to protect the church from this and similar traumatic experiences in the future.⁴⁶

Some of the concepts associated with the investigative judgment are, indeed, biblical, but the Bible itself nowhere associates them with an investigative judgment, for which there is no sola Scriptura basis whatever.⁴⁷

Upon ascending to heaven Jesus assured His disciples "I am with you always, to the end of the age" (Matthew 18:20). The Book of Hebrews is our primary source of information about His ministry in heaven on their (and our) behalf since that time, I suggest that the following composite summary of His ministry as presented in Hebrews provides an appropriate basis for a revised article 23 of Fundamental Beliefs, should such a statement eventually be

desired. The author of Hebrews presents Christ's ministry in heaven, on our behalf, by analogy with the role of the high priest in the ancient sanctuary ritual:

On the cross Jesus offered Himself as a single sacrifice for all time that atoned for the sins of those who draw near to God through Him.⁴⁸ That one sacrifice qualified Him to serve as our great High Priest in heaven, perpetually.⁴⁹ Having made that sacrifice, Christ entered the Most Holy Place--"heaven itself"--to appear in the presence of God on our behalf.⁵⁰ He invites us to come boldly to Him, by faith, to find mercy and grace to help us in our time of need.⁵¹ He will soon appear, a second time, "to bring salvation to those who are waiting for him."⁵²

7. "Rightly Explaining the Word of Truth"⁵³

The almost infinitely diverse and often contradictory ideas attributed to the Bible, and thus its relevance for our time, suggest the importance of identifying principles on the basis of which we can have confidence in the validity of our conclusions with respect to the perspectives of life and reality its divine Author and the inspired writers intended their words to convey.

We read and study the Bible with the objective of learning who we are, how and why we came to be here, how we should relate to life and make the most of its opportunities, where we are going, and how best to get there. This constitutes what we may call our "world view," our concept of what life on planet Earth is all about.

Our quest for this information is something like a literal journey from where we may be now to where we would like to be, but have never been over the road before. In planning such a journey we must first know where we are, where we want to be at journey's end, and the best way to get there. Our planning must take into consideration the facts of geography and travel as they really are, not as we might like or imagine them to be. In other words we must be objective with respect to reality, to the facts of geography and travel as they really are. To be subjective in our planning---to think of them as we might imagine or like them to be---could eventually prove to be disastrous. It is the same with reading and studying the Bible: Objectivity is essential. Being subjective in our study and thinking inevitably imposes our personal, unenlightened, opinions upon the Bible and leaves us blind and deaf to what God is trying to say to us through it. As a result, we assume that our personal opinions constitute the voice of God!

In the Bible even a child or a semi-literate person can find the way of salvation and follow it all the way to the pearly gates, and find welcome there. But for in-depth study of some portions of it those not at home with ancient Hebrew and Greek should make use of relevant reference material prepared by reliable persons who are conversant with those languages. Certain factors are essential for everyone conducting in-depth study of the Bible. The following is a brief resume of factors essential to such a study.

Objectivity is the mental quality that aspires to evaluate ideas and draws conclusions in terms of their intrinsic reality, rather than in terms of a person's untested, subjective presuppositions. Objectivity is essential for ascertaining the intended import of the Bible.

Untested, subjective presuppositions regarding the nature and teachings of the Bible almost inevitably lead to wrong conclusions. Everyone, consciously or unconsciously, comes to the

Bible with a set of presuppositions about it which control evaluation of the data considered and thus the conclusions drawn from it. Accordingly, the importance of presuppositions is crucial in determining the validity of one's conclusions. Presuppositions should ever remain open to revision as clearer, objective evidence may require. The objective is to eliminate every subjective factor from the reasoning process in order to bring it into harmony with objective reality.

Is it possible to test the presupposition that the Bible is, as it claims to be, the unique revelation of God's infinite will and purpose for the human race? Yes. The objective evidence for this consists of (1) the Bible's accurate evaluation of the natural human ethical-moral-spiritual state, (2) its perfect remedy for the imperfections of that natural state, (3) the demonstration that that remedy has transformed the psyche of countless millions of human beings for two thousand years, and (4) that if Bible principles were universally accepted and practiced they would automatically eliminate all war, all crime, and all selfish manipulation of other human beings---and thus transform this world into a little heaven on earth! Given the opportunity, the human experience confirms these conclusions beyond the possibility of either doubt or error. This authenticates Bible principles as being of more than human origin, and so validates the above presupposition as being objective and trustworthy.

The Old Testament was written between twenty-four and thirty-seven centuries ago, mostly in ancient Hebrew and in a world more than a little different and strange to us. The New Testament was written in Greek some nineteen centuries ago. The Old Testament records the history of the Hebrews as the covenant people and chosen instrument of the divine purpose for them and for the human race in ancient times, instruction designed to qualify them to be living representatives of, and witnesses for, the true God, and their individual and corporate response to this instruction.⁵⁴ The Hebrew language had a limited vocabulary that reflected their primitive culture and world view, a form of writing that consisted of consonants only, and grammar and syntax different from ours today.

The Bible was thus historically conditioned,⁵⁵ that is, adapted and specifically addressed to, the needs, comprehension, and covenant role of its recipients at the time it was written, and to their circumstances and perception of the divine purpose, yet its fundamental principles and instruction are of universal value and applicability. It was written in their language and in thought forms with which they were familiar, and reflects the salvation history perspective of their time. That record, however, "was written for our instruction" also. Accordingly, we need to historically condition our minds to their time, circumstances, and perspective of salvation history in order to fully understand and appreciate its message for our time. In-depth study and appreciation of the Bible require that the historical circumstances in which a passage was written must be taken into consideration.

The salvation history perspective of the Old Testament envisioned ancient Israel as God's covenant people and chosen instrument of the divine purpose to restore humanity to harmony with the divine purpose for this world.⁵⁶ God revealed all of this to them in order that they might cooperate intelligently with His infinite purpose for the human race. That revelation, imparted over the centuries of antiquity, provided ancient Israel with instruction that would qualify them individually and collectively as a nation to fully represent the supreme value and desirability of cooperating with His eternal purpose. It envisioned the climax of earth's history and the complete restoration of divine sovereignty over all the earth at the close of Old Testament times. The New Testament assumes the validity of this Old Testament perspective of salvation history as reaching a climax in the life, ministry,

crucifixion, resurrection, and promise of Jesus to return soon---at the close of New Testament times.⁵⁷

This Bible perspective of salvation history was implicit in Scripture and in the minds of people of that time. It must also be in our minds as we read Scripture. Accordingly, the salvation history perspective of the time a passage was written must be taken into consideration in order to ascertain its intended, true meaning.

The original text of Scripture, in the languages in which it was written, is the ultimate, supreme authority for what it says.⁵⁸ Good modern translations such as the New Revised Standard Version (NRSV⁵⁹), the New International Version (NIV), and the Good News Bible (Today's English Version, TEV) are as accurate and reliable translations as any available today. The King James Version (KJV), with its superb, stately literary style has had a profound influence on the English language and endeared itself to readers for nearly four centuries, but sometimes it does not accurately reflect the original text.⁶⁰

This was because the KJV was based on late manuscripts that had accumulated numerous scribal errors and editorial changes over several centuries since the original autographs. Since an ancient manuscript known as the Sinaiticus was discovered in 1844, thousands of ancient manuscripts centuries closer to the originals have been found that provide us, today, with much more accurate information as to how the original autographs actually read.⁶¹ Also, the biblical languages are better understood than they were in 1611, when the KJV became available, and the history and culture of antiquity are better understood. Word studies---the way in which Hebrew and Greek words occur in the Bible and their meaning as defined by context, in each instance---are thus essential to determine their meaning.

The literary context of a passage is essential to an accurate determination of its meaning. This includes its immediate context, in particular, but also its extended context in the entire document of which it forms a part. Ancient Hebrew, in which most of the Old Testament was written,⁶² had already become a dead language to the extent that when Ezra read from "the book of the law of Moses" (the Torah, or Pentateuch) in public about 450 B.C., it needed interpretation in order for Jews, even of his time, to understand it.⁶³

Several characteristics of ancient Hebrew were responsible for this: (1) For one thing, it had a very limited vocabulary, one in which many words were used to express a wide variety of meanings. (For instance, the KJV translates ten common Hebrew words by an average of eighty-four English expressions each, and one of them by 164 English words and expressions!⁶⁴). (2) Ancient Hebrew writing consisted of consonants only, and the reader had to supply whatever vowels he thought were intended, and in some instances might supply a set of vowels different from those the writer intended.⁶⁵ The vowels that now appear in Hebrew Bibles were added to its consonants by the Masoretes, Jewish scholars, many centuries after ancient Hebrew had become a dead language, according to what they thought to be the intended meaning. For this reason it is futile to correlate two passages of scripture on the basis of the same English word located in a concordance---as William Miller did in developing the sanctuary doctrine!

The analogy of Scripture---the use of one Bible passage to clarify another---must be used with caution.⁶⁶ The context of both passages must first be taken into account in order to determine whether or not they may be used together.

In summary, in-depth study of the Bible requires consideration of one's presuppositions, the historical circumstances to which a passage was addressed and to which it was intended to apply, its salvation history perspective, its sense as determined by the original language, its literary context, and cautious use of other Bible passages of Scripture to amplify it.

Seventh-day Adventists today affirm the sola Scriptura principle of the Reformation in principle, but sometimes unwittingly compromise it in practice, notably in affirming the traditional interpretation of Daniel 8:14.

Seventh-day Adventism emerged as a discrete entity within the Christian community on October 23, 1844⁶⁷ as the result of a particular understanding of Daniel 8:14 and the great disappointment that attended their disillusionment the preceding day. That understanding, which was subsequently modified in some details and became the traditional Adventist interpretation, has, since then, been considered the keystone of Adventism's self-identity, understanding of the Bible, theology, and sense of mission.⁶⁸

In Jeremiah 18:7-10 the prophet summarizes the nature and purpose of predictive prophecy as follows: At one moment I may declare concerning a nation or a kingdom, that I will pluck up and break down and destroy it, but if that nation concerning which I have spoken, turns from its evil I will change my mind about the disaster that I intended to bring on it. And at another moment I may declare concerning a nation or kingdom that I will build and plant it, but if it does evil in my sight, not listening to my voice, then I will change my mind about the good that I intended to do to it.

Accordingly, predictive prophecy is always conditional on the response of the people to whom it is addressed. Its function is not to demonstrate divine foreknowledge nor does it necessarily predetermine the course of events, for if it did it would thereby deprive people of the power of choice. Its intended purpose is to enable them to make wise choices in the present by indicating the ultimate result of either a right or a wrong choice. For this reason Bible prophecy, even apocalyptic prophecy, is always conditional, and its time element is always flexible, in order to provide for the free exercise of human choice.⁶⁹ It is a preview of what can be, not what necessarily will be.

Accordingly, the seventy weeks-of-years of Daniel 9:24-27 provided the Hebrew exiles in Babylon with a preview of what the future held for them, subject to their cooperation.⁷⁰

Three Methods of Bible Study

The traditional Adventist interpretation of Daniel 8:14 was formulated on the basis of what is commonly known as the proof-text method of biblical study and interpretation, which construes Bible passages in terms of what a modern reader thinks to be their import. This method

- (1) is highly subjective,
- (2) understands the Bible from the modern reader's cultural, historical, and salvation history perspectives,
- (3) accepts the Bible in translation as authoritative,

(4) makes the reader's personal and group-think presuppositions normative for evaluating data and for

(5) drawing conclusions.

This method does not require special training or experience, and is followed by a majority of untutored Bible readers. Since the beginning most Adventists have followed this method, but no reputable Bible scholar follows it today.

When Daniel 8:14 is studied by the historical method, serious flaws in the traditional interpretation become apparent because the historical method

(1) aspires to be as objective as possible,

(2) endeavors to understand the Bible as the various writers intended what they wrote to be understood and as their original reading audience would have understood it from their cultural, historical, and salvation history perspective,

(3) considers words, literary forms, and statements according to their meaning in the original language as normative,

(4) endeavors to evaluate data objectively, and

(5) bases its conclusions on the weight of evidence. This method requires either special training in biblical languages and the history and milieu of antiquity, or reliance on source material prepared by persons with such training. Since about 1940 most Adventist Bible scholars have followed this method.

Since about 1970 a hybrid of these two methods known as the historical-grammatical method⁷¹ has attained limited popularity among Seventh-day Adventist Bible scholars and lay people, and major support among church administrators. Why? It consists of historical method procedures under the control of proof-text presuppositions and principles, which enable it to provide apparent scholarly support for traditional conclusions. It is highly subjective, aspires to dominate and eventually control all official Adventist study of the Bible, and has more or less controlled General Conference doctrinal policy for the past thirty years

Let us emulate the sincerity and diligence of our spiritual forefathers in their study of God's Word. We have no valid reason to criticize them because of the flaws we find in their

understanding of the Bible.⁷² Let us remember that they did the best they knew how as they studied the Bible by the proof-text method, the generally accepted method of that time.⁷³

They did not have access to the more accurate ancient Bible manuscripts that we do today, nor to our knowledge of ancient Hebrew and Greek or the history of ancient times. In taking note of flaws in the traditional interpretation of Daniel 8:14 we can be grateful for their dedication, build on their labors, and be faithful in our time as they were in theirs, to the best it is our privilege to know.⁷⁴

8. "Rightly Explaining" Daniel 8:14

The first imperative for comprehending the prophecies of Daniel in the sense Inspiration intended is an objective frame of mind divested of every personal, subjective, modern presupposition with respect to their import.

The second imperative is to identify the circumstances set forth in Daniel 1 to 6 and 9:1-23, which provide the historical background within which Inspiration set its five prophetic passages and from which it intended Daniel and his intended readers to understand them. Accordingly, in order to understand those passages as Inspiration intended them to be understood we must do so with that historical perspective in our minds, and from the same perspective of salvation history as Daniel and his intended readers did. Any interpretation that ignores or controverts that historical perspective and / or the salvation history perspective of their time is automatically suspect and imposes an alien, uninspired interpretation on those prophecies.

The first six chapters of the Book of Daniel recount the exile of Daniel and his compatriots to Babylon "in the third year of the reign of Jehoiakim of Judah," which is dated to 606/5 B.C., and their experiences during the seventy years of exile foretold by Jeremiah in chapter 29:1-14. According to Daniel 9:1, in "the first year of Darius" (which is dated to 537/6 B.C. by Jewish inclusive reckoning), Daniel had been in exile for exactly seventy years. But as yet there was no visible evidence that release from exile was imminent. Accordingly, Daniel prayed the importunate prayer for release from exile and for restoration recorded in chapter 9:4-19.

While Daniel was still praying the angel Gabriel reappeared⁷⁵ and said, "I have now come out to give you wisdom and understanding. At the beginning of your supplications a word went out [obviously in heaven], and I have come to declare it, for you are greatly beloved. So consider the word and understand the vision." Gabriel thereupon repeats that "word" verbatim (verse 24), as he had promised, and proceeds to explain it in verses 25 to 27.

It is of crucial importance to note that Gabriel explicitly identifies the "word" that "went out to restore and build Jerusalem" at the commencement of the seventy weeks of years as "the word" that "went out"---in heaven---while Daniel was praying.⁷⁶ That "word"⁷⁷ was obviously one that only God Himself (and not an earthly monarch) could possibly have issued! On the authority of no less a person than the angel Gabriel, the "seventy weeks" of years thus began in 537 B.C., not eighty years later in 457 B.C.!

Gabriel's explanation of that "word" in verses 25-27 very briefly sketched the future of God's covenant people during the seventy weeks of years, and its climax in the ruthless oppression of "the prince who is to come" during the seventieth of the seventy "weeks," which he had already foretold in chapter 8:9-13 and explained in verses 19 to 25.⁷⁸

As already noted, Daniel 9:23-25 begins the seventy weeks of years at the time the "word" was issued in heaven, in 537 B.C. In the same way, contextual identification of the "he" of verse 27 identifies events of history that mark their close in the seventieth of the seventy "weeks." It is universally accepted that the immediate antecedent of a personal pronoun identifies the person to whom it refers unless the context unambiguously specifies otherwise. Accordingly, verse 26 identifies the immediate antecedent of the pronoun "he" in verse 27, who "make[s] a strong covenant with many" for the seventieth of the seventy "weeks" and "make[s] sacrifice and offering cease" during the last half of the "week," as the evil "prince who is to come"---not the "anointed prince" of verses 25-26!

Chapter 11:23 confirms the fact that his alias, the last king of the north, does, indeed make such a covenant with people in "alliance" with him. Also, his fate set forth in verse 27, "the decreed end is poured out on the desolator," is equivalent to the horn-king of chapter 8:25

being "broken, and not by human hands," and to the last king of the north in chapter 11 who "come[s] to his end, with no one to help him."⁷⁹

Chapter 9:24-27 thus provides an exact but much more complete explanation of chapter 8:13-14's question and answer about events between Daniel's time and "the appointed time of the end" "many days from now" when "the vision of the evenings and the mornings" was to meet its fulfillment.⁸⁰ Isn't that exactly what Gabriel said the audition of 9:24-27 was supposed to do?⁸¹

Such is Daniel's perspective of salvation history. In order to understand chapters 8 and 9 as heaven intended them to be understood, we must imagine ourselves in Daniel's historical circumstances and view them from his perspective of salvation history in order to form an accurate understanding of what was revealed to him.

Daniel's Perspective of Salvation History

Daniel's perspective of salvation history was a composite of the visions of chapters 2 and 7, each with its explanation, and chapter 8 with its three-fold explanation in chapters 8, 9, and 11-12. It consisted of a series of universal kingdoms⁸² followed by a period of disintegration and fragmentation,⁸³ which Gabriel told Daniel would be a "troubled time" (9:25)⁸⁴.

At the "appointed time of the end ... many days from now"---after sixty-nine of the "seventy weeks of years"⁸⁵ ---there would be an unprecedented "time of anguish" for God's people in which they would be "trampled," their power shattered,⁸⁶ their land and city devastated,⁸⁷ their loyalty and faithfulness to God tested,⁸⁸ their covenant with Him and its prescribed system of worship abolished,⁸⁹ and an idolatrous system of worship enforced.⁹⁰ As a result of this attempt to obliterate the knowledge and worship of the true God, many Jews would apostatize and enter into a "covenant" with their oppressor.⁹¹

The duration of this time of anguish for God's people is given variously as (1) "a time, two times, and half a time" = three and a half years,⁹² as (2) the last half of the seventieth of the seventy "weeks" = also three and a half years,⁹³ and as (3) the time during which 2300 evening and morning sacrifices would normally have been offered = 1150 literal days = three years, two months, and 10 days⁹⁴ within the three and a half years of "anguish."⁹⁵

At the close of this time of anguish the Ancient of days would sit in judgment and "the decreed end" would be "poured out upon the desolator," who would thus "come to his end with no one to help him" and be "broken" but "not by human hands."⁹⁶ Simultaneously, the sanctuary would "be restored to its rightful state," the Ancient of Days would vindicate His faithful people and award them an "everlasting kingdom," Michael would arise to deliver them, the righteous dead would be raised to life eternal, the "wise," including Daniel, would enter upon their eternal reward and shine like the brightness of the firmament for ever and ever.⁹⁷

The prophecies of Daniel locate this time of anguish (1) during the "time, two times, and half a time" of Daniel 7:25, (2) at or near "the end" of the "rule" of the four horn Greek era of chapter 8:8, 21-23, (3) during the last half of the seventieth of the seventy weeks of chapter 9:24-27, and (4) during the reign of the last king of the north of chapter 11:20-45.

Obviously Daniel's perspective of salvation history was vastly different from ours---by more than two thousand years! But by the sure word of his angel mentor that was the perspective from which he and the angel Gabriel then viewed the future. It is the identical format set forth in the Old Testament.³⁵ To ignore or deny it is a major violation of the sola Scriptura principle, and to say that neither Daniel nor Gabriel knew what they were talking about! It is an important part of in-depth study of the Bible to read it from its own historical and salvation history perspectives, in order to understand and appreciate its message for us in our time!

Daniel's perspective of salvation history thus explicitly invalidates the historicist concept of predictive prophecy. Furthermore, his perspective was identical with that of the Old Testament as a whole.⁹⁸

Four KJV Translation Errors That Led Pioneer Adventists Astray

Four major translation errors in the KJV of Daniel 8:14 and 9:25-26, of which William Miller and pioneer Adventists were obviously unaware, led them, unwittingly, astray.⁹⁹

The KJV of Daniel 8:14 reads: "Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." Here and in chapter 9 the KJV inaccurately reflects the Hebrew text of Daniel at four specific points. In the original Hebrew text and in the NRSV it reads: "For two thousand and three hundred evenings and mornings; then the sanctuary shall be restored to its rightful state."

The Hebrew word for "days," *yamim*, is not in the Hebrew text of 8:14, which reads simply *erev boquer*, "evening morning." "Days" is interpretation, not translation. When Daniel meant "days" he consistently wrote "days," *yamim*.¹⁰⁰ Wherever the words *erev* and *boquer* occur in a sanctuary context (as in 8:14), without exception they always refer to the evening and morning sacrificial worship services or to some other aspect of the sanctuary and its ritual services. These sacrifices were offered *tamid*, "regularly," late every afternoon before sunset and early every morning after sunrise. See, for example, Exodus 29:38-42 and Numbers 28:3-6. *Erev* sometimes precedes *boquer* in view of the fact that Hebrew custom began each day at sunset, with *erev* referring specifically to the waning light of day associated with sunset and *boquer* the rising light of day associated with sunrise, not to the dark and light portions of a 24-hour day.

The traditional interpretation considers *erev boquer*, "evening morning," a composite term meaning a 24-hour day. But according to verse 26 *haerev we haboquer*, "the evening and the morning," are discrete entities, as the repeated definite article requires. The question of verse 13, and thus the answer of verse 14 both focus on the sanctuary and the time during which its continual (*tamid*) burnt offering was banned. Accordingly, *erev boquer* in verse 14 is to be understood in a cultic sanctuary context specifically with reference to the *tamid* (continual) burnt offering.

Note also that the question of verse 13, to which verse 14 is the inspired answer, asks for how long the *tamid*, the "regular burnt offering" already mentioned in verse 11, would be "trampled." In place of *tamid* in verse 13, however, verse 14 substitutes the expression *erev boquer*, thereby calling attention to the fact that the two are synonymous terms for the same thing, the evening and morning sacrificial worship services. Indeed, both terms occur together in the passages noted above with respect to the two daily worship services. (In

8:11 and 14 the NRSV---correctly---adds "burnt offering" to the term "regular," *tamid*, in recognition of the fact that *tamid* refers to the daily, or regular, burnt offerings.)

The word *tamid*, "continual(ly)," "regular(ly)," occurs 104 times in the Old Testament, 51 times in connection with the sanctuary ritual, 53 times otherwise. More than half of the 51 sanctuary-related occurrences are in connection with the daily burnt offering (32 of the 51 times); and 19 times of the bread of the presence, the lamp, the cereal offering, and other aspects of the sanctuary and its ritual.

The Hebrew word *nitsdaq* never means "cleansed," as the KJV translates it. *Nitsdaq* is the passive form of the verb *tsadaq*, "to be right," and means "to be set right," or as the NRSV renders it, "to be restored to its rightful state." Had Daniel meant "cleansed" he would have used the word *taher*, which does mean "cleansed" and always refers to ritual cleansing in contrast to *tsadaq*, which always connotes moral rightness.¹⁰¹

Daniel 8:14 is concerned with the meaning of the sacrificial worship service, not with whether it was performed correctly. It affirmed Israel's continued loyalty to God and commitment to its covenant relationship with Him, at the beginning and again at the close of each day. The KJV based its rendering of *nitsdaq* as "cleansed" on the Latin Vulgate, which reads *mundabitur*, and the Greek Septuagint, which reads *katharisthesetai*, both of which denote ritual cleansing, probably reflecting the ritual cleansing of the temple after its desecration by Antiochus IV Epiphanes in 167 B.C., as recorded in 1 Maccabees 4:36-54.¹⁰²

The KJV's "the Messiah the Prince" in Daniel 9:25 and "Messiah" in verse 26, respectively, constitute *interpretation* of the Hebrew text, not translation of it. The Hebrew text reads "an anointed, a prince" or "an anointed prince" in 9:25 and "an anointed" in verse 26. In so doing, the KJV commits a double error by: (1) rendering the Hebrew indefinite as definite, and (2) arbitrarily identifying the anointed prince as Jesus Christ. This double error automatically led pioneer Adventists to another, even grosser, error in verse 27, considered below.

To be sure, the English word "messiah" accurately transliterates the Greek *messias*, which in turn transliterates the Hebrew *mashshiach*, and the English word "Christ" accurately translates the Greek *messias*. But the KJV translators had no legitimate reason for rendering the Hebrew indefinite as definite and identifying the anointed prince of Daniel 9:25 and 26 as Jesus Christ.

The KJV rendering "seven weeks, and three score and two weeks" in 9:25, implying a total of sixty-nine "weeks" between "the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem" and the coming of its "Messiah the Prince," grossly misrepresents the Hebrew syntax of verse 25.

Hebrew syntax requires that the seven-week period be the time between the "going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem" and the "anointed prince" referred to, and that the "threescore and two weeks" refer to the duration of the "troubulous times" during which the "street" and the "wall" remain built prior to the evil "prince that shall come" of the following verse. The NRSV renders the Hebrew syntax of verse 25 *correctly*: "... there shall be seven weeks; and for sixty-two weeks it [Jerusalem] shall be built again ..." Verse 26 confirms the fact that the seven weeks and the sixty-two weeks are two discrete periods of time, not one composite time period. Hebrew usage throughout the Old Testament confirms this conclusion.

Those who formulated the traditional Adventist interpretation of Daniel 8:14 were led astray by these four KJV errors. Had they been working directly from the Hebrew text of Daniel, or an accurate English translation, they would never have contrived the traditional Adventist interpretation.

Their second error was adoption of the day-for-a-year interpretation of Bible prophecy. That pseudo principle, inherent in the historicist interpretation of Bible prophecy, was invented in the ninth century by the Jewish scholar Nahawendi, as a device by which to make Daniel's prophecies relevant to his day. Catholic scholars subsequently adopted and used it until certain other Catholic scholars, and later Protestants, based their identification of the papacy as the antichrist of Bible prophecy on it. Thereupon Roman Catholics abandoned the day-for-a-year principle, whereas Protestants retained it as proof that Rome was "Babylon." Suffice it to note, here, that there is no Bible basis whatever for this so-called principle.¹⁰³

The Immediate Context of Daniel 8:14

The vision of chapter 8:1-12, the question of verse 13, and the explanation of verses 15 to 27 constitute the immediate context of verse 14. As a matter of fact chapter 8 itself identifies all four essential elements of verse 14: (1) its sanctuary, (2) why it needed cleansing or being "restored to its rightful state," (3) how long it had needed cleansing or restoration, and (4) when that cleansing or restoration would occur. According to verses 9-12, their cryptic little horn invades the "beautiful land" and overthrows the sanctuary located there--- obviously the sanctuary, or temple, in Jerusalem. Verse 14 itself specifies that the period of time during which the sanctuary would remain overthrown and its regular burnt offering suspended as the time during which 2300 "regular burnt offerings" would normally have been offered. With two such offerings each day, that would be 1150 literal twenty-four-hour days, or three years, two months, and ten days. When would this occur? Verses 21 to 25 specify that all of this, including the cleansing or restoration of the sanctuary to its rightful state, would take place soon after the close of the four-horn (Hellenistic) Greek era of the prophecy.

Verse 13, the question to which verse 14 is the answer, identifies the "evenings and mornings" as an equivalent term for its "regular burnt offering."¹⁰⁴ The nature of the sanctuary's cleansing or restoration is explained in the proximate context of the rest of the Book of Daniel, which also identifies other events that accompany or follow its cleansing or restoration.

Verses 11 and 12 of chapter 8 attribute the trampling of the sanctuary mentioned in verses 11-13 to the cryptic little horn of verse 8, which verses 21 to 23 identify as "a king of bold countenance" at "the end" of the four horn (Greek) era of the vision. Accordingly, context explicitly identifies the restoration of the sanctuary to its rightful state in verse 14 as removal of the damage caused by the little horn. The sanctuary's overthrown, trampled state included, particularly, the taking away of its "regular burnt offering" and substitution of the "transgression that makes desolate"¹⁰⁵ in its place.

The answer of verse 14 substitutes the expression "evenings and mornings" for verse 13's question about "the regular burnt offering," thereby identifying them as equivalent terms for the same thing. With two such sacrifices each day, the time during which 2,300 evening and morning sacrifices would normally have been offered would be a period of 1,150 literal

days, or nearly three and a half literal years. Verse 26 identifies the time in history when this would happen as the "appointed time of the end ... many days from now," "at the end" of the "rule" of the four Greek (Hellenistic) horns of the male goat.¹⁰⁶

The immediate context of verse 14---chapter 8 itself---thus identifies all of the essential elements of the verse, but leaves the restoration of the sanctuary "to its rightful state" unexplained because Daniel fell ill.¹⁰⁷ As will be seen, events associated with that restoration are revealed elsewhere in Daniel. The traditional Adventist interpretation of Daniel 8:14 thus removes it completely from the immediate context in which Gabriel and Daniel placed it, in obvious violation of the sola Scriptura principle. The proximate context---Daniel 7, 9, and 10-12---clarifies matters still further.

Daniel 9 as Proximate, Continuing Context for 8:14

The traditional Adventist interpretation of Daniel 8:14 recognizes a relationship between chapters 8 and 9, but at three vital points misconstrues its contextual contribution to an accurate understanding of 8:14. This valid relationship is evident from (1) the fact that Gabriel had not been able to complete his commission to explain the vision of chapter 8,¹⁰⁸ (2) that when he reappears in 9:21-25 he summons Daniel to "understand" that vision, and (3) that his message in 9:24-27 provides the very information needed to complement his aborted explanation of 8:19-27.

The traditional interpretation assumes that the 70 "weeks" of years of 9:24 constitute the first 490 of its 2300 *erev boquer* construed as that many literal years during which the sanctuary is said to be desolate. But according to 9:24-26 the sanctuary is restored and in full operation during the first 69 of the 70 "weeks"! How can the same sanctuary be restored and in full operation¹⁰⁹ during the very time 8:13-14 has it "desolate"? This insoluble paradox, inherent in and indispensable to the traditional interpretation, constitutes it an oxymoron!

The second contextual anomaly implicit in and essential to the traditional interpretation is its identification of the *davar*, "word" (KJV "commandment"), that went out to restore and build Jerusalem,¹¹⁰ as the decree of Artaxerxes Longimanus in 457 B.C. But that decree¹¹¹ says nothing about rebuilding either Jerusalem or the temple, which had already been rebuilt and in operation for 59 years!¹¹²

Immediately prior to Gabriel's reappearance and message recorded in 9:20-27 Daniel had been pleading in prayer for God to restore His now desolate sanctuary in Jerusalem.¹¹³ At this point in Daniel's prayer Gabriel interrupts to announce that a *davar*, "word"¹¹⁴ (or "command," KJV) had already gone forth, obviously in heaven, in response to his prayer, and that he (Gabriel) had now come to "declare it" to Daniel. He forthwith repeats that "word"¹¹⁵ and explains it.¹¹⁶ Contextually, the "word" that "went out [motsa] to restore and rebuild Jerusalem"¹¹⁷ is the very "word" that "went out" (*yatsa*) in response to Daniel's prayer,¹¹⁸ and is quoted verbatim in verse 24! Gabriel assures Daniel that God Himself, not some earthly monarch, had already answered his fervent prayer! Obviously that "word"¹¹⁹ is one that only God Himself could possibly have issued, not some earthly monarch!

With considerable support even among presumably reputable Bible scholars, the traditional Adventist interpretation identifies the "he" of 9:27 who "make[s] a strong covenant with

many" renegade Jews for the seventieth of the seventy weeks,¹²⁰ and for half of the week" makes "sacrifice and offering cease," as the "Messiah the Prince" (KJV) of verses 25 and 26, meaning Christ. But the immediate antecedent of the pronoun "he" in verse 27 is the evil "prince that shall come" of verse 26, not the anointed prince of verse 25! Only reliance on the faulty KJV identification of the anointed prince of verse 25 as Christ, and identifying Him as the "he" of verse 27, is the traditional interpretation able to reckon backwards to identify the decree of Artaxerxes Longimanus in 457 B.C. as marking the beginning of the seventy "weeks" of years (and thus also of its 2300 years). Furthermore, the Hebrew *ein lo* of verse 26 (KJV "but not for himself," NRSV "shall have nothing") actually means that the cut off prince would have no successor. Thus to have either him or a successor reappear as the "he" of verse 27 makes verse 27 contradict verse 26! Another oxymoron!

Identifying the "he" of verse 27 as the evil "prince who is to come" of verse 26, however, makes verse 27 an exact parallel to the career of the little horn in chapter 8, who likewise "makes sacrifice and offering cease" and in their place sets up "an abomination that desolates."¹²¹ Remember, as pointed out above, that the angel Gabriel specifically presented 9:25-27 as a continuing explanation of the prophecy of chapter 8. To complete the parallel, he now¹²² tells Daniel that "the decreed end is poured out upon the desolator," as he had formerly told him (in chapter 8) that "the king of bold countenance" would "be broken, and not by human hands."¹²³

This contextual understanding of 9:27 automatically and conclusively locates the 2300 evenings and mornings" of 8:14, understood as the number of sacrifices that would normally be offered, two each day, during the course of 1150 days, within the 1260 days, or three and a half years of the last half of the seventieth "week" of years of chapter 9---the "appointed time of the end" in the "latter part" of the four-horn era¹²⁴ when the little horn of verses 9-13, 23-27 appears on the prophetic stage in what was, in Daniel's time, "the distant future."¹²⁵

9. Flaws in the Sanctuary Doctrine

There can be no question as to the sincerity, diligence, and integrity of those who formulated the traditional Adventist interpretation of Daniel 8:14. It is equally obvious that they were following the flawed principles of the proof-text method: (1) In four major instances they adopted translation errors where the KJV misrepresents the Hebrew text. (2) They completely ignored the literary context in which Daniel 8:14 occurs. (3) They likewise ignored the historical context specified by the first six chapters and chapter 9:1-19 of the book, within which its several prophetic pericopes were given and to which they specifically applied. (4) They did not take into account the salvation history perspective specified by the book (and the entire Old Testament),¹²⁶ within which Daniel 8:14 occurs and to which Daniel specifically applies it. As set forth in the preceding section of this paper, *sola Scriptura* and the historical method both require that these factors be taken into account.

Today, anyone who makes exegetical blunders such as these is automatically dismissed as an unreliable Bible student. Had the pioneers of our message been following the principles of the historical method they would never have come to the conclusions they did---and never experienced the bitter disappointment on October 22, 1844. Let us emulate their

sincerity, earnestness, and devotion to the Word of God, and be true to the best we know today, as they were in their time!

In comparison with the exegetical requirements set forth in the two preceding sections (7 and 8 above), the traditional interpretation of Daniel 8:14 ignores ...

... the historical context provided by chapters 1 to 6 and 9:4-19, within which Inspiration placed it--the point in history when the seventy years of exile foretold by Jeremiah came to a close and the restoration era was about to begin.

... the salvation history perspective of Daniel's time, and of the entire Bible.^{35, 131} ... the Hebrew text of Daniel 8:14 and 9:25-26 at four major points, identified in section 8 above.¹⁰³

... the immediate context of 8:14 in chapter 8 itself, which explicitly identifies (1) the sanctuary mentioned in verse 14 as that located by verses 9 to 11 in "the beautiful land," Judea; (2) its desolation of the sanctuary as that caused by the little horn in verses 11 to 13, and (3) when that desolation would take place, at the close of the (Hellenistic) Greek era, in verses 21 to 23. Accordingly, reference by analogy to the heavenly sanctuary of the Book of Hebrews is irrelevant.

... the fact that 9:24-26 has the sanctuary restored and in full operation during the very time that 8:13-14 has it desolate and out of operation. This contradiction, inherent in and essential to the traditional interpretation of Daniel 8:14 which requires that the seventy weeks of years be considered the first segment of the 2,300 "days," renders it an exegetical oxymoron.

The day-for-a-year idea applied to Bible prophecy appears first in the ninth century Karaite Jewish scholar Nahawendi's attempt to relate the fulfillment of Daniel's prophecies to events of his day. Modern reliance on the day-for-a-year "principle" in the interpretation of Bible prophecy originated with (1) the mistaken KJV rendition of the Hebrew *erev boquer* ("evenings mornings") in Daniel 8:14 as "days," when as a matter of fact *erev boquer* is verse 14's contextual equivalent of "regular burnt offering" in the question of verse 13, to which verse 14 is the inspired answer, and with (2) the endeavor to correlate these supposed "days" with the "seventy weeks" of Daniel 9:24. The expression "seventy weeks" is simply use of the jubilee system of expressing 490 years as 49 jubilees, each of its ten "jubilees" consisting of 49 literal years. There is absolutely no Bible basis whatever for citing Daniel 9 as evidence for the day-for-a-year idea.

It should be noted that the "days" of Numbers 14:34 during which representatives of the twelve tribes had spied out the land of Canaan were not prophetic of the years God sentenced the Israelites to wander in the desert. Those years were, rather, judicial, sentencing the unbelieving wanderers for their lack of faith in God's promise to give them the land of Canaan. The 390 "days" of Ezekiel 4:6 during which God directed the prophet to lie on one side and then the other, represented that many past years of apostasy. Those "days" were in no sense prophetic of the past years of apostasy.

Under the caption "Christ's Ministry in the Heavenly Sanctuary" article 23 of Fundamental Beliefs reads as follows, with a distinction between that which accurately reflects Scripture and is biblically relevant in bold face, and the sanctuary doctrine's flawed interpretation of Bible passages in ordinary type:

There is a sanctuary in heaven, the true tabernacle which the Lord set up and not man. In it Christ ministers in our behalf, making available to believers the

benefits of His atoning sacrifice offered once for all on the cross. He was inaugurated as our great High Priest and began His intercessory ministry at the time of His ascension. In 1844, at the end of the prophetic period of 2300 days, He entered the second and last phase of His atoning ministry. It is a work of investigative judgment which is part of the ultimate disposition of all sin, typified by the cleansing of the ancient sanctuary on the Day of Atonement. In that typical service the sanctuary was cleansed with the blood of animal sacrifices, but the heavenly things are purified with the perfect sacrifice of the blood of Jesus. The investigative judgment reveals to heavenly intelligences who among the dead are asleep in Christ and therefore, in Him, are deemed worthy to have part in the first resurrection. It also makes manifest who, among the living, are abiding in Christ, keeping the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus, and in Him therefore, are ready for translation into His everlasting kingdom. This judgment vindicates God in saving those who believe in Jesus. It declares that those who have remained loyal to God shall receive the kingdom. The completion of this ministry of Christ will mark the close of human probation before the second Advent.

The first part of the preceding statement accurately reflects the description of Christ's ministry on our behalf since His return to heaven nearly two thousand years ago. The last part has no basis whatever in Scripture. To be in harmony with the *sola Scriptura* principle it should be deleted from the Fundamental Beliefs resume of Adventist beliefs and replaced by an amplification of Christ's ministry as set forth in the Book of Hebrews.

The ephemeral umbilical cord is essential to life prior to birth, but totally irrelevant thereafter. May it be that the traditional sanctuary doctrine was a sort of spiritual umbilical cord God permitted as a means of reviving advent expectancy, but should be discarded once it had served its purpose? "The Son of Man is coming at an unexpected hour," "the night is far gone, the day is near," "let us put on the armor of light." "What sort of persons ought you to be in leading lives of holiness and godliness" while "waiting for and hastening the day of God."?¹²⁷ May it be that God overlooked this defect in their understanding of Daniel 8:14 and honored their sincerity, in view of the fact that the traumatic experience of October 22, 1844 had the effect of reviving the state of advent expectancy Jesus long ago commended to His followers: "Keep awake, therefore, for you do not know on what day your Lord is coming."¹²⁸

The basic cause of the bitter disappointment was unawareness of the fact that, when given, Daniel's preview of the future applied specifically to the Jewish captives in Babylon anticipating return to their homeland, and to His plans for them culminating in the establishment of His eternal reign of righteousness in the long ago. This becomes obvious when the historical circumstances of Daniel's time and its perspective of salvation history---all explicit in the book itself---are taken into consideration. The presupposition that Daniel 8:14, when given, anticipated events of our time was the basic cause of the 1844 error and the resulting disappointment. Continued disappointment will be inevitable until this error is recognized and corrected, and the historicist principle on which it is based, is abandoned.

10. The Sanctuary Doctrine and *Sola Scriptura*

The traditional Adventist sanctuary doctrine is based on the historicist principle, or method, of prophetic interpretation. Consequently, those who follow that method automatically find the doctrine flawless. On the other hand, those who follow the historical principle, or

method, find it bristling with flaws. As a result, differences of opinion with respect to the sanctuary doctrine can be resolved only by objectively testing the presuppositions and methodology on which it is based, by the *sola Scriptura* principle. The two methods are as mutually exclusive and irreconcilable as day and night, and a choice between them is decisive for the study of Bible prophecy.

Historicism is based on the untested pre-concept that the modern reader's perspective of salvation history is inherent in Bible prophecy and therefore in full harmony with the *sola Scriptura* principle. According to the historicist principle the modern reader of the Bible is to understand its statements with respect to the end time of human history and associated events, in terms of our modern perspective of salvation history, with an uninterrupted, continuous fulfillment of Bible prophecy throughout the two thousand years since Bible times. The sanctuary doctrine and its advocates have always taken this principle for granted and never tested its presumed validity objectively, that is, by the Bible itself. This was true at Glacier View in August 1980. It is equally true of the subsequent GC-appointed Daniel and Revelation Committee and its seven-volume official report, which presupposes the inherent validity of historicism but never attempts to test or defend it objectively by the *sola Scriptura* principle.

On the other hand, the historical principle begins with objective attention to prophetic statements of the Bible in terms of their import as determined by the historical circumstances and salvation history perspective within which they were given and to which they were intended to apply. This principle is not adopted as a subjective pre-concept, but on the objective basis of plain *sola Scriptura* evidence, as illustrated in Sections 7 and 8 above with respect to Daniel's own explicit historical and salvation history perspective. Both are inherent in the Book of Daniel and obvious when read objectively.

Section 8 above examines the historical sections of the Book of Daniel and Daniel's own perspective of salvation history with the objective of determining the historical circumstances and salvation history perspective as a basis for understanding the import of its prophetic sections. Daniel's salvation history perspective is identical with that of the Old Testament as a whole, as my article "The Role of Israel in Old Testament Prophecy"¹²⁹ in volume 4 of the SDA Bible Commentary demonstrates. Chapter 4 of my 725-page unpublished book manuscript *The Eschatology of Daniel*, "The Old Testament Perspective of Salvation History," provides replete Bible evidence for the conclusion that it anticipates the climax of human history at the close of Old Testament times, or soon thereafter.

Jesus and the New Testament writers unanimously reiterate this Old Testament perspective of salvation history and anticipate His promised return at the climax of New Testament times. In 36 pages chapter 12 of *The Eschatology of Daniel*, "The New Testament Perspective of Salvation History," covers this aspect of the subject in considerable detail.

In summary, at the beginning of His public ministry Jesus announced as the theme of His mission: "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God has come near, repent and believe in the good news." What was fulfilled? The time prophecies of Daniel, alone in the Old Testament, identify the "time" to which Jesus here refers. Thus, on no less than the authority of Jesus Himself, fulfillment of the "time" specified by Daniel was near when Jesus appeared in fulfillment of Old Testament anticipation of His coming. During the course of His sermon in the synagogue at Nazareth He declared concerning the Messianic prophecy of Isaiah 61:1-3: "Today this scripture has been fulfilled in your hearing."

During the course of Jesus' response to the disciples' inquiry concerning the destruction of the Temple, to which He had just referred, the "sign" of His promised return and "the end of the age" was, "When you see the desolating sacrilege standing in the holy place spoken of by the prophet Daniel ... know that he is near, at the very gates. Truly I tell you, this generation will not pass away until all these things, [specifically including His coming in the clouds of heaven to gather His elect]¹³⁰ have taken place."

That Jesus specifically intended His remarks concerning the prophecy of Daniel being fulfilled in His disciples' own generation is evident from (1) His use of the pronouns "you" and is His disciples' generation is evident from His repeated "your" twelve times throughout His discourse, and (2) their repeated use of such expressions as "the end of the times," "the coming of the Lord is at hand," "it is the last hour," "these last days," "the time is near," He is "coming soon," "the time has grown very short," "the end of the ages has come," "these last days," and "yet a little while," nearly forty times when referring to Jesus' anticipated return.¹³¹ John the revelator specifically says that everything in the Book of Revelation "must soon take place," and Jesus assures him four times "I am coming soon," and the last of which, "surely I am coming soon."¹³²

There is not the slightest suggestion or hint anywhere in either the Old or the New Testaments that Jesus' return would be postponed more or less indefinitely beyond Bible times. The Bible evidence is all explicitly to the contrary. The Bible itself knows nothing whatever about the historicist interpretation of its prophecies, a concept that is gratuitously imposed upon them. If Gabriel and Daniel were here today they would inevitably render the verdict of *sola Scriptura* against historicism and in favor of a historical understanding of Bible prophecy, including that of the Book of Daniel, and insist on the Bible's own historical and salvation history perspectives! The historicist principle by which Adventists have consistently understood and interpreted Bible prophecy has, ever since the beginning, imposed our uninspired modern perspective of salvation history on it, and thereby been in unwitting violation of the *sola Scriptura* principle. In contrast, the historical principle honors the Bible's own perspective of salvation history, within which its prophetic messages were given and to which they were intended to apply. It thereby consistently honors the *sola Scriptura* principle. Let us not soon forget that the historicist interpretation of Bible prophecy has ever been and continues to be responsible for the loss of many otherwise dedicated leaders and the defection of uncounted hundreds of otherwise faithful Seventh-day Adventists. It has, in addition, diverted considerable time, attention, and substantial resources of the church from its mission to the world.

Surely it is high time for responsible church leaders to awake to the situation and do something about it. The obscurantist 1600-page, 5-volume Daniel and Revelation Committee report on Daniel accepts and consistently applies the historicist principle to Bible prophecy---officially for the church. Do we want the twenty-first century to witness the fulfillment of Christ's promise to return, or do we prefer to repeat our pathetic historicist past complacently and indefinitely into the future, and thereby alienate the respect and confidence of biblically literate Adventists and non-Adventists?

11. Obscurantism and the Sanctuary Doctrine

Webster defines obscurantism as "depreciation of or positive opposition to enlightenment or the spread of knowledge, esp. a policy ... of deliberately making something obscure or withholding knowledge from the general public." Here, the word "obscurantism" is used in

the specific sense of making presumably authoritative decisions and/or statements with respect to the sanctuary doctrine on the basis of untested, preconceived opinions and/or without first weighing all of the available evidence on the basis of sound, recognized principles of exegesis and basing conclusions exclusively on the weight of all the evidence.

Obscurantism has characterized the official response of the church to every question raised with respect to the traditional interpretation of Daniel 8:14, the sanctuary doctrine, and the investigative judgment. In at least most instances this obscurantism has been inadvertent and not intentional, but its effect has been the same as if it had been intentional. It is high time for the church to be done with the traditional clichés with which it has heretofore responded to questions regarding the sanctuary doctrine. It is time to face up to and to deal fairly and objectively with all of the evidence.

A Window of Hope and Opportunity at Mid-Century

Elder R. R. Figuhr's twelve years as president of the General Conference at mid-century (1954-1966) provided the church with an era of wise leadership and openness in which administrators and trained Bible scholars worked together harmoniously and effectively in resolving biblical and doctrinal questions. Over the preceding fifteen years the church had developed a community of trained, responsible Bible scholars whose professional expertise Elder Figuhr respected and trusted, and who, in turn, respected and appreciated his wise leadership. An open, happy, and rewarding working relationship developed between them that was good for the church.

Another important aspect of that mid-century era of good will and cooperation was the spirit of consensus and harmony among the Bible scholars of the church in which the sometimes bitter doctrinal factionalism¹³³ of the earlier decades of the century had disappeared. For this two factors were responsible, the first being the Bible Research Fellowship, pioneer professional organization of Bible Scholars, and second, the *SDA Bible Commentary*.

At their 1940 meeting in Takoma Park the North American college Bible teachers authorized the formation of a professional organization in which they could work together on matters of exegesis and doctrine, share the results of their study with one another, and benefit from one another's constructive criticism.¹³⁴ This organization became a reality three years later--1943--in the Bible Research Fellowship (BRF),¹³⁴ of which Dr. L. L. Caviness was chairperson and I secretary throughout its brief lifetime of approximately ten years. We were teaching together in the religion department at Pacific Union College.

Eventually, BRF membership rose to 250 and, with one exception, included all college level Bible Teachers around the world. Many others, including seventeen General Conference persons, were dues-paying members. During those ten years more than 90 formal papers were considered and shared with members.¹³⁵ At the Bible teachers' 1950 meeting at Pacific Union College, responses to a questionnaire found complete agreement with respect to every major, divisive exegetical and doctrinal issue over the preceding fifty years!¹³⁶ At that 1950 meeting BRF made a report of its operations, a formal vote of appreciation for BRF was taken, and all joined in singing the Doxology.

In 1951, on behalf of BRF, I proposed to the General Conference that it establish a permanent committee to replace BRF.¹³⁷ The 1952 Autumn (now Annual) Council accepted my proposal and established the Biblical Research Committee (BRC) of the General

Conference. Thereupon Dr. Caviness, present as a delegate, formally handed over BRF operations to BRC. Simultaneously transferring from Pacific Union College to the Review and Herald Publishing Association to edit the Bible Commentary, I was appointed a charter member of BRC. After several years, for a still higher level of continuity and effective service to the church, I proposed that the committee become an institute.¹³⁸ This was voted in 1975, whereupon BRC became the Biblical Research Institute (BRI), which it remains today (2002).

The second unifying factor was production of the seven-volume SDA Bible Commentary (1952-1957),¹³⁹ in which a team of approximately fifty writers and editors participated.¹³⁹ Prior to publication each volume was read and criticized by ten church leaders around the world, who were paid for their criticisms.¹⁴⁰ Some critical sections were read and criticized by 125 such readers. All criticisms were carefully evaluated, and where considered appropriate, accepted.

But during the late 1960's that brief mid-century era of openness, good will, progress, and cooperation between administrators and Bible scholars began imperceptibly to erode into the closed-minded, polarized, obscurantist, and theological witch-hunting that continues to the present time (2002). In order to understand this subtle change in the Adventist climate over the past thirty years, let us note first, the three architects of obscurantism primarily responsible for it. All three were southern Bible belt fundamentalists. We will also note several specific evidences of obscurantism.

Architects of Obscurantism

The role of this part of Section 11 on obscurantism in the church over the past 33 years is to explain how the present climate of obscurantism surreptitiously invaded and captured the church. Only a person who served the church through the preceding era of openness and mutual respect between administrators and Bible scholars at the General Conference level is in a position to appreciate the profound change that revolutionized Adventist theology, Biblical hermeneutics, and approach to doctrine during the decade of obscurantism (1969-1980).

The three principal architects of obscurantism introduced briefly below were all obviously sincere, dedicated individuals who conscientiously believed that their ultimate objective, or "end," justified whatever means they might employ to achieve that objective. For instance, they were never willing to enter into open, responsible dialog with those who did not share their perspective, but two of the three always, consistently put daggers in the backs of those whom they suspected of not sharing their point of view. In personal conversation the president of the General Conference admitted this to me. On the contrary, it was my privilege to converse personally with each of the "architects of obscurantism" named below, by which I came to understand their objectives and methods first hand. Realizing, eventually, that the last two of the three were simply implementing Elder Pierson's policy and objectives, I spent many hours at various times in conversation with him, the last being two or three hours on the chartered Pan-American flight returning from the General Conference Session in Vienna, in 1975.

These conversations were always positive, "friend of the court" in tone in which I dealt with principles and never mentioned anyone's name. In one of those conversations Elder Pierson cryptically told me that one of the other two "architects" was disseminating (among

GC personnel) inaccurate accusatory comments with respect to loyal Adventist scholars whom he considered theological renegades. In our correspondence following Elder Pierson's retirement in 1979 we both expressed appreciation for each other's friendship. In his last letter a short time before his death he wrote: "Through the years that we served together in Washington I always considered you as a friend. Though there may have been areas of differing opinions I had a warm feeling for you personally." In my last letter to him I expressed the same sentiment.

Robert H. Pierson was a gracious person, a dedicated Adventist, a gentleman in every way, but also a person with clear objectives and resolute determination to achieve them. A major objective of his administration as president of the General Conference was to replace the administrator / Bible scholar partnership that had developed during Elder Figuhr's administration with strict administrative control of the theological and doctrinal processes of the church.

During his thirteen years as president of the General Conference (1966-1979) Elder Pierson completely reversed the policy of his predecessor, R. R. Figuhr, with respect to biblical studies, doctrine, and cooperation with its community of Bible scholars. His very sincere but resolute aim was to restore the situation that had prevailed when he graduated from Southern Junior College in 1933 and left North America three years later for distinguished overseas service in India, the Caribbean, and South Africa, where he served with distinction until he was elected GC president thirty years later. For all practical purposes, in 1936 church administrators had been in exclusive control of theology and doctrine for the church. At that time there were no trained Adventist Bible scholars. Anyone who attended an "outside" university for training in such subjects as biblical languages, archeology, ancient history, and chronology was automatically considered *persona non grata* by every Adventist college board.¹⁴¹

Accordingly, Pierson distrusted the entire Adventist community of Bible scholars and set out to exclude them from meaningful participation in the Biblical and doctrinal deliberations of the church. In private conversation and in GC committees he repeatedly stated it to be his policy that administrators alone---and not in counsel with Bible scholars---should decide exegetical questions for the church. His first step toward implementing this policy took place at the Spring Meeting of the GC in 1969, which eliminated the Bible scholars of the church, *en masse*, from the Biblical Research Committee¹⁴²---a policy that was never implemented, however, due to vigorous protests from the Theological Seminary faculty. Undaunted, however, later that year he achieved his objective by adding numerous administrators and other non-scholars to BRC, and appointing a vice president of the GC to supervise the Biblical Research Committee (now Institute) and the GC office of biblical studies (BRI).¹⁴³

Also in the spring of 1969, Pierson invited a teacher at his *alma mater*, Southern Adventist College (now University), to chair BRC---Gordon M. Hyde---whose training was in communication---and who shared Pierson's Southern Bible belt fundamentalist theological perspective. Hyde protested that he was not trained in theology, but Pierson explained that he was to function as an administrator and not as a Bible scholar.¹⁴⁴ With this understanding Hyde accepted the invitation, and when, during his first years at the GC he was expected to reply to a theological question, he parried the question with the explanation that he was not a theologian.

Upon occasion Hyde could be devious and underhandedly maneuver to achieve his objectives. For instance, at the week-long GC-appointed Charismatic Committee at Camp Cumby-Gay in Georgia, Hyde announced that every speaker was to confine his remarks to thirty minutes. But he gave Hasel two full hours for his presentation. Upon another occasion he invited Hasel to a sensitive subcommittee hearing to which the Bible Research Committee had explicitly not appointed him, and provided him with copies of papers to be presented to that subcommittee which were to be shared with the appointed members of the committee only. Members of the subcommittee objected to this *faux pas* on Hyde's part, and as a result the subcommittee never met.¹⁴⁵

When, toward the close of my forty-seven years of service to the church Hyde repeatedly refused requests for a face-to-face reconciliation, I wrote him a nine-page letter "looking for reconciliation" in which I mentioned the problems that had arisen between us and made a final appeal for an opportunity to restore the friendly relationship we had enjoyed when he first came to the GC. But he never replied and was intransigent against ever meeting.

Hyde's major project designed to promote Hasel as leading theologian of the church was the series of three North American Bible Conferences, the first of which convened at Southern Adventist College, the second at Andrews University, and the third at Pacific Union College. He assigned Hasel the theme topic, biblical hermeneutics, and featured him on every panel discussion. The senior members of the Theological Seminary faculty were bypassed altogether or assigned relatively minor roles.¹⁴⁶

Hyde's attempt to have Hasel appointed dean of the Theological Seminary in the spring of 1974 (prior to the conferences) was aborted by the senior members of the faculty because of Hasel's interference with established Seminary procedures, his collusion with Gordon Hyde and the GC to control Seminary policy, and what the senior members of the faculty referred to as his "intolerable dogmatism."¹⁴⁷ Hasel did, however, become dean in 1980, but was demoted seven years later for plagiarism and his attempt to separate the Seminary from Andrews University.

Without expertise in biblical studies and theology himself, Hyde selected Gerhart F. Hasel, a former colleague at Southern Adventist College who had transferred to the Seminary in 1967 and whose ultra-conservative perspective he shared, as his mentor and personal adviser in biblical-theological matters. Hyde's objective was to elevate Hasel to be the leading Adventist theologian and dean of the Theological Seminary at Andrews University, where he would be in a position to indoctrinate the next generation of Adventist Bible scholars and pastors with his obscurantist hermeneutical perspective.

During his tenure as dean, Hasel made several teachers more experienced than he feel unwelcome at the Seminary and, in effect, froze them out---Drs. Sakai Kubo, Ivan Blazen, Fritz Guy, and Larry Geraty. All four were immediately invited to serve at other Adventist institutions of higher education, three of them as college or university presidents. Hasel forthwith appointed Seminary students he had trained, and who accepted his biblical hermeneutic, to replace them. He and Gordon Hyde subsequently forced two other religion faculty members---Drs. Lorenzo Grant and Edwin Zachrisson---to leave Southern Adventist College at approximately the same time as Jerry Gladson, and the president of the college resigned in protest. Hasel never approached his targets directly, in compliance with Matthew 18:15, but stuck verbal daggers in their back by denouncing them to administrators (who accepted his word without verifying it).

Over the decade 1969 to 1979 this triumvirate---Pierson, Hyde, and Hasel---conspired effectively together to gain control of Adventist Biblical studies, theology, and doctrine in harmony with their fundamentalist, obscurantist perspective.¹⁴⁸ Hasel's role was to control Adventist biblical studies and theology. Hyde's role was to devise procedures by which to implement Hasel's hermeneutical and theological perspective, Pierson's role was to protect Hasel and Hyde whatever they might attempt to do. I have set forth a documented record of thirty-one specific incidents in this conspiracy designed to implement Pierson's policy, in my forty-page paper *Architects of Crisis: A Decade of Obscurantism (1969-1979)*.

This explains the origin of the obscurantist climate in the church over the past thirty years and its unwillingness to deal objectively with the numerous exegetical anomalies in the traditional Adventist interpretation of Daniel 8:14 with its sanctuary and investigative judgment.

Aftermath of the Decade of Obscurantism

By the close of the decade of obscurantism (1969-1979) the goal of its three architects was firmly in place. Elder Pierson, ailing, retired a year early. Replaced as director of BRI, Gordon Hyde transferred to Southern Adventist College to be dean of the School of Religion. Gerhard Hasel became dean of the Theological Seminary for seven years (1980-1987), after which the General Conference demoted him, primarily because of his attempt to separate it from Andrews University.¹⁴⁹ That unanticipated event precipitated the founding of the Adventist Theological Society (ATS) the following year (1988), which was specifically designed to perpetuate the objectives of the decade of obscurantism in view of Hasel's loss of influence as Seminary dean.¹⁵⁰

In view of the fact that Gordon Hyde was then dean of the school of religion at Southern College (SC; now University) and Gerhard Hasel dean of the Theological Seminary at Andrews University, between 1980 and 1987, that both had been teachers at SC prior to 1969, and that Robert Pierson was a graduate (1933) of Southern when it was a junior college, it was no accident that the Adventist Theological Society (ATS) was founded at SC in 1988 by representatives of both institutions and that SC became its first headquarters until it later moved to Andrews University. Thus ATS has a solid basis in Adventist Southern Bible belt fundamentalism, which determines its hermeneutical and theological orientation.¹⁵⁰

Developments at the General Conference (GC) level since the decade of obscurantism (1969-1979) are likewise intimately related to these facts. Among these developments have been the following: (1) obscurantism in control at Glacier View,¹⁵¹ (2) obscurantism in relating to Walter Rea,¹⁵² (3) obscurantism at Consultations 1 and 2,¹⁵³ (4) obscurantism in the Daniel and Revelation Committee and its 5-volume report,¹⁵⁴ (5) obscurantism in the Methods of Bible Study report,¹⁵⁵ (6) obscurantism at the GC Biblical Research Institute, and thus in control of GC doctrinal policy,¹⁵⁶ (7) obscurantism in the way several dissenting faculty members at the Seminary and SAC have been treated,¹⁵⁷ (8) obscurantism motivating the present GC (IBMTE) and NAD committees formulating a low-tolerance-level policy with respect to dissent from official doctrinal policy. The triumvirate has proved to be eminently successful!

The Nature and *Raison d'Etre* of Doctrinal Obscurantism

Obscurantism is unwillingness to examine either purported or demonstrated facts objectively, and to encourage or coerce others into accepting subjective presuppositions. The classic illustration of obscurantism was president of the Flat Earth Society Simon Voliva's journey around the world in 1929, when upon his return he explained to society members that his trip had proved conclusively that planet earth is flat---by going in a circle on its flat surface!

Obscurantism is the result of a subjective state of mind in which one's unproved presuppositions take precedence over the weight of objective evidence to the contrary. It usually occurs when a person presumes to evaluate matters beyond the limits of his personal training and competence. Almost without exception that was the situation with a decided majority of Seventh-day Adventist leaders with respect to doctrinal matters for nearly a century after 1844. That explains the inability of many if not most of the participants in the historic 1919 Bible conference to resolve the doctrinal issues on its agenda. Adventist administrators untrained in reliable principles of biblical exegesis have, almost without exception, nevertheless traditionally functioned as the ultimate authority on matters of doctrine.

During the mid-century era (approximately 1940 to 1969) when, for the first time, Adventist Bible scholars began to practice objective methods of Bible study and church administrators, appreciating the value of their expertise, began to accept them as genuine partners in dealing with doctrinal matters. Biblical and doctrinal obscurantism gradually disappeared. After 1969, however, as obscurantism on the part of new church administrators gave the next decade (1969-1979) the unhappy sobriquet "decade of obscurantism."

For instance, during sessions of the Biblical Research Committee (now Institute) Gerhard Hasel repeatedly stated that it was a mistake even to try to be objective. In the plenary session of the Sanctuary Review Committee at Glacier View, for instance, he demonstrated this by emphatically declaring in the plenary session Monday afternoon, August 10, 1980, "God's only intention in Daniel 8:14 was to point forward to 1844!" This statement was met by a loud chorus of amens.

Obscurantism was also evident on the part of leaders in charge of study Group 2 at Glacier View on Monday morning. Twelve of the sixteen speeches in the group that morning favored Ford's point of view, but when chairman of the group---a GC vice president---summed up the opinion of the group for its report to the plenary session that afternoon, he reported the minority of four speeches as the view of the majority---an obvious instance of obscurantism. Following one of the speeches favoring Ford, the other vice president present responded, "We could never accept that!" In the plenary session that afternoon eleven of the fifteen speeches by Bible scholars likewise favored Ford's position on the same topic, but again administration took the consensus to be negative. From beginning to end obscurantism was in charge at Glacier View.

Obscurantism characterizes the tedious printed reports of the General Conference-appointed Daniel and Revelation Committee that functioned during the 1980s. (See below). It is likewise the guiding principle of the Adventist Theological Society, legitimate heir of Gerhard Hasel's hermeneutical legacy.

Obscurantism continues to be alive and well at the General Conference level. On November 15, 2000 I sent another major paper on Daniel 8:14 to some eighty Bible scholars and administrators, including the president of the General Conference. His reply was courteous to a "T", but he referred the paper to the Biblical Research Institute (BRI) with the comment that their reply would be his also. In January 2001 he sent me a copy of the evasive BRI reply, which reported that they had already considered and settled all of the biblical anomalies in the traditional sanctuary doctrine to which my paper had called attention, which I well knew was not so. Evidently obscurantism is still in charge at BRI and the General Conference.

In what does official obscurantism with respect to the sanctuary doctrine consist? Throughout the twentieth century, inclusive of Glacier View (1980) and the subsequent Daniel and Revelation Committee Series report, the General Conference has always countered flaws in the doctrine that have been called to its attention with ever more elaborate and evasive reasons adduced in favor of it. But it has never yet paid attention to the flaws themselves!

As long ago as 1934 W. W. Prescott called attention to this problem in a letter he wrote to W. A. Spicer, president of the General Conference: "I have waited all these years for someone to make an adequate answer to Ballenger, Fletcher and others on their positions re. the sanctuary but I have not seen or heard it."¹⁶⁰ Having been a member of the GC committees that met with Ballenger, Fletcher, and Conradi, Prescott realized that the official GC responses, both oral and published, offered presumed reasons for believing the sanctuary doctrine, but left the flaws to which the three had called attention completely unanswered! The same was true with respect to Dr. Ford at Glacier View and the subsequent Daniel and Revelation Committee report. Obscurantism still characterizes GC and BRI responses to valid questions regarding exegetical flaws in the sanctuary doctrine.

12. The Daniel and Revelation Committee

Eventually realizing that Glacier View had not settled the sanctuary issue, the General Conference appointed the Daniel and Revelation Committee (DRC) and assigned it the task of compiling what was intended to be definitive proof of the traditional interpretation of Daniel 8:14, the sanctuary, and the investigative judgment. The committee functioned during the 1980s under the auspices of the General Conference Biblical Research Institute (BRI) and published its report in seven volumes under the title Daniel and Revelation Committee Series (DRCS).

The five volumes of the DRCS series devoted to Daniel defend what is now considered the official response of the church to all questions regarding the sanctuary doctrine. Unwittingly, however, DRCS presents Adventist scholarship under the control of obscurantism. It does not address any of the contextual anomalies to which Section 8 above, "Rightly Explaining Daniel 8:14," calls attention!

One would have expected so important a committee as DRC to be composed, at least primarily, of a cross-section of the trained, experienced, known, and trusted Bible scholars of the church. It was not! They were intentionally excluded! The composition, or membership, of the committee bears the unmistakable imprint of Gerhard Hasel as the only one who could have selected its members. Why so? At the time, he was dean of the Theological Seminary, at the height of his career, and approximately half of DRC's eighteen members had been Seminary students during his fifteen years or so as a member of the

Seminary faculty. They were otherwise unknown to either the General Conference or the incumbent Bible scholars in the colleges of North America. And they all shared Hasel's hermeneutical perspective, as did all but three other members of the committee!

As reflected in the DRCS report the conclusions to which the committee came with respect to the sanctuary doctrine were thus determined before the committee ever met!

As set forth in the preface to volume 1 of the series, its interpretation is based on the historicist principle of prophetic interpretation, with respect to which it acknowledges that "Seventh-day Adventists stand virtually alone as exponents" today. Historicism interprets the predictive prophecy of the Bible as providing an uninterrupted continuum of fulfillment from Bible times to the present. In so doing it rejects the Bible's own, inherent, perspective of salvation history, which explicitly anticipates the climax of earth's history, Christ's promise to return, and the establishment of God's eternal, righteous dominion over all the earth at the close of Bible times.¹⁶¹ The DRCS reaffirmation of historicism is the crux of the issue to which this paper is addressed. It is the ultimate, "scholarly," demonstration of the perennial obscurantism that has characterized Adventism's perennial reaffirmation of the sanctuary doctrine for more than a century.

It is not the objective of this paper to review the five DRCS Daniel volumes in detail, but rather to evaluate the credibility of its historicist interpretation in terms of faithfulness to the sola Scriptura principle and to generally recognized principles of exegesis, particularly the crucial importance of context. Most of its 1600 pages are devoted to scholarly analyses of the text of Daniel that only a trained Bible scholar would be able to evaluate. Others would probably depend on their personal presuppositions with respect to the sanctuary doctrine in accepting or rejecting the conclusions to which the respective authors draw from the evidence they present.

1519 of the 1600 pages consist of articles by 18 authors. One author contributed 418 pages (28%), another 176 pages (12%), and a third 111 pages (9%), for a total of 705 pages. The other 15 authors contributed an average of 54 pages each, five of them as little as 12 pages or less.

The disorganized way in which DRCS deals with the sanctuary doctrine reflects the disorganized way in which its parent "committee" (DRC) must have operated. A committee is expected to integrate the contributions of its members into a consensus that represents the committee as a committee. A Bible translation conducted by a group of translators working together is considered to be far more accurate and reliable than one by a single individual, however qualified that individual may be. The consensus of the group tends to eliminate individual idiosyncrasies, however "scholarly" they may be. DRCS offers no such consensus or synthesis.

The eighteen DRCS authors are to be commended for their knowledge of ancient and recent literature relevant to the prophecies of Daniel, for their expertise in ancient Hebrew and cognate languages, and for their obviously diligent labors encapsulating all of this for modern readers. On the other hand, their labors were flawed because of their obviously overriding subjective use of this information in defense of an interpretation of the prophecies of Daniel that, as a matter of fact, contradicts what Daniel intended what he wrote to convey, as determined by context.¹⁵⁸

Almost without exception the DRCS authors tacitly assume the validity of the historicist principle as their fundamental presupposition and then, reasoning in a circle, offer what they

write as proof of that presupposition! At four major points they assume the accuracy of the KJV translation where it misrepresents the Hebrew text. They ignore the historical context within which Daniel locates his visions and to which he applies them, and his explicit, composite, salvation history perspective. In at least seven major instances they ignore or contradict Daniel's explicit statements in the context. And in the year of our Lord 2002 BRI, with the full approval of the GC, affirms DRCS as final and conclusive proof of the traditional understanding of Daniel 8:14, the sanctuary, and the investigative judgment! *Reductio ad absurdum* and the ultimate exercise in obscurantism posing as the highest level of scholarship Adventists have to offer!¹⁵⁸

In another noteworthy anomaly, the several chapters dealing with the supposed analogies between the sanctuary of Daniel 8:14 and the sanctuaries of the books of Leviticus and Hebrews is based on the supposition that its sanctuary is the heavenly sanctuary, whereas, as noted in section 8 above, context explicitly identifies it as the sanctuary, or temple, in Jerusalem. These two analogies are valid only if the context in Daniel permits them. It does not, period! Thus the several chapters devoted to the sanctuary in Leviticus and Hebrews are irrelevant to the exegesis of Daniel 8:14!

Dr. William Shea's protracted and convoluted chiasmic literary analysis of significant passages of Daniel throughout volume one of the DRCS and elsewhere, sometimes in explicit contradiction of context, may be impressive to the uninitiated but wearisome beyond measure and otherwise counterproductive. DRCS would have been vastly improved without his 418 pages of comment! Much of Dr. Gerhard Hasel's 176 pages consists of detailed analyses of non-Adventist interpretations of Daniel that are of no value or relevance to any Seventh-day Adventist studying the book of Daniel. Accordingly, some 40% of DRCS's 1519 pages of comment is really of little or no practical value with respect to clarifying the Adventist understanding of its prophetic pericopes. In many respects DRCS is a mute witness to the uncoordinated and irrelevant way in which DRC evidently functioned, yet BRI informs us that it has settled, once for all, every question about the traditional interpretation of Daniel 8:14, the sanctuary, and the investigative judgment!

Currently in progress is another General Conference project which seems destined to solidify the Pierson-Hyde-Hasel objective of transforming the Seventh-day Adventist Church from a community dedicated and open to the continued guidance of the Holy Spirit into an ever more accurate and complete "knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ,"¹⁶² into the closed, obscurantist, fundamentalist church that they envisioned---the International Board for Ministerial Training and Endorsement with its sub-boards in the various divisions. This project is already proving to be divisive, and has the possibility of repeating the fate that overtook the Lutheran Church---Missouri Synod in December 1976---schism.¹⁶³

13. A Permanent Remedy for Doctrinal Obscurantism.

The church urgently needs a *bona fide* consensus of all of its qualified Bible scholars in order to ascertain as accurately as possible all matters of biblical exegesis in harmony with the sola Scriptura principle, preliminary to the formulation of doctrinal statements in partnership with church administrators. Such a consensus can be achieved only by an organization that would provide its members with an opportunity to confer together apart from every influence or concern other than faithfulness to sola Scriptura and loyalty to the church.

(1) This organization would serve as an agency of, funded by, and dedicated to cooperating with the General Conference, with the specific objective of providing GC administrators with a *bona fide* consensus of its community of Bible scholars on all biblical and doctrinal matters. (2) It would participate with the GC in defining their working relationship. (3) It would select its name (for example, "Bible Scholars' Council on Biblical Exegesis"). (4) It would define its membership requirements, (4) select its officers and specify their terms of service, and (5) elect an executive committee and a permanent staff. (5) It would define its operating procedures, (6) set its own agenda, (7) receive and respond to requests from the GC, (8) select topics of its own for consideration, and (9) define its principles of exegesis.

(10) It would report to GC administration only, and not otherwise publicize its findings beyond scholarly circles. (11) Its reports to administration would reflect both the majority consensus and the degree of minority dissent, if any. (12) It would conduct most of its business via e-mail, but (13) hold an annual convocation which all members would be invited to attend, with their employing organizations funding travel and accommodations. (14) It would ordinarily meet in camera, but might, at its discretion, invite non-scholar observers. (15) Its formative stage might be limited to North American Bible scholars, but eventually it should include all qualified Adventist Bible scholars worldwide.

Such an organization would be of inestimable value to the church. It would help the church to be a faithful witness to the *sola Scriptura* principle in all aspects of its witness to the everlasting gospel, and to avoid the obscurantism and intermittent doctrinal controversy of the past century.

14. The Authenticity of Adventism

This review and analysis of the traditional Adventist interpretation of Daniel 8:14, the sanctuary, and the investigative judgment is designed to be constructive and remedial, not critical, accusatory, or punitive. I sincerely hope that it will be received in the same spirit, and that appropriate action will be taken to spare the church and its members from a repetition of the traumatic episodes of the past for which this pseudo-biblical doctrine, historicism, and obscurantism have been responsible. For two reasons Seventh-day Adventism remains an authentic, credible witness to the everlasting gospel despite its all-to-human imperfections such as its traditional interpretation of Daniel 8:14, the sanctuary doctrine, and the investigative judgment: (1) Its unique emphasis on applying the gospel of Jesus Christ to every aspect of human personhood, mental and physical as well as spiritual and social---practical, loving concern for the well-being and happiness of all human beings, and (2) its emphatic witness to His promised, imminent return to transform this suffering little world into the permanent abode of righteousness and peace He originally designed it to enjoy

In view of the fact that Seventh-day Adventists have, historically and today, relied on the authenticity of the 1844 experience and the basic credibility of the traditional interpretation of Daniel 8:14, and in view of the above evidence that that interpretation is not tenable when tested by the *sola Scriptura* principle (which the church affirms but compromises in its interpretation of Daniel 8:14), the question inevitably arises, "What basis is there for concluding that Adventism is an authentic witness to the everlasting gospel of Jesus Christ?" An inevitable and appropriate question indeed!

The pragmatic response to that question is the extent to which the church conforms to, and reflects, the teachings of Jesus Christ and complies with the gospel commission. Whether

or not it does so uniquely is none of our business or concern. Even to be concerned with that question violates His specific instruction on record in Mark 9:38-41. Someone was casting out demons in Jesus' name and the disciples "tried to stop him, because he was not following us. But Jesus said, 'Do not stop him; for no one who does a deed of power in my name will be able soon afterward to speak evil of me. Whoever is not against us is for us.'" On another occasion Peter, pointing to John, asked Jesus "What about him?" In His reply Jesus said to Peter, "What is that to you? Follow me." It is none of our business as Seventh-day Adventists to question the credibility or integrity of others as authentic witnesses of Jesus Christ. Let us focus our attention on the credibility of our witness to the everlasting gospel---and banish any "holier than thou" questions from our minds. In Acts 10:35 Peter says, "In every nation [and religious community] anyone who fears him and does what is right is acceptable to him."

Jesus' summary of the gospel is on record in Mark 12:29-31: "You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind, and with all your strength," and "You shall love your neighbor as yourself." This is the true test of us corporately as a church as well as of us individually, as members of the church. In other words, gospel principles apply to every aspect of our individual and corporate being---our love for, and the dedication of our entire individual and corporate being, to God---and in our relationship to one another and to every other human being. "As you did it to one of the least of these my brethren, you did it to me."¹⁵⁹ The agape love of God is selfless concern and care for the well-being and happiness of others. That must be the ideal and practice of the church with respect to every human being everywhere, in theory but even more importantly, in practice. "In as much . . . !"

We are admitted to eternity on the basis of the kind of people we are, individually, not what we may sincerely believe about Daniel 8:14 or any other passage of Scripture. A person may conscientiously believe in the traditional interpretation of Daniel 8:14, and if everything else in his or her life is in harmony with the gospel he / she will encounter no problem at the pearly gates of eternity. And if a person sincerely believes that is not its import, but everything else in his / her life is in harmony with the gospel, he / she will encounter no problem at the pearly gates of eternity. But if we become abusive of one another in our discussion of the subject we will both arrive at the pearly gates only to find them bolted and barred against both of us.

Let our corporate attitude as a church be moderated by this fact, but at the same time let the church, corporately, be in full harmony with the sola Scriptura principle in its delineation of, and witness to, Daniel 8:14. In terms of sola Scriptura its sanctuary witness to the gospel is grossly defective and alienates the confidence and respect of biblically literate people, Adventist and non-Adventist alike. Let us be willing to recognize and remove that obstacle to acceptance of our message to the world that Jesus will soon return.

In the years immediately following October 22, 1844 the traditional sanctuary doctrine was an important asset for stabilizing the faith of disappointed Adventists. Today it is an equally significant liability and deterrent to the faith, confidence, and salvation of biblically literate Adventists and non-Adventists alike. It was present truth following the great disappointment on October 22, 1844. It is not present truth in the year of our Lord 2002. *Quod erat demonstrandum!*

Raymond F. Cottrell, 335 Midori Lane, Calimesa, CA 92320-1615 February 9, 2002
r.rc@gte.net

NOTES: Most of my papers cited in the following notes are on file in the Heritage Room of the Del E. Webb Library on the campus of Loma Linda University. The Association of Adventist Forums is currently planning a website and has requested a list of all my major papers.

01. Le Roy Edwin Froom, *Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers*, vol. 4, p. 403.
02. Cf. Matthew 27:51.
03. 1 Peter 3:7-12.
04. Hebrews 8:2.
05. Leviticus 16.
06. Matthew 25:1-13.
07. Cf. Ellen G. White, *Early Writings*, p. 58.
08. White, *The Great Controversy*, p. 409.
09. *Ibid.*, pp. 409-422.
10. White, *Evangelism*, p. 221.
11. " , Letter 10, 1895.
12. " , *Fundamentals of Christian Education*, pp. 112, 126. *Selected Messages*, Book 1, p. 21; Book 2, p. 85; *Counsels to Writers and Editors*, p. 145; *Testimonies to the Church*, vol. 5, pp. 663, 691; vol. 6, p. 402; *Great Controversy*, p. vii; *Colporteur Ministry*, p. 125.
13. " , *Selected Messages*, Book 1, pp. 37, 164; Book 3, p.33..
14. Comprehensive Index to the Writings of E. G. White, pp. 21-176. An estimate of the entries.
15. White, Letter to E. J. Waggoner and A. T. Jones (Letter 37, 2-18-1887). J. H. Waggoner, *The Law of God, an Examination of the Testimony of Both Testaments*, Rochester, N.Y., The Advent Review Office, 1854, pp. 70, 108. In 1856 James and Ellen White and others met for two days in Battle Creek, Michigan, and decided that Waggoner was wrong in identifying the law in Galatians as the Ten Commandments. James White withdrew the book from circulation.
16. White, *Sketches from the Life of Paul*, pp. 188-192.
17. " , *Selected Messages*, Book 1, p. 234.
18. " , *Selected Messages*, Book 1, p. 233.
19. " , *Acts of the Apostles*, pp. 383-388.
20. D. M. Canright, *Seventh-day Adventism Renounced*, pp. 118-126. For an extended discussion see my *Eschatology of Daniel*, Chapter 20, "Daniel in the Critics' Den,"
21. Albion F. Ballenger, *Cast Out for the Cross of Christ*, Introduction pp. i-iv, 1, 4, 11, 82, 106-112. See Note 20.
22. W. W. Fletcher, *The Reasons for My Faith*, pp. 6, 17, 23, 86, 107, 115-138, 142-170, 220. See especially pp. 111-112, where he quotes a plaintive letter to Ellen White.
23. See Chapter 20, "Daniel in the Critics Den" in my *Eschatology of Daniel*, where I quote extensively from original documents preserved in the General Conference Archives.

24. For detailed information concerning R. A. Greive see Desmond Ford, *Daniel 8:14, the Day of Atonement, and the Investigative Judgment*, Glacier View edition, pp. 89-95; printed edition pp. 55-61.

25. For a summary of highlights of Desmond Ford's 991-page *Daniel 8:14, the Day of Atonement, and the Investigative Judgment*, see my 18-page paper, "Dr. Desmond Ford's Position on the Sanctuary" For a very detailed account of proceedings at the Glacier View meeting of the Sanctuary Review Committee, August 10-15, 1980, see my report "The Sanctuary Review Committee and Its New Consensus" in *Spectrum*, 11:2, November 1980, pp.2-26. This article is based on my complete shorthand notes of every speech and all proceedings at the morning Study Group 2, of which I was a member, and the afternoon and evening plenary sessions. My unpublished 20-page paper "Group Dynamics at Glacier View" explains what happened at Glacier View and why it happened as it did. My 21-page unpublished paper "A Post-mortem on Glacier View" summarizes my reaction to events at Glacier View. My 38-page paper "A Hermeneutic for Daniel 8:14," was distributed as an official Glacier View document. My 14-page "Report of a Poll of Adventist Bible Scholars Concerning Daniel 8:14 and Hebrews 9" summarizes responses to 125 questions. The poll was sent to a list of all Bible scholars in North America (teaching and non-teaching) provided by the GC Department of Education, and to several overseas. This report includes, also, a list of responses to a 1958 poll I sent to 27 teachers of Hebrew in North American SDA colleges, and a few others proficient in Hebrew, all personal friends of mine.

26. Ford is still a member of the Pacific Union College church.

27. Dale Ratzlaff's 1996, 384-page *Cultic Doctrine of Seventh-day Adventists* focuses on the traditional Adventist doctrine of the sanctuary. Jerry Gladson's 383-page *A Theologian's Journey from Seventh-day Adventism to Mainstream Christianity* (2001) is an account of obscurantist leadership persecution as a result of the traditional sanctuary doctrine.

28. Janet Brown gives her e-mail address as Janet.E.Brown@intel.com.

29. Mrs. Donald W. Silver (Christine M. Silver) is the daughter of Dr. and Mrs. Robert H. Brown.

30. White, *The Great Controversy*, p. 409.

31. " , *Evangelism*, pp. 221, 224.

32. My 28-page unpublished paper, "Questions on Doctrine: A Historical-Critical Evaluation," is a detailed review of the eighteen Martin-Barnhouse interviews with General Conference personnel in 1955 and 1956. My 10-page "Questions on Doctrine: Footnotes to History" recounts a number of humorous moments during the Martin-Barnhouse interviews.

33. Donald G. Barnhouse, ed., *Eternity*, 7:67, September 1956, pp. 6-7, 43-45.

34. My 16-page "An Evaluation of Certain Aspects of the Martin Articles" quotes from, and summarizes, comment in the contemporary (1956) Evangelical Christian press regarding the Martin-Barnhouse interviews. This document was prepared at the request of the editorial committee preparing *Questions on Doctrine* for publication.

35. My article "The Role of Israel in Old Testament Prophecy" in volume 4 of the *SDA Bible Commentary* (pages 25-38) classifies and summarizes some five thousand Old Testament passages relating to God's dealings with Israel under the covenant relationship, including the Old Testament perspective of salvation history, which culminated in the coming of Messiah and the establishment of His eternal reign of righteousness at or soon after the

close of Old Testament times. These five thousand passages were accumulated during the course of teaching the class Old Testament Prophets for several years at Pacific Union College during the 1940s and 1950s. The parenthetical sentence on page 38, "This rule does not apply to those portions of the book of Daniel that the prophet was bidden to shut up and seal, or to other passages whose application Inspiration may have limited exclusively to our own time," was added by F. D. Nichol during the editorial process. He personally agreed with everything in the article and made no alterations in it, but feared for the adverse reception of the Commentary except for this *caveat*.

36. See Note 26.

37. My set of the committee papers considered is in the GC Archives.

38. My study of 150 important words in the Aramaic and Hebrew portions of Daniel fills 108 typewritten pages.

39. My correlation of the prophecies of Daniel 7, 8, 9, and 11-12 fills 14 typewritten pages.

40. For my own convenience, I wrote out (in parallel columns) key passages of the prophecies of Daniel in Hebrew, Greek (both the LXX and Theodotion), the KJV, and RSV.

41. Especially the first four chapters of 1 Maccabees, where I found twenty-four points of specific identity between Daniel's little horn and the career of Antiochus IV Epiphanes. I concluded, however, that Christ assigned the fulfillment of Daniel's prophecies to New Testament times, and that the New Testament writers nearly forty times anticipate Jesus' promised return within their generation. Chapters 4 "The Old Testament Perspective of Salvation History" and 12 "The New Testament Perspective of Salvation History" in my unpublished book manuscript, *The Eschatology of Daniel*, sets all of this forth in detail. See Note 131.

42. Chapter 13 of my unpublished book manuscript *The Eschatology of Daniel*, "Jewish Interpretation of Daniel," traces Jewish interpretation in some detail from ancient to modern times. For this I relied primarily on Josephus' *Antiquities of the Jews and Wars of the Jews*, Abba Hillel Silver's *A History of Messianic Speculation in Israel*, and Joseph Klausner's *The Messianic Idea in Israel*.

43. Chapter 14 of my unpublished book manuscript, *The Eschatology of Daniel*, "The Sanctuary Doctrine and the Investigative Judgment," traces the development of the traditional Adventist interpretation of Daniel 8:14 in considerable detail.

44. Chapter 17 of my *Eschatology of Daniel*, "The heavenly Sanctuary in the Epistle to the Hebrews," explores its comment on Christ's ministry in the heavenly sanctuary in considerable detail.

45. See Section 9, "Flaws in the Sanctuary Doctrine."

46. See Section 14, "A Permanent Remedy for Obscurantism."

47. See Note 44.

48. Hebrews 7:27; 10:11-12.

49. Hebrews 2:17-18; 4:14-15; 6:19-20; 7:24-28.

50. Hebrews 7:25; 9:12, 24.

51. Hebrews 2:17-18; 4:14-16.

52. Hebrews 9:28; 10:37.

53. 2 Timothy 2:15. Biblical hermeneutics has been the focus of my study for more than fifty years, the chapter "Principles of Biblical Interpretation" in *Problems in Bible Translation* (pp. 79-127) being one of my first (1953) published papers in this area. Among my many papers on this subject have been "Hermeneutics: What Difference Does It Make?" (37 pp.), "Ellen G. White and the Bible" (43 pp.), "The Role of Biblical Hermeneutics in Preserving Unity in the Church" (18 pp.), and many others.

54. See Note 35.

55. The paper "Historical Conditioning in the Bible and the Writings of Ellen G. White" (92 pages) was written on assignment by and for the Biblical Research Committee (BRC/BRI).

56. See Note 35.

57. See chapter 12 of *The Eschatology of Daniel*, "The New Testament Perspective of Salvation History." Nearly forty times the New Testament writers anticipate the return of Christ within their generation. See Note 131.

58. I relied on the third edition of Rudolf Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* and two Hebrew dictionaries: Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner's *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*, G. Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren, and Heinz-Josef Fabry's *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, eleven volumes of which are now available in English.

59. Except as otherwise noted I used the Revised Standard Version of the Bible, but often referred to other translations.

60. Two problems limit the value of the King James' Version for serious study: (1) it was based on late manuscripts that had accumulated a considerable number of scribal errors, and (2) several hundred English words convey a different meaning today than they did in 1611. Ronald Bridges and Luther A. Weigle's *The Bible Word Book* explains several hundred English words in the KJV that are either obsolete or archaic today.

61. Footnotes in Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* list numerous helpful variant readings in the ancient versions and translations of the Hebrew Bible.

62. My knowledge of Aramaic is limited.

63. Nehemiah 8:7-8.

64. From Robert Young's *Analytical Concordance to the Bible*.

65. In the ancient Hebrew of Genesis 1:1 the word for "created" was written *br'* (consonants only). The Masoretes supplied vowels to make it read *bara'*, "created." With equal reason they might as well have supplied vowels to make it read *bore'*, which would have verse 1 read "When God began to create ... ," thus making verse 1 a dependent clause, with verse 2 the main statement:

66. See Section 7, on the analogy of Scripture. The heavenly sanctuary of the Book of Hebrews is not a valid counterpart for the sanctuary of Daniel 8:14 because because verses 9 to 13 identify it as the sanctuary located in the "beautiful" land (*tsebi*), Judea. Chapter 11:16, 41 confirms this identification, and in 11:45 *tsebi* the "beautiful" holy mountain in Jerusalem where the temple was located. Furthermore, context (8:11-13) specifically identifies the reason the sanc

tuary needs "cleansing" or restoration because of its trampling by the little horn (cf. 11:31).

67. The name "Seventh-day Adventists" was chosen in 1860, and the General Conference was organized in 1863.

68. See Section 2, "Ellen G. White and the Sanctuary Doctrine." I have explored Adventism's sense of mission in my paper "Adventism in the Twentieth Century;" pp. 6 to 9.

69. In Moses' farewell address to Israel prior to their entrance into the promised land (Deuteronomy 28) he set forth the good things that would happen to them if they obeyed God's instructions (verses 1-14), and the misfortunes if they disobeyed (verses 15-68). The argument that Daniel 8 and 9 are "apocalyptic" (and thus supposedly immune to the conditionalism principle) ignores the fact that, contextually, they apply specifically to the Hebrew people and therefore are subject to the conditions specified in Jeremiah 18:7-10.

70. See note 69.

71. See my 49-page paper, "The Adventist Theological Society and Its Biblical Hermeneutic."

72. Reading one of William Miller's books, I found his uninterrupted misuse of commonly accepted principles of exegesis a deeply troubling experience.

73. For characteristics of the proof-text method, see Section 7.

74. For a list of changes the church has already made in the Sanctuary doctrine see Desmond Ford's *Daniel 8:14, the Day of Atonement, and the Investigative Judgment*, pp. 115-121 (Glacier View duplicated edition), pp. 73-88 (printed edition).

75. Daniel 9:23 cf. 8:16.

76. Daniel 9:21-23.

77. Daniel 9:24.

78. Cf. Daniel 7:24-25.

79. Daniel 11:45.

80. Daniel 8:17, 26.

81. Daniel 9:22-25.

82. Daniel 2:37-40; 7:3-7; 8:3-8; 11:2-3.

83. Daniel 2:41-43; 7:7-8, 17, 23; 8:8-9; 11:4-5, 25-29, 40-43.

84. Daniel 9:25.

85. Daniel 2:44; 7:28; 8:17, 19, 26; 9:24, 27; 11:35, 40.

86. Daniel 7:21, 25; 8:10, 13, 24-25; 9:26; 12:1, 2, 7.

87. Daniel 8:9; 9:36; 11:22, 24, 41.

88. Daniel 8:11, 25; 11:36.

89. Daniel 7:25; 8:11-12; 9:26-27; 11:31; 12:11.

90. Daniel 8:13; 9:27; 11:31.

91. Daniel 8:12-13; 9:27; 11:22.

92. Daniel 7:25; 12:7.

93. Daniel 7:25; 9:27; 12:7.

94. Daniel 8:14.

95. Daniel 9:27; 12:1, 7.

96. Daniel 7:22, 26; 8:25; 9:27; 11:45; 12:11.
97. Daniel 7:22, 27; 8:14; 12:1-3, 13-14.
98. See Note 35.
99. Enumerated below.
100. Daniel 1:12; 8:26-27; 10:13-14; 11:20; 12:11-12.
101. As in Leviticus 16.
102. A comparison of the career of Antiochus IV Epiphanes as set forth in 1 Maccabees 1 to 4 with the little horn of Daniel results in 24 points of undeniable identity. This led ancient Jewish scholars to identify him as the fulfillment of the Daniel's predictions. However, Christ's statements in Mark 1:15, Matthew 24 (etc.), and some forty times by New Testament writers locate the fulfillment of Daniel's end-time prophecies at the close of New Testament times. See references cited in Notes 130 and 131.
103. The prophetic day-for-a--literal-year concept was originally formulated by the Karaite Jewish scholar Nahawendi in the ninth century in an endeavor to identify events of his time as the fulfillment of Daniel's prophecies. The idea that this "principle" was operative with respect to the seventy "weeks" of years of Daniel 9 ignores the fact that it was, as a matter of fact, an application of the ancient Jewish jubilee-year system of dating, not the purported day-for-a-year "principle." The ancient Jewish Book of Jubilees uses this system of dating scores of times for dating events in Jewish history. See Chapter 15, "Jewish Interpretation of Daniel," in my *Eschatology of Daniel* for a number of relevant examples from the Book of Jubilees. See also Abba Hillel Silver, *A History of Messianic Speculation in Israel*, pp. 52-55, 208; Le Roy Edwin Froom, *Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers*, vol. 1, p. 713; vol. 2, p.196.
104. Cf. verse 11.
105. Verses 11-12.
106. Verses 3, 21-23.
107. Verses 2-6, 27.
108. Daniel 8:16, 26-27.
109. " 9:24-27.
110. " 9:25.
111. Ezra 7:21-27.
112. " 6:13-15.
113. Daniel 9:3-19.
114. " 9:17-19.
115. Verse 24
116. Verses 25-27.
117. Verse 25.
118. Verse 23.
119. Verse 24.
120. Cf. Daniel 11:23.

121. Daniel 8:11-13; cf. 9:27.
122. Verse 27.
123. Daniel 8:23-25.
124. " 8:20, 23.
125. Verse 26.
126. See Note 35.
127. Matthew 24:44; Romans 13:12; 2 Peter 3:11-12.
128. Matthew 24:42.
129. See Note 35. 130. Matthew 24:1-31 30-34. 131. PETER: 1 Peter 1:20; 4:17, 27; 2 Peter 3:11-14. JOHN: John 21:21-23; 1 John 2:18; Revelation 1:1, 3; 3:11; 12:12; 22:6-7, 10, 12, 20. JAMES: James 5:7-9. PAUL: Romans 13:11-12; 1 Corinthians 1:7-8; 7:29; 10:11; Philippians 3:20; 4:5; 1 Thessalonians 3:13; 4:15-17. HEBREWS 1:2; 9:26-28; 10:37.
132. Revelation 1:1, 3; 3:11; 22:6-7, 12, 20.
133. See my 82-page paper, Adventism in the Twentieth Century. pp. 34-54.
134. See [R. Allen Anderson] Minutes of Council of Teachers in Bible, Seventh-day Adventist Colleges, Washington, D. C., July 30 to August 25. 1940, p. 32 and [L. H. Hartin] Report of Bible Teachers' Council, Angwin, California, July 23-31, 1950, p. 74 (in the GC Archives).
135. My complete file of BRF papers is in the Heritage Room of the James White Memorial Library at Andrews University. (During the first year or two of our monthly Sabbath afternoon meetings at PUC some presentations were oral only, without formal papers.)
136. See Note 135 for the 1950 meeting.
137. "Let Us Have an Associate Secretary for Bible Research in the Ministerial Association." I sent this proposal to Le Roy Froom, founder of the Ministerial Association and a personal friend of mine for 28 years; R. Allen Anderson, incumbent director of the Ministerial Association; and W. E. Read.
138. "A Draft Proposal for a Seventh-day Adventist Institute of Biblical Studies" (14 pp.) Appended to it was "Twenty-five Years of Cooperative Research-type Bible Study" (16 pp.), in which I reviewed events of the years 1940 to 1966. The appendix was intended to provide him with information about what had happened in Adventist Bible scholarship during his protracted absence.
139. Raymond F. Cottrell, "The Untold Story of the Bible Commentary," Spectrum, 16:3, August 1985, pp. 34-51. The Commentary did not identify authors because of numerous editorial changes made in some contributions. My Spectrum article lists all the contributors.
140. See p. 10 of any volume of the Commentary.
141. Among the first Adventist "Bible teachers," as Bible scholars were then called, to attend "outside" universities were: R. E. Loasby, E. C. Banks, S. H. Horn, W. G. C. Murdoch, E. R. Thiele, L. H. Wood, and A. G. Maxwell. They tended to avoid classes in theology as such, but focused on such subjects as biblical languages, the history of antiquity, archeology, and chronology.
142. General Council Spring Meeting minutes for April 4, 1969.

143. In the autumn of 1968 R. H. Pierson invited W. J. Hackett to serve as a GC vice president. They had become acquainted on the 1968 Geoscience field trip of that summer. Elder Hackett confided in me that one of his principal objectives was to "clean up" the religion faculties at Loma Linda and Andrews universities.

144. A personal friend of mine, a colleague then on the religion faculty at Southern Adventist College, shared this information with me.

145. See my paper "Architects of Crisis: A Decade of Obscurantism" 40 pp.).

146. For example, W. G. C. Murdoch, S. H. Horn, E. E. Heppenstall.

147. In personal conversation with W. G. C. Murdoch, Siegfried H. Horn, and E. E. Heppenstall, long-time personal friends of mine.

148. See Note 45.

149. In conversation with a long-time personal friend of mine, then in the inner circle of ATS leadership. He confided to me the fact that ATS was organized specifically as a result of Hasel's loss of influence when demoted from deanship of the Theological Seminary.

150. My paper, "The Adventist Theological Society and Its Biblical Hermeneutic," evaluates the history and objectives of ATS. The section on ATS hermeneutics is based on personal interviews and official ATS publications.

151. See Note 25.

152. See pp. 49-50 of my 82-page paper "Adventism in the Twentieth Century."

153. For Consultation I see Warren C. Trenchard, "In the Shadow of the Sanctuary," *Spectrum*, 11:2, 1980, pp. 26-29; for Consultation II, Alden Thompson, "Theological Consultation II," *Spectrum*, 12:2, 1981, pp. 40-52.

154. Volume 1: *Selected Studies on Prophetic Interpretation*, 174 pp.; Volume 2: Symposium on Daniel, 557 pp.; Volume 3: *Doctrine of the Sanctuary*, 238 pp.; Volume 4: *Issues in the Book of Hebrews*, 237 pp.; Volume 5: 70 Weeks, Leviticus, *Nature of Prophecy*, 394 pp.

155. My paper "The Annual Council Statement on Methods of Bible Study," (5 pp.) notes the fact that after the committee released its report BRI inserted a preamble reiterating ATS hermeneutical principles. As a result some members of the committee told me that they had refused to sign their names in approval of the document. ATS requires members to affirm acceptance of it. .

156. Personal correspondence with both the former and the new (2002) BRI directors and the president of the GC makes evident that they are firmly committed to ATS hermeneutical policy.

157. For instance, Drs. Fritz Guy, Larry Geraty, Sakai Kubo, and Ivan Blazen (at the Theological Seminary); and Drs. Lorenzo Grant, Edwin Zachrison, and Jerry Gladson (at Southern Adventist University).

158. See Section 8, "Rightly Interpreting Daniel 8:14."

159. Matthew 25:40.

160. W. W. Prescott's letter is on file in the GC Archives.

161. See Note 35.

162. 2 Peter 3:18.

My series of six articles as an associate editor of the Review and Herald during January and February 1977 were designed to alert Adventists to the same debate then incipient in our church, and with a possibility of the same result (schism). Many have told me that they "got the point."