



Reflections

A BRI Newsletter

Number 4
October 2003

Biblical Research Institute

PURPOSE

Reflections is the official newsletter of the Biblical Research Institute of the General Conference. It seeks to share information concerning doctrinal and theological developments among Adventists and to foster doctrinal and theological unity in the world church. Its intended audience is church administrators, church leaders, pastors, and teachers.

NEWS AND COMMENTS

BRI SCHOLARS



We enjoy working together as a team. This does not only involve holding seminars together but also reading each others' papers and asking for advice.

TIME AND GEOLOGY: A POSITIVE PERSPECTIVE

Current thinking in the geologic community accepts and promotes time frames and interpretations of depositional systems that are problematic with respect to the belief system of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Because radiometric dating and order in the fossil record are globally recognized and accepted, they are among the most serious challenges. Only slightly less challenging are phenomena that are time related but more controversial within the geologic com-

Some of our readers may wish to see a picture or two of their colleagues at the BRI. The photo to the left portrays the present BRI scholars; from left to right: Ekkehardt Mueller, Angel Rodríguez, Gerhard Pfandl, and George Reid.



munity, such as paleomagnetism, cooling of large igneous bodies, varves, reefs and stromatolites, fossil intermediates, some environments of deposition, and some aspects of biogeography.

How should the church deal with these issues? There are two obvious approaches, 1) recognize the problematic areas inherent to each process (poke holes) or, 2) conduct research suggested by understandings of the Genesis account of earth history. While there is some validity to the first approach such as, challenging the interpretation of the distribution of the isotopes in radiometric dating, we typically fall into the trap of

nitpicking e.g., arguing over margins of error. The Geoscience Research Institute, using both approaches, has focused on and continues to follow the second approach through the efforts of staff research and providing grants for similar research conducted by non-staff researchers. The advantages to the second approach are numerous: different questions are asked, credibility is established, information is distributed, science is advanced, the geologic community is influenced, new lines of thinking are inspired, and most importantly, faith in the Bible is strengthened.

Are the challenges being met? As research progresses, yes, challenges are being met. In Wyoming, Arizona, coastal Peru, Patagonia, as well as global studies, conventional theories have been successfully challenged and new theories, theories consistent with the Biblical accounts of earth history are gradually being accepted. Research opportunities using this approach are vast. The primary current restraint on more research is a lack of trained researchers committed to this approach, but where limited research has been conducted, there is progress. Consequently, no good reason exists for the Seventh-day Adventist Church to abandon or alter its Bible-based belief system on the basis of current scientific theories.

Elaine Kennedy,
Geoscience Research Institute

CONVERSATIONS BETWEEN ADVENTISTS AND CATHOLICS

For some time theologians from the Roman Catholic Church have manifested interest in holding conversations with Seventh-day Adventists concerning Adventist beliefs. After careful consideration, and motivated by the opportunity to present our beliefs to leading Catholic theologians, the invitation was accepted. Consequently, Dr. Bert Beach and Dr. John Graz of the General Conference Department of Public Affairs and Religious Liberty, and Dr. Angel Manuel Rodríguez of the Biblical Research Institute met in Rome May 5-6, 2000 with Bishop (now Cardinal) Walter Kasper and Msgr. John Radano from the Vatican.

The conversation was very informal, and cordial and touched on different topics including the organizational structure of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. We provided a brief summary of our doctrines based on the 27 Fundamental Beliefs without analyzing any of them. Catholics placed special emphasis on baptism and the second coming of Christ and pointed out that during Mass there is a daily reference to the Coming of Christ. They showed particular interest in the global

nature of our church. We also gave a report on Adventist interchurch relations.

Msgr. Radano informed us on how the Pontifical Council for Christian Unity is organized and about its activities. It promotes ecumenism inside the church and with regard to other churches. According to him true ecumenism requires faithfulness to the apostolic faith as received from Christ through the apostles and under the safeguard of the church, in the unity of sacraments and ministry. We discussed some areas of tension. Our Catholic friends mentioned that apparently in some regions of the world we were misrepresenting them. We suggested that in those cases they should feel free to contact us and present their concerns and pointed out that in some parts of the world our relations with Catholics are fine while in others there are problems on both sides.

Proselytism was briefly discussed. It was clear that Catholics reject proselytism when it targets their members. Although they accept civil laws on religious freedom, they call for respect inspired by Christian love and unity. When Catholic bishops visit the Vatican some of them complain (they said) about Adventist proselytism. The question was raised if we proselytize Catholics because we do not consider them to be Christians—that is to say because we do not accept infant baptism. We commented that a person who lives as a Christian is a Christian but one who does not practice a Christian lifestyle is not a Christian. Furthermore there are various definitions of proselytism, and proselytism is not necessarily wrong. It is based on the person's right to religious freedom that grants the individual the opportunity to explore other faiths and even to accept new doctrinal options. At the end of the meeting Catholics expressed desire to have additional informal conversations with Adventists.

Since then three subsequent meetings have been held. The first one was a two day meeting in May 2001 at the John Knox Center in Geneva, Switzerland, named for the leader of the Scottish Reformation. The discussion centered around a paper written by George W. Reid in which he summarized and analyzed Adventist teachings as expressed in the 27 Fundamental Beliefs of Seventh-day Adventists. Other Adventist participants included Dr. Beach, Dr. Graz, and Dr. Roland Meyer. Among the Catholic theologians were Bishop Marc Ouellet, Msgr. John Radano, Dr. James F. Puglisi, and Dr. Ralph Del Colle. The discussion revolved around common doctrines. Several questions were raised on peculiar Adventist beliefs but there was no in-depth discussion of any of them. It was anticipated that those could be topics for further discussion in the future.

The second meeting was held in May 2002. The Adventist group included Dr. Beach, Dr. Graz, Dr.

Reid, Dr. Rodriguez, and Dr. Richard Lehman, at that time President of the Franco-Belgian Union of SDA. As requested by the Catholic group the subject under consideration was Sabbath/Sunday. The guiding paper prepared by Dr. Rodríguez focused on an intensive biblical and theological study of the biblical Sabbath. The paper prepared by Catholic theologian Dr. Puglisi focused on a biblical and historical/theological study of Sunday. Catholic theologians argued that the seed of Sunday observance is found in the NT and that it originated as a result of theological reflection on the meaning of the resurrection of Jesus. Adventists commented that doctrines or dogmas are to be based on biblical evidence and not on post-apostolic traditions and that there is no evidence in the NT to support the position that the resurrection of Jesus led to Sunday observance. We also rejected the authority of the church to define and/or establish doctrines without clear biblical basis.

The third meeting took place in May 2003. The Adventist group included this time Dr. Richard Davidson, from Andrews University Theological Seminary, who prepared a paper on hermeneutics, and Dr. Roland Meyer, from Salève Adventist University. The topic of discussion was Adventist and Catholic hermeneutics. The paper on the Catholic side was prepared by Dr. Gospert Byamungu, from the Ecumenical Institute at Bossy. Catholics showed a high view of Scripture while arguing that a modified use of the historical-critical method was not incompatible with it. We also argued for a high view of Scripture but found the classical and modified use of the historical-critical method incompatible with it. Catholics do not separate Scripture from Tradition because according to them Tradition is grounded in Scripture. We argued that as long as Tradition is a witness to apostolic teaching we do not reject Tradition. Our concern is with post-apostolic traditions that are not based on Scripture. Among them we mentioned such teachings as purgatory, the treasury of merits, indulgences, Mariology, etc. We obviously disagreed. They argued that those teachings were based on biblical-theological concepts. The role of the Magisterium in the interpretation of the Bible was discussed and Catholics argued that in the area of dogmas the church needs an authoritative interpretation of the Bible and that it is provided by the Magisterium (the Pope and the Bishops together make decisions). As Protestants we argued that the Bible is its own interpreter, that it provides its own rules of interpretation and that through the assistance of the Holy Spirit believers are able to understand its message of salvation without the need of a Magisterium.

At the close of the meeting Catholic theologians asked Adventists whether our application of Rev 13 to the Papacy is based on sola scriptura and whether we

still apply the chapter to the Papacy. We commented that our position is not exclusively Adventist but that it goes back to the Reformers themselves and is based on a method of interpretation provided by the Bible itself. The Catholic reaction was to consider our interpretation of Rev 13 to be a sectarian element. In a humorous way Adventists commented that the Mariological interpretation of some biblical passages is also sectarian. On a more serious tone, Adventists commented that we would be less than honest should we tell them that we no longer hold our understanding of those prophecies. However, in conjunction with our eschatology stands an effort to express Christian fellowship and love. Future developments depend on whether religious liberty or intolerance are practiced. As Adventists, it was added, we should not allow our particular prophetic view to determine the way we relate to Catholics and would not like those views to determine the way Catholics relate to us. There is some tension, but we should seek ways of expressing sincere Christian love to each other.

No conversation has been planned for 2004. The discussions have been useful by providing an opportunity to share with Catholic theologians important aspects of our message and interacting with them. The Adventist papers presented in the meetings are available on our web-page.

Angel Manuel Rodríguez, BRI

NONCOMBATANCY

While wars are waging in different parts of the world and terrorism is showing its ugly face again and again, many Adventists think about whether or not to get involved in military action. In Korea recently five theology students refused to carry guns during military reserve training. "We believe carrying guns is not proper to [sic] us, as Christians, individuals, and theology students who are going to be pastors."¹ Whereas in many parts of the world Adventists are drafted into the army and try hard to be recognized as noncombatants and conscientious objectors, some of them doing civil service, in other countries some church members join the army voluntarily. In different parts of the world church the Iraqi war and other events have triggered a lively discussion on the question of where the Seventh-day Adventist church stands today and how we should relate to war.² Some claim, "There are no indications that our Adventist church today disapproves serving in the army in whatever capacity." They say that "the present state is one of uncertainty on the Adventist position regarding serving in the army."³

This is not quite true. While the church ministers

to noncombatant members in the army, as well as to pacifists and combatants, it recognizes that individuals make free choices and have to follow their informed conscience. The longstanding official position of the church is expressed in the 1972 statement in terms of noncombatancy:

“Voted, 1. That we accept as our basic view the 1954 General Conference Session action entitled, ‘The Relationship of Seventh-day Adventists to Civil Government and War,’ as amended at the 1954 Autumn Council, and further amended as follows:

Genuine Christianity manifests itself in good citizenship and loyalty to civil government. The breaking out of war among men in no way alters the Christian’s supreme allegiance and responsibility to God or modifies their obligation to practice their beliefs and put God first.

This partnership with God through Jesus Christ who came into this world not to destroy men’s lives but to save them causes Seventh-day Adventists to advocate a noncombatant position, following their divine Master in not taking human life, but rendering all possible service to save it. As they accept the obligation of citizenship as well as its benefits, their loyalty to government requires them willingly to serve the state in any noncombatant capacity, civil or military, in war or peace, in uniform or out of it, which will contribute to saving life, asking only that they may serve in those capacities which do not violate their conscientious conviction.

This statement is not a rigid position binding church members but gives guidance leaving the individual member free to assess the situation for himself.”⁴

This statement has never been revoked. “From the first the Seventh-day Adventist Church has staunchly advocated noncombatancy for its members. . . In the United States a statement confirming the position taken during the Civil War was adopted by the North American Division on Apr. 18, 1917: ‘We hereby reaffirm the foregoing declaration. We petition that our religious convictions be recognized by those in authority, and that we be required to serve our country only in such capacity as will not violate our conscientious obedience to the law of God as contained in the decalogue, interpreted in the teachings of Christ, and exemplified in His life’ (North American Division Committee *Minutes* 1:517, Apr. 18, 1917).”⁵ In 1923 the European Division Committee voted a similar statement in Gland, Switzerland. Actions were taken by the General Conference in 1951, 1952, 1954, and 1972.

If we compare the 1954 statement with the 1972

action, we notice that minimal changes in wording have been made here and there, but that an additional sentence has been added at the end. In 1969 the North American Division issued a statement which recommended noncombatancy but allowed church members to hold a pacifist position while being backed by the church. “The U. S. was involved in Vietnam, and only those individuals who could show religious backing for their pacifism would be released to alternate service.”⁶ The additional sentence of the 1972 statement allows the church to serve all members, no matter what their conscience dictates them, while officially advocating noncombatancy.

Over the years the Seventh-day Adventist Church has released statements that are related to the issue of noncombatancy. In “A Statement of Peace” we read: “In a world filled with hate and struggle, a world of ideological strife and of military conflicts, Seventh-day Adventists desire to be known as peacemakers and work for worldwide justice and peace under Christ as the head of a new humanity.”⁷ An earlier document declares: “Adventists, by precept and example, must stand and work for peace and good will toward men—and thus be known as peacemakers and bridge builders.”⁸ And the latest official statement, issued in 2002, affirms: “Jesus Christ, the Prince of Peace, wants His followers to be peacemakers in society and hence calls them blessed (Matt. 5:9).”⁹

Whereas Tony Campolo takes issue with Seventh-day Adventists in North America, saying: “You stood up for the righteousness of Jesus. But little by little, the affluence that has pervaded this community has seduced you into a mindset that makes me wonder whether your allegiance is more to America than to the kingdom of God,”¹⁰ in an editorial William Johnsson states: “From our earliest history we Adventists have officially advocated a stance of noncombatancy in times of war. We support government, but our ultimate loyalty is to God, whatever that may cost us.”¹¹ Angel Rodríguez concludes “that there is no such thing as a just war. . . The church must insist at all times on the evilness of human wars. If the function of the church in the context of war is to speak for peace and reconciliation, it must promote noncombatancy among its members, based on the biblical teaching of the value of human life.”¹²

The Adventist Church is not abandoning its advocacy of noncombatancy. On the contrary! It invites all church members to follow Christ’s footsteps and live their lives according to the Sermon on the Mount.

Ekkehardt Mueller, BRI

¹NSD Communication Department

²See, e.g., *Spectrum* 30/4 (2002) and 31/4 (2003); *ATS-Mail* 2/6 (2003):3-4.

³Samuele Bacchiocchi, "Endtime Issues No. 99."

⁴*Autumn Council of the General Conference Committee: General Actions*, October 14-29, 1972, Mexico City, 17.

⁵*Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia*, Second Revised Edition, M-Z (Hagerstown: Review and Herald and Publishing Association, 1996), 184.

⁶"Noncombatancy," Information provided by Adventist Chaplaincy Ministries.

⁷"A Statement of Peace," in *Statements, Guidelines & Other Documents: A Compilation*, ed. by Ray Dabrowski (Silver Spring: General Conference Communication Department, 2000), 50.

⁸"A Statement on the Peace Message to All People of Good Will," in *Statements, Guidelines & Other Documents: A Compilation*, ed. by Ray Dabrowski (Silver Spring: General Conference Communication Department, 2000), 51.

⁹"A Seventh-day Adventist Call for Peace," http://www.adventist.org/beliefs/main_stat52.html.

¹⁰Tony Campolo, "Blessed are the Peacemakers," *Spectrum* 31/2 (2003):54.

¹¹William G. Johnsson, "War and Peace in Iraq," *Adventist Review*, April 2003, 3. See also, William G. Johnston, "Man of Power," *Adventist Review*, June 19, 2003, 5.

¹²Angel Manuel Rodríguez, "Christians and War," *Adventist Review*, April 10, 2003, 11. See also, Lincoln E. Steed, "Just War," *Liberty* January/February 2003, 30-31.

FOCUS ON SCRIPTURE

THE TIME PROPHECIES IN DAN 12

In recent years a number of Seventh-day Adventists have begun to apply the time prophecies in Daniel 12:5-13 to the future.¹ Rejecting the traditional Adventist understanding, which places the 3 ½ times, the 1290 and 1335 days as prophetic times in the past, they claim these time periods are to be understood as literal days still to come. According to one interpretation, the 1335 days begin with the national Sunday law in America, and the 3 ½ times or 1260 days and the 1290 days with the universal Sunday law.²

I. Evaluation

This new proposal contains a number of problems which make this interpretation unacceptable:

- (1) The 3 ½ times or 1260 days in Daniel 7:25 and 12:7 are seen as two different time periods in history, one in the past and one in the future. This interpretation violates one of the fundamental principles of biblical hermeneutics, namely "scripture interprets scripture, one passage being the key to other passages."³ If this principle is discarded, prophecy becomes a wax nose which can be bent in any direction the interpreter wants it to go. The prophecies of Daniel are given according to the principle of repetition and enlargement. This can be clearly seen by looking at the four major prophecies in the book (Dan 2, 7, 8-9, 10-12) which all begin in the

time of the author and end with the Second Advent. Each prophecy emphasizes different aspects of this time period. Daniel 7 adds details concerning the little horn to the vision in Daniel 2, and Daniel 8 enlarges the picture of the little horn even further, etc. Thus, common elements in different chapters of the book must refer to the same things or events. If the "taking away of the daily" in Daniel 8:11 refers to events in the past, so must "the taking away of the daily" in Daniel 12:11, and if the 3 ½ times in Daniel 7:25 refer to the past, so must the 3 ½ times in Daniel 12:7.

- (2) This view ignores the basic structure of Daniel's visions where visions are always followed by explanations.
 - a. Daniel 2 – vision (31-35), explanation (36-46).
 - b. Daniel 7 – vision (1-14), explanation (15-27).
 - c. Daniel 8-9 – vision (1-12), explanation (13-26; 9:24-27)
 - d. Daniel 10-12 – vision (11:2-12:4), explanation (12:5-13)

While it is true that the vision in Daniel 11:2-12:4 is itself an explanation of the vision in Daniel 8, we must not overlook the fact that in Daniel 7, 8, and 10-12 the time prophecies are always situated within the explanation section, not in the visions themselves. In Daniel 10-12 the vision ends in 12:4 and the time prophecies are given in 12:5-13. This structure is destroyed, if 12:5-13 is interpreted as a new vision.

- (3) This new view completely ignores the linguistic and grammatical connections between the vision in Daniel 11 and the explanation in Daniel 12. First, 12:5-13 is not a new vision with a different topic, but an explanation of certain elements in the vision of chapter 11. This is evident from the question in 12:6, "How long shall be the fulfillment of *these wonders*?" The Hebrew word *pala'* for "wonders" can be translated as "awesome events"⁴ or "wonderful events."⁵ Since verse 5 does not refer to any events, "these wonders" can only refer to events seen in the vision in Daniel 11. The word *pala'* is in fact used in 11:36 where it refers to the blasphemies spoken by the King of the North. It is also used in 8:24 where the little horn destroys "fearfully [*pala'*]." In 12:7, 8 Daniel hears the words, "and when the power of the holy people has been completely shattered *these things* shall be finished." Because he does not understand what he heard, Daniel asks, "what shall be the end of *these things*?" Thus three times in 12:6-8 we have references to "these things/

wonders.” Each time they refer to the events of the vision in chapter 11. This clearly indicates that Daniel 12:5-13 is part of the vision of Daniel 11:2-12:4. Furthermore, there is also a strong thematic and linguistic connection between the texts in 7:25 and 12:7. The shattering of the power of the holy people in 12:7 lasts for 3 ½ times and is the same as the persecution of the saints in 7:25 which also lasts for 3 ½ times.

- (4) M. Berry, one of the main proponents of this new view, begins both the 1260 and 1290 days in Daniel 12 with the universal Sunday law. The 1260 days, she believes, end with the universal death decree, the 1290 days continue for another 30 days. She explains the extra 30 days as two 15 day time periods. The first 15 days are the “one hour” in Revelation 17:12 (360 divided by 24 is 15), and the second 15 days are the “one hour” referred to in Revelation 18:10. While the first 1260 days are counted as literal days, the last thirty days of the 1290 are counted as two prophetic hours which she interprets according to the year-day principle. This mixing of literal and prophetic time is another indication of the confusion in this new view.
- (5) Finally, this new interpretation of the times in Daniel 12 is also against clear statements of Ellen White. In 1880 she wrote, “I have borne the testimony since the passing of the time in 1844, that there should be no definite time set by which to test God’s people. The great test on time was in 1843 and 1844; and all who have set time since this great period marked in prophecy, were deceiving and being deceived.”⁶ Now it is true that Ellen White here speaks about date setting for the Second Advent which the new view does not, nevertheless, there is no indication in her writings that any kind of prophetic time would play a role in the future. In fact, in a letter from 1850 Ellen White writes concerning a Brother Hewit, “We told him of some of his errors in the past, that the 1335 days were ended and numerous errors of his. It had but little effect. His darkness was felt upon the meeting and it dragged.”⁷ Some believe that in this statement she places the 1335 days in the future. However, the sentence is generally understood to mean, “We told him of some of his errors in the past, [we told him] that the 1335 days were ended and [we told him] numerous errors of his.” Otherwise we must ask, why Ellen White reprimanded brother Hewit and not her husband and all the other pioneers who taught that the 1335 years were ended?⁸ This indicates that she herself placed the 1335 days in the past.

II. *The Adventist Interpretation*

In Daniel 12:5-13 the prophet is still by the river Tigris, where he was in 10:4. Now he overhears a conversation between two heavenly figures and eventually joins in. This passage parallels Daniel 8;13, 14 in several ways. Both take place beside a river, both involve two anonymous heavenly beings, and both involve the question “How long?”

“*How long shall be the fulfillment of these wonders?*” (12:6) – This refers back to the vision in chapter 11. Gabriel had given Daniel this long explanation to help him understand what will happen to God’s people (10:14). Now two other heavenly beings appear, and one of them, for Daniel’s information, asks Michael, the man clothed in linen, a question. The answer in verse 7 defines the time of the end as that which follows the 1260 years of papal supremacy and persecution. “In this answer Daniel was actually given the other half of the answer to the question asked by these same celestial attendants in 8:13. That question concerned the trampling under foot by the papal power of both sanctuary and host. In 8:14 the answer given was that the sanctuary would be trampled down till 1844. Now the answer is given that the host will be trampled down till 1798. And in the ensuing enquiry by Daniel and answer by Michael will be given the relationship between these two periods.”⁹

- (1) *1290 days* (12:11) – The taking away of the *tamid* (the daily) is mentioned three times in the book of Daniel:

Daniel 8:11	No specific time is connected with it.
Daniel 11:31	Again no specific time or date is given.
Daniel 12:11	“From the time . . . 1290 days.”

It is important to note the parallelism between Daniel 11:31 and 12:11

11:31 Forces shall be mustered by him [king of the North] and they shall defile the sanctuary fortress: then they shall *take away the daily sacrifices*, and *place there the abomination of desolation*.

12:11 And from the time that the *daily sacrifice is taken away*, and the *abomination of desolation is set up*, there shall be one thousand two hundred and ninety days.

The two texts are clearly parallel and refer to the same events in history. Now if 11:31 refers to the past so must 12:11.

In Daniel 8:11 “the daily” refers to Christ’s intercessory ministry which was usurped by the work of the priests through the mass and the confessional. By

sacrificing Christ anew in every mass, the papacy has removed Christ's heavenly ministry in the thinking of men. How long has this been going on? In May 1998, Pope John Paul II issued his pastoral letter *Dies Domini* in which he called for Sunday laws.¹⁰ In the same letter he speaks about the attendance at Sunday mass, and states that particularly from the beginning of the sixth century on there were universal statutes which made it obligatory for the people to attend mass. As Seventh-day Adventists we say that in the sixth century the daily was taken away and the abomination of desolation was established. We begin the 1290 years with 508. Why? Primarily, because deducting 1290 from 1798, which is understood to be the end of the 1260 and 1290 years, brings us to 508. What happened in 508? In 496 Clovis, king of the Franks became a Roman Catholic. All the other Germanic tribes who had dismantled the Roman Empire were Arians and therefore in opposition to the pope in Rome. Clovis defeated the Visigoths and became the first civil power to join up with the rising Church of Rome. France, therefore, is called the oldest daughter of the Roman Catholic Church.

"After his great victory over the Goths in 507 . . . Clovis came to Tours, probably in the middle of 508, to hold a victory celebration. There he met Byzantine envoys who presented to him the decree naming him an honorary consul."¹¹ The joining of the civil and the religious powers (Franks and papacy) at that time was an important step in "setting up the abomination of desolation," which refers to the unscriptural teachings of the papacy and their enforcement through the union of church and state. It is one of the ironies of history that France, the power that helped the papacy at the beginning of the 1290 years, was the same power that brought about its demise at the end of this time period, when Napoleon in 1798 had Pope Pius VI taken prisoner.

- (2) *The 1335 days* (12:12) – No specific event is mentioned for the beginning of the 1335 days. The context however seems to imply that it began at the same time as the 1290 days. If this is correct, the 1335 days ended in 1843-44 at the time when the first angel's message was being preached. (This is also the last year of the 2300 year prophecy which runs from the fall of 1843 to the fall of 1844). The 1335 day prophecy is not mentioned in connection with the activity of the Little Horn power. Rather it is related to a special blessing for those who live at the end of that time period. Another blessing for the time of the end is found in Rev 14:13, "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord

from now on."

Conclusion

The evidence from Scripture and the Spirit of Prophecy does not support the concept that the time prophecies in Daniel 12 are still in the future. The Adventist interpretation which, in harmony with the historicist principles of interpretation, places these time prophecies in the past, is still the best solution to the difficult texts in Daniel 12:5-13.

Gerhard Pfandl, BRI

¹Marian G. Berry, *Warning!* (Brushton, NY: Teach Services, 1990), 154. Ronald Gary Stickney, *The Prophecy of Daniel 11 and Revelation* (Grand Junction, MI: Proclaim the Prophecy "Now" Seminar, n.d.). Robert N. Smith, Jr., *Sunday vs Rapture* (Ft. Worth, TX: Roheka Books, 2002).

²Berry, 154.

³Ellen G. White, *Evangelism*, 581.

⁴Ernest C. Lucas, *Daniel*, Apollos Old Testament Commentary (Leicester, England: InterVarsity Press, 2002), 296.

⁵L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996), 928.

⁶Ellen White, *Life Sketches of James and Ellen White*, 221.

⁷Ellen White, *Manuscript Release*, 6:251.

⁸James White, "The Judgment," *Review and Herald*, January 29, 1857, 100. Uriah Smith, "Short Interviews with Correspondents," *Review and Herald*, February 24, 1863. I am indebted to Alberto Timm for the pioneer sources. See his article "Os 1290 e 1335 dias de Daniel" in *Ministeria* (Brazil), (May-June 1999), 16-18.

⁹Ernest W. Marter, *Daniel's Philosophy of History* (Bracknell, England: Newbold College, 1967), 115.

¹⁰Pope John Paul II, "Dies Domini" (May 31, 1998), section 47. For the text of this Apostolic Letter see the Vatican website: www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii. *Dies Domini* can be found under his Apostolic Letters. Visited 5/15/03.

¹¹Herwig Wolfram, *The Roman Empire and Its Germanic Peoples* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), 222.

BOOK NOTES

Bailey, Phylis C. *Topical Concordance of the Bible*. Revised edition. Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald 2003. 412 pp. \$19.99.

This concordance is a useful tool for preparing Bible studies, sermons, or class lectures. The 301 topics listed in this volume cover not only important Biblical words like "faith," "joy," and "love," but also concepts and topics which are not readily apparent in Scripture, such as "associates," "disabilities," and "Christian living." Such topics as "death as a sleep," "finishing the work," "latter rain," "meat eating," "sealing and shaking," "Spirit of Prophecy" etc. reflect specific Adventist interests and will be appreciated by many. While some of the texts seem forced under a particular topic, e.g., Deuteronomy 21:9 has nothing to do with abortion, there are many helpful listings for a variety of topics. The book contains

five lists of spiritual gifts, a list of Jesus' names, and a list of all his parables, but for some reason there is no list of his miracles. Also, considering the importance of the sanctuary doctrine for Seventh-day Adventists, it is surprising that "sanctuary" or "Christ's ministry in heaven" receives no attention in this volume. Originally published in 1975, this revised edition includes many entirely new topics, such as "antichrist," "business," "holiness," and "liberty." In addition, 2600 new texts have been added under old topics.

Gerhard Pfandl, BRI

Jan Paulsen. *Let Your Life so Shine: The Uncommon Rewards of Living Like Jesus*. Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 2002. 128 pp. \$10.99.

This book is a collection of sermons prepared by Elder Jan Paulsen, President of the General Conference, in which he opens his heart to the church. The criterion he used in the selection of the sermons is provided in an interview included at the end of the book. To the question, "What are the main tasks of the GC President?," he answers, "My assignment is a spiritual one. I am not the chief executive officer of a corporation. It's a spiritual leadership role that I have." In the book Elder Paulsen addresses us as a spiritual leader, ministering to the world church.

In the sermons he shares with us that which is of extreme importance for him as he looks at the church and its mission. The language is that of a preacher, simple, easy to follow, addressing the heart of the church. The sermons deal with different aspects of the life of the community of believers and the hope that unites them. Here theology is fully put at the service of the church in order to minister to it. He describes for us what should happen to the church, in fact what is already happening as it travels home.

There is a significant emphasis on the unity of the church, which in the interview the author identifies as one of the main challenges we confront. He argues that this unity requires us to work together, to accept others who are different but still children of God, to be compassionate, loving and forgiving to each other and to recognize that we are all part of something that spans the whole world. The role of the Holy Spirit in creating and leading us is fundamental in Elder Paulsen's view of the church. His ministry provides gifts that are to be used for the good of the church in loving service. In the sermons church members are challenged to transform the Christian life into an adventure of service to God and to others. That service is expected to be disinterested because the reward received comes to us as a gift and not as something earned. The sermon about the church as a community on the move is used to call us to live as

pilgrims on this world exhibiting our specific values and lifestyles, loving each other and those around us.

The emphasis on unity and the need to improve the quality of life in the community as it continues to grow is not based on a sentimentality that knows no limits. This is clearly stated in the sermon on Matt 13:24-30, where Elder Paulsen indicates that we should not ignore "flagrant abuse of the church's identity, standards, and mission by someone who ostensibly claims to belong to the church but who is increasingly showing himself or herself hostile and destructive to the church, its message, and its mission. Such a person does not belong. The church has the right to say so and take actions to signify that" (p. 78). The last sermon addresses the Adventist hope; the certainty of the return of the Lord, an appropriate closure to the collection of sermons.

Angel Manuel Rodríguez, BRI

John T. Anderson. *Investigating the Judgment*. Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 2003. 123 pp. \$12.99.

John T. Anderson is a business man who used to work as a pastor in southern California. This book is the result of his personal study of the subject of the investigative judgment as he searched for answers to questions raised by the critics of the doctrine. He provides for us a readable discussion of the subject based on an impressive amount of biblical evidence. He has taken advantage of studies written by other Adventists on the subject of the sanctuary during the last twenty-five years.

After discussing the need for the investigative judgment, Anderson develops the Adventist model of the final judgment from its pre-advent beginning to its conclusion after the millennium. Several chapters are dedicated to a discussion of the biblical evidence supporting the biblical teaching of an investigative judgment. There is a very useful discussion of the prophetic evidence found in Dan 7-8 and in other prophetic books of the OT. This is followed by a study of the word "cleansed," used in Dan 8:14, concluding that the term expresses in the OT the ideas of judgment and cleansing.

The author has collected a significant amount of evidence from biblical narratives to demonstrate that the idea of an investigative judgment permeates the Old and New Testaments. There is much more material than he was able to gather in this small book, but what he offers is significant. The book concludes with a study of Dan 8:14 and a short discussion of Christ's entrance into the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary. Anderson's discussion of the question raised in Dan 8:13 is weak, incomplete and overlooks the reference made there to the ministry of Christ as our mediator. The reader will have to supplement it with materials written by other

Adventist investigators (see materials found on the BRI web page). Concerning Christ's entrance into the most holy place, he suggests that "to say that Christ did not enter the Most Holy Place of the sanctuary in heaven for the purpose of beginning the investigative judgment until 1844 does not have to mean that He was not in the presence of His Father before that time, or even that He was not in the Most Holy Place prior to 1844. It simply indicates that He began a new phase of His ministry at that time" (p. 116). This book will help to reaffirm the faith of Adventists interested in this important topic.

Angel Manuel Rodríguez, BRI

Knight, George R. *Exploring Hebrews: A Devotional Commentary*. Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 2003. 254 pp. \$ 16.99.

Although a number of books published by Adventists have dealt with aspects of the Book of Hebrews, almost no Adventist commentaries are available on this important New Testament letter. George Knight must be lauded for having remedied the apparent lack. This commentary is designed to be a user-friendly commentary, the first in a series of similar commentaries. G. Knight has provided his own translation of the Greek text. Following two preliminary sections and an introduction to the Book of Hebrews the author deals with the content of the Letter to the Hebrews in nine major parts and 53 smaller sections, doing an excellent job in interpreting Hebrews for a twenty-first century audience.

Although the commentary is called a devotional commentary, exegetical insights appear in many places. It does not, however, follow the format used in most other commentaries, with verse indications to point out which verse the author is exploring in a given place. This commentary contains no footnotes or endnotes, but a bibliography is supplied on pp. 23-25. References to secondary literature are found in the text itself. Because

the commentary is called a homiletical commentary it uses illustrations here and there and has a personal tone in some places. It also focuses on application, has a practical touch, and contains shaded boxes with interesting outlines, explanations, or quotations. However, in the theological sections of Hebrews the practical aspects are not intensively developed. The author seems to like enumerations which are used quite frequently. They contribute to clarity of thought.

The book contains helpful remarks on Hebrews 7, the covenant, the permanency of the law, the Day of Atonement, etc. It discusses some of the difficult issues but is silent on others (e.g., the question of which veil is addressed in Heb 6:19 or how to understand precisely the locations in Heb 9:11-12). But a devotional commentary need not deal with these detailed questions or with the challenges presented by certain Adventist and non-Adventist authors who believe that the Book of Hebrews contradicts the Adventist sanctuary doctrine.

The present reviewer felt that in some minor areas the commentary could be a little more balanced or phrased differently (e.g., the discussion of the old covenant on pp. 146-147, the standard for the final judgment on p. 242, and the food mentioned in Heb 13:9 discussed on p. 246). It may be difficult to follow G. Knight in his suggestion that the "false" placing of the altar of incense in Heb 9:4 was due to the fact "that the author may not have been all that concerned with the exact details because he had more important things to talk about" (p. 152), especially if he was Jewish-Christian writing to a Jewish-Christian audience.

Aside from these minor reservations the commentary is a valuable work. It may prove very helpful for the Adventist community worldwide addressing church members as well as pastors and scholars and strengthening their commitment to their Savior and High Priest Jesus Christ.

Ekkehardt Mueller, BRI

BIBLICAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE

GENERAL CONFERENCE OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS

12501 Old Columbia Pike, Silver Spring, MD 20904, USA

Webpage: <http://biblicalresearch.gc.adventist.org>; phone: 301-680-6790

fax: 301-680-6788; e-mail: biblicalresearch@gc.adventist.org

Editor: Ekkehardt Mueller, Th.D., D.Min.

Production Manager: Marlene Bacchus