

Andrews University Seminary Student Journal

Volume 1
Number 1 *Spring 2015*

Article 1

1-2015

Full Issue, Vol. 1, No. 1

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/aussj>



Part of the [Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

(2015) "Full Issue, Vol. 1, No. 1," *Andrews University Seminary Student Journal*: Vol. 1 : No. 1 , Article 1.

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/aussj/vol1/iss1/1>

This Full Issue is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @ Andrews University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Andrews University Seminary Student Journal by an authorized editor of Digital Commons @ Andrews University. For more information, please contact repository@andrews.edu.

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY SEMINARY STUDENT JOURNAL

Volume 1

Spring 2015

Number 1

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL iii

INVITED ARTICLE

FORTIN, DENIS. Historical and Theological Perspectives on
the Rise of Arminianism and the Place of Seventh-day
Adventism in the Calvinist-Arminian Debate 1

ARTICLES

THEOLOGY

SILVA, SERGIO L. Creation and Covenant: A Hermeneutical
Approach to the Correlation of the Seventh Day
and the Biblical Sabbath 17

MENDIETA, ERICK. Typology and Adventist Eschatological
Identity: Friend or Foe? 43

CHURCH HISTORY

HERNANDEZ, ABNER F. Adventist Eschatological Identity
and the Interpretations of the Time Periods of Daniel 12:11-12 65

BURTON, KEVIN M. Wolcott Hackley Littlejohn:
Defender of the Faith 85

Copyrights @ 2015 held by authors

Online edition: ISSN 2376-063X

Print edition: ISSN 2376-0621

WELCOME *AUSSJ* AND LIVE LONG!

JIRÍ MOSKALA

Dean and Professor of Old Testament Exegesis and Theology
(Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Andrews University)

Congratulations! It is a great pleasure to introduce a new journal initiated by the Seminary doctoral students and produced at the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary. Its particularity lies in the fact that it is a student journal sponsored by the Seminary faculty. This is a historical moment because a student journal has never been published at the Theological Seminary. The journal's name echoes and is deliberately associated with *Andrews University Seminary Studies*, the official Seminary journal. At first glance, it may look like *AUSSJ* is a child of *AUSS*. The acronym of this newborn journal may be puzzling and misleading for some, because the first guess is to interpret it as a *junior* journal of *AUSS*. However, the last letter *J* in the acronym of *AUSSJ* simply stands for journal.

The acronym *AUSSJ* stands for *Andrews University Seminary Student Journal*. It will be mainly published semiannually online. The play with *AUSS* is intentional in order to demonstrate its close affinity to Andrews University and the Theological Seminary. This new endeavor by students is jointly sponsored by the Andrews University School of Graduate Studies and the SDA Theological Seminary.

The first issue presents a powerful medley of important issues. The sponsoring faculty member for this special introductory volume is Dr. Denis Fortin, professor of Theology, and his insightful article deals with "Historical and Theological Perspectives on the Rise of Arminianism and the Place of Seventh-day Adventism in the Calvinist-Armenian Debate." Four bright students publish their fine studies: (1) Sergio Silva argues for the importance of perceiving a close relationship between biblical Creation and Covenant. He approaches this topic from an exegetical angle and offers answers to the principle question of what is the correlation between the seventh day and the biblical Sabbath. (2) Erick Mendieta engages the readers' attention with a pertinent problem that lies at the core of our Seventh-day Adventist self-understanding when he deals with our interpretation of typology in relationship to Adventist eschatological identity. (3) Abner Hernandez explains in his article the need for careful prophetic interpretation and articulates the historicist understanding of the 1290 and 1335 days/years of Daniel 12 and formulates this historical study especially against the futuristic interpretation. (4) Kevin Burton underlines the importance of studying early Adventist history and draws crucial lessons from the life and struggles of Wolcott H. Littlejohn whom he presents as a defender of the faith.

It is a joy to be at the birth of this students' journal and wish it a safe, meaningful, and fruitful journey through real life. May its sailing always be under God's guidance, leadership, and abundant blessings. May this journal inspire many

to do solid, accurate, and balanced scholarship, and bring many into a closer relationship with God and a better understanding of the Holy Scriptures. May its pages guide its readers to unfolding deep mysteries of God's Word, be a force for courageous and bold actions, and lead to faithful advancement of the mission of the Church. Let this journal grow and become a powerful theological resource for exploring God's truth with passion and joy. May its contributions speak powerfully to the mind, answer pertinent questions, and touch the hearts of its writers and readers.

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES ON THE RISE OF ARMINIANISM AND THE PLACE OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISM IN THE CALVINIST-ARMINIAN DEBATE

DENIS FORTIN

Professor of Theology

(Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Andrews University)

fortind@andrews.edu

Abstract

This article provides a brief historical survey of some of the theological issues raised by Arminius and *The Remonstrance*, and seeks to identify the key theological arguments that anchor the Arminian perspective of the Adventist doctrine of salvation. Four hundred years ago, in 1610, a group of Dutch pastors and theologians published a document in which they responded to the accusations of heresy leveled against the teachings of their colleague, Reformed theologian Jacobus Arminius, who had recently died (1609). This document encapsulated Arminian teachings on the doctrine of salvation in five points and subsequently became known as *The Remonstrance*, a French noun referring to an official and well-articulated document to protest or raise objections about a law or an edict. In the years that followed, the teachings of *The Remonstrance* became a rallying point for those who were dissatisfied with traditional Calvinism. In 1618, during the Synod of Dort, Reformed theologians fought against the Arminian soteriology presented in *The Remonstrance* and formulated their own response to the five points of Arminianism. This eventually became known as the five points of Calvinism, otherwise referred to as TULIP (the Total depravity of human beings, the Unconditional election of the redeemed, the Limited atonement of Christ only for the redeemed, the Irresistible grace of God toward the redeemed, and the Perseverance of the Saints). Subsequent decades and centuries witnessed waves of conflicts among many Christian Protestant religious groups that traced their theological roots to either Calvinism or Arminianism. The Seventh-day Adventist understanding of salvation clearly finds its roots in the Arminian *Remonstrance* and Wesleyan Methodism, but also brings its own unique theological nuances and contributions to this doctrine.

Keywords: Calvinism, Arminius, Arminianism, *Remonstrance*, Salvation, Methodism, TULIP, predestination, freewill.

Introduction

About four hundred years ago, in 1610, a group of Dutch pastors and theologians published a document in which they responded to the accusations leveled against the teachings of their colleague, Reformed theologian Jacobus, or James, Arminius, who had died the year before. This document encapsulated Arminian soteriological teachings in five points and subsequently became known as *The Remonstrance*, a French word referring to an official and well-reasoned document to protest or raise objections about a law or an edict.

In the years that followed, the teachings of *The Remonstrance* became a rallying point for those who were dissatisfied with traditional Calvinism, but more particularly with a strict *unconditional* predestination.

Subsequent decades and centuries witnessed waves of conflicts among many Christian Protestant religious groups that traced their theological roots to either Calvinism or Arminianism. As Roger Olson has shown in his recent book *Arminian Theology: Myths and Realities*,¹ there are major theological differences between Calvinism and Arminianism, but there are also many points in common. The Seventh-day Adventist understanding of salvation clearly finds its roots in the sixteenth-century Reformation and the Arminian *Remonstrance*. But eighteenth-century Methodism, which championed Arminian thought, forms the immediate theological context for the Adventist doctrine of salvation in the nineteenth century.

This article presents a brief historical survey of the theological issues raised by Arminius and *The Remonstrance*, the Calvinist/Reformed response given at the Synod of Dort, and identifies the key theological arguments that anchor the Arminian perspective of the Adventist doctrine of salvation.

I. Theological Issues Raised by Arminius and the Remonstrance

Arminianism begins per se in Holland at the end of the sixteenth century. James Arminius was born near Rotterdam in 1559.² He studied theology under some of the best teachers of his time and spent five years in Geneva (1582-1587) under the tutelage of Theodore Beza where he was exposed to the various forms of scholastic Reformed theology. In 1588, Arminius received a pastoral appointment

¹Roger E. Olson, *Arminian Theology: Myths and Realities* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2006).

²This biographical and historical context of Arminius' life and teachings is taken from Richard A. Müller, "Arminius and Arminianism," in *The Dictionary of Historical Theology*, ed. Trevor A. Hart (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000), 33-35, and J. K. Grider "Arminianism," in *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Walter A. Elwell (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1984), 79-81.

in Amsterdam and in 1602 became professor of theology at the University of Leiden.

Arminius soon found himself at odds with two of his university colleagues, Franciscus Gomarus and Lucas Trelcatius. During the decade or so before his university appointment, Arminius had begun to shift his understanding of the Reformed doctrine of predestination and the debate that his views initiated at the university occupied the remainder of his life. In 1608, he argued for his orthodoxy in his *Declaration of Sentiments*, a document he offered to the Estates General of Holland.³ In this document he presented his views on predestination, human free will, divine grace, assurance of salvation, the divinity of Christ, and his justification for his request to revise the *Belgic Confession* and the *Heidelberg Catechism*. Of all the topics he addressed in the *Declaration* predestination receives the lengthiest treatment and he clearly stated his divergence from the Reformed theology of his colleagues. “The document presents three Reformed views of predestination—the supralapsarian, a modified supralapsarian position, and the infralapsarian—and rejects them all in favour of a fourth position, Arminius’s own.”⁴

Supralapsarianism

Supralapsarianism is the form of the doctrine of predestination that Arminius was most at odd with and in order to understand his position and the theological contributions he made, we need to understand what he was against. Calvinist theology laid great emphasis on the sovereignty of God, which was a concept borrowed from Augustine. God is said to be perfect in all respects of his nature, possessor of all power, righteousness, and holiness. He is eternal and completely self-sufficient. Therefore, he is not subject either to time or to any other beings, nor is he to be reduced to spacio-temporal categories for human understanding and analysis. To his creatures God must always remain mysterious, except insofar as he reveals himself to them.

This philosophical understanding of the nature of God, taken from Greek Aristotelian and neo-Platonic philosophy, had some important implications. According to this perspective God is timeless and exists in timelessness; hence, he cannot do anything new for this would reduce him to a set of imperfect and human categories. “Zwingli and Calvin both had emphasized that everything that happens—including the fall of Adam and Eve and the election of some humans to salvation and others to damnation—is decreed by God. In other words [...] nothing at all happens or can happen accidently or even contingently. Everything that happens outside of God himself happens by divine decree. God foreknows

³James Arminius, *A Declaration of the Sentiments of Arminius in The Works of James Arminius*, London ed., trans. by James Nichols and William Nichols (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1996), 210-275.

⁴Müller, 34.

what will happen because he foreordains everything that happens, and he foreordains because he decrees it all from eternity.”⁵

Therefore, Reformed theology at the time of Arminius wondered and speculated about the order of these eternally foreordained divine decrees. Theologians asked themselves what could have been the ultimate and first decree in the mind of God, the eternal decree that would bring the most glory to God. “They agreed that all of God’s decrees are simultaneous and eternal because they accepted Augustine’s notion of eternity as an ‘eternal now’ in which all times—past, present and future—are simultaneous. For God, they believed, there is no separation or even succession of moments. Everything is eternally present.”⁶ Since God exists only in timelessness, God cannot respond to a human situation, like the fall. What appears to us as God’s response to human life has always been decided of all eternity in the mind of God and God has preordained of all eternity, before the creation of time, everything that has happened in regards to the plan of salvation.

Reformed theologians speculated over the *logical* order of these decrees, not their *chronological* order. At the time of Arminius, they had somehow figured out and established the order of these divine decrees into different schemes. Arminius took issue with the supralapsarian scheme of these decrees. These decrees of God are named in reference to the fall of humanity, particularly when was ordained the decree to save the elect. Supralapsarianism argues that the decree that brings the most glory to God is the salvation of the elect and the damnation of others, and this decree must logically have been in the mind of God *before* the decree to allow or ordain the fall of humanity (from the Latin *supra* before, and *lapsa* fall). The logical order of the supralapsarian decrees is:

1. To predestine some to eternal life in heaven and some others to eternal damnation in hell;
2. To create both the saved and the reprobate;
3. To allow the fall of humanity;
4. To provide atonement and salvation only for the elect;
5. To give salvation only to the elect.

⁵Roger E. Olson, *The Story of Christian Theology: Twenty Centuries of Tradition and Reform* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1999), 457. Based on Eph 1:11 where Paul refers to the plan of him “who works all things after the counsel of His will,” God’s decree is a theological concept for the comprehensive plan for the universe and its history which God’s sovereignty established in eternity. The Westminster Shorter Catechism provides this classic definition: “The decrees of God are his eternal purpose, according to the counsel of his will, whereby, for his own glory, he hath foreordained whatsoever comes to pass” (Question 7). See Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom*, 3 vols. (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1919), 3:677.

⁶Olson, *Story of Christian Theology*, 457.

The Remonstrance

In 1610, just one year after the death of James Arminius, five articles of faith based on his teachings were drawn up by his followers. The Arminians, as his followers came to be called, presented these five doctrines to the States of Holland and West Friesland in the form of a *Remonstrance*. The Arminian party also insisted that the *Belgic Confession* and the *Heidelberg Catechism* (which was the official expression of the doctrinal position of the Churches of Holland) be amended to conform to the doctrinal views contained in the *Remonstrance*. They wanted to see changes made to five particular doctrines of the Reformed faith as understood by supralapsarianism.

Before going any further, we should note that Arminius and the Remonstrants did not reject the philosophical foundation of Reformed theology. Their understanding of God's eternal nature, of eternity, and of the need of eternal divine decrees remained intact. What they challenged was the nature of these decrees, their logical order and their biblical and historical foundation. Arminius and his colleagues were Protestant scholastic theologians just as much as other Reformed theologians at the time. By the eighteenth century, however, when John Wesley championed an Arminian understanding of salvation, this philosophical understanding of eternity and of God's relationship with humanity was no longer as prominent and did not concern theologians to the same extent.

What were the five doctrinal points or objections of the Arminian *Remonstrance*?

God's election of people is conditional to their response. The first point of contention with traditional Reformed theology was its *unconditional* predestination. Arminians had difficulty accepting that God would decide from all eternity who would be saved and who would not. Moreover, if God would of his own will decide to save some, then why not save all humankind? In this sense Arminianism viewed Calvinism as fatalistic.

The Remonstrants also had difficulty with the antinomian tendencies of Calvinism or the seeming complacency of the people. If God had already determined who would be saved, why should people make much efforts at keeping the commandments of God or in being strict about church standards? For Arminianism this attitude had also a negative impact on missionary and evangelistic endeavors. Why preach the gospel if God has already decided who will be saved? Furthermore, Calvinism's view of predestination was opposed to human freedom and human reason, key concepts of the Renaissance view of humankind.

In contrast to Reformed unconditional predestination, the *Remonstrance* states that God, foreseeing who would believe in Jesus, has predestined the elected people to salvation and that one's salvation is determined by one's acceptance of God's offer. Arminianism affirms that God desires all persons to be saved but an individual has to believe in the salvation Christ has provided in order for her to be

saved and to benefit from salvation. A key text for Arminians is John 3:16, “For God so loved the world that he gave his only Son that whosoever believes in Him should not perish but have everlasting life.”

Christ died for all sinners. The *Remonstrance* objects to Calvinism’s view of limited atonement, that Christ atoned for the sins of the elect only. Arminianism affirms that Christ’s sacrifice of atonement on the cross was made for all of humankind who has ever lived or will ever live. Yet, the benefits of this universal atonement are applied only to the believer.

Human freewill is restored by the Holy Spirit. The *Remonstrance* also specifies that because of the fall of Adam and Eve, the nature of human beings is sinful and that of themselves no one is able to do good or even to believe in God. Even a person’s will is affected by sin. However, God has given to every human being a measure of his grace to enable them to accept the influence of the Spirit. Through this divine intervention, called prevenient grace, human beings have a free will and are able to believe in God because the Holy Spirit works in all of them. It is therefore the work of the Holy Spirit to effect a transformation in a person’s heart in order for them to rightly understand, think, will, and effect what is truly good.

Grace can be resisted. In article four the *Remonstrance* explains that God, through his Holy Spirit and his grace, accomplishes all the good that a person may do or conceive. However, the grace of God can be resisted. People may resist the operation of the Holy Spirit in one’s life and God does not force anyone against their will to accept his salvation.

Believers may persevere in the faith or fall from grace. The last article goes on to say that the Christian may have the victory over sin through the assisting grace of the Holy Spirit. If the individual who is tempted to sin desires the help of Christ, he/she will have the victory. In the last part of the article, the statement becomes blurry, and the writers did not seem to know for sure if it was possible for one to fall from grace, although it cited a few biblical references that support this concept. However, later Arminianism took the position that one’s perseverance in the faith is a condition for salvation.

Synod of Dort

Calvinism reacted strongly to the *Remonstrance* and its five Arminian articles. What Arminianism promoted was tantamount to a redefinition of what Reformation theology had stood for against Roman Catholicism. The Reformers had stood firmly against the possibility of humankind to earn even a little part of their salvation and believed Roman Catholicism had accepted during the Middle Ages an anthropology based on Pelagianism, that human beings are not totally depraved but could operate parts of their salvation. The Reformers believed that this view of humankind was the basis of Roman Catholic sacraments and of a works-oriented salvation scheme.

By understanding the nature of human beings to be totally depraved, as Augustine had believed against Pelagius, Reformed soteriology emphasized the sovereignty of God in the salvation of humanity. From all eternity, God chose who would be saved and who would be lost, without any human participation in salvation. We need to understand the Reformers' position in its context and in reaction to abuses and aberrations in Catholic theology. I believe Arminianism brought back the pendulum of the doctrines of God's sovereignty, human free will and salvation into a more centrist position with a better biblical understanding.

In any case, Reformed theologians reacted strongly against Arminianism. To meet the challenge they faced various Reformed churches of Holland, Switzerland, England and France sent delegates to a synod in the city of Dort from November 13, 1618 to May 9, 1619.

It unanimously rejected the five points of Arminianism and produced a document, the Canons of the Synod of Dort, in which the major doctrines of Reformed theology were carefully defined in response to Arminianism. It is from this document that came what is now called the "five points of Calvinism"⁷ or the TULIP:

1. the Total depravity of human beings,
2. the Unconditional election of the redeemed,
3. the Limited atonement of Christ only for the redeemed,
4. the Irresistible grace of God toward the redeemed, and
5. the Perseverance of the Saints.

Regarding the position taken by the Synod of Dort, Jaroslav Pelikan comments, "the Synod of Dort affirmed its allegiance to normative Reformed teaching, as promulgated in the *Belgic Confession*, to whose authority the several national delegations to the synod subscribed, and in the *Heidelberg Catechism*, which was endorsed as 'a very accurate compendium of orthodox Christian doctrine.'"⁸ This document is still today the basis of many Reformed doctrinal positions.

Although it is a strong Calvinist document, and a reaffirmation of the basic tenets of supralapsarianism, some of the language and expressions used in it betray an uneasiness with the freedom of the will and such texts of Scripture as John 3:16. From an Adventist perspective, it does not successfully answer the objections raised by James Arminius and *The Remonstrance*. Thus the debate continues 400 years later.

⁷A well-known exposition of the five points of Calvinism is David N. Steele and Curtis A. Thomas, *The Five Points of Calvinism* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Pub. Co., 1963).

⁸Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine*, vol. 4: *Reformation of Church and Dogma (1300-1700)* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984), 236.

II. Key Theological Arguments of Adventist Arminian Soteriology

But why are Seventh-day Adventists Arminian in their theology? I will try to answer this question from two directions; first, by highlighting what I perceive to be Arminius's most accurate and powerful arguments showing the weaknesses of an unconditional predestinarian theology and, second, by describing briefly the major foci of Adventist theology.

Arminius's Key Theological Contributions

After many years of conflicts, as I alluded to earlier, Arminius wrote his *Declaration of Sentiments* in 1608 in which he presented his best arguments against the supralapsarian form of Reformed theology and why he felt it was inconsistent with biblical theology and church history.

Seventh-day Adventists know very little about James Arminius. In fact, most of Protestantism knows very little about Arminius. He remains one of the least studied Protestant theologians, yet he is still one of the most influential. Among his arguments in the *Declaration of Sentiments*, his twenty objections to the supralapsarian doctrine of unconditional predestination reveal a deep knowledge of Scripture, church history and contemporary theological developments.

Among Arminius's twenty objections I find that five of them, in particular, speak powerfully in favor of his understanding of the plan of salvation and resonate well with Adventist beliefs. At the beginning of the list, he stated unequivocally the main reasons for his decision to reject supralapsarianism. The various texts of Scripture that speak of a person's belief in God's salvation, or of the need to believe in Christ in order to be saved, are at the core of his understanding of the plan of salvation and of the gospel. Arminius saw a crucial sequence of events in Scripture regarding someone's salvation: God loves humanity and gives his Son as a sacrifice of atonement for all humankind, and whoever believes in Christ and repents from sin, receives the forgiveness of sins and the promise of eternal life. This sequence he believed is the core doctrine of the gospel and this Good News is a genuine invitation to whoever believes. God provides salvation for all human beings, he invites them to accept Christ as Saviour, those who accept this invitation are saved. Hence, God could not have already determined who would be saved or lost before the creation of the world or before the fall of humankind as stated in supralapsarianism. "For, according to the tenor of the discourses delivered by John and Christ," Arminius explained, "as they are described to us by the Evangelist, and according to the doctrine of the Apostles and Christ after his ascension, the Gospel consists partly of an injunction to *repent and believe*, and partly of a promise to bestow *forgiveness of sins, the grace of the Spirit, and life eternal*."⁹ According to Arminius, the simple sequence of events

⁹Arminius, *Declaration of Sentiments*, 217.

explained in Scripture is to be accepted as God's revelation of the plan and the order of salvation.

A second crucial theological reason that I find appealing is based on his understanding of the nature of God's character. Arminius finds "repugnant" to the nature of God's character the belief that from all eternity he decreed some people to eternal damnation before they were created and even before they made a decision to rebel against him. This, he said, "represents God as decreeing something for a particular end [...] which neither is nor can be good".¹⁰ Fundamentally, he argued, the decision to condemn someone, before that person sins, is an evil decision and cannot be in accordance to God's wisdom, justice and goodness.

A third theological reason relates to the freedom of the will. He argued that human beings were created with freedom of will and, therefore, "with a disposition and aptitude for the enjoyment of life eternal."¹¹ Hence, if the first decree of supralapsarianism is accurate, then this doctrine is inconsistent with the image of God in human beings; human beings were not really created with freedom of will since logically before their creation they were already unconditionally predestined to either be saved or be lost. In fact, human beings are misled to think that they have freedom of will.

A fourth theological reason relates to the purpose of creation. Scripture tells us that creation was a "good" act of God, which implies a moral quality. At the end of the creation week, "God saw everything that He had made, and indeed it was very good" (Gen 1:31 NKJV). According to Arminius, "If creation be the way and means through which God willed the execution of the decree of his reprobation, he was more inclined to will the act of reprobation than that of creation; and he consequently derived greater satisfaction from the act of condemning certain of his innocent creatures, than in the act of their creation."¹² Again, here, Arminius raised an issue of logical inconsistencies between the supralapsarian understanding of salvation and his understanding of biblical theology. Ultimately, if God derives more glory from the salvation of some and the damnation of others, than he does from the creation of human beings, then why create human beings in the first place? Why give them freedom of the will? Why declare creation to be "very good"? To Arminius, all this is illogical and inconsistent with biblical revelation.

A fifth theological reason Arminius stated relates to the nature of sin and its impact on the nature of God's character. I find this argument the strongest he made. What is the relationship between sin, human transgression, and eternal damnation? In the plan of salvation, is sin the result of a human transgression to God's law and does it bring about eternal damnation? Paul seems to say so in

¹⁰Ibid., 222.

¹¹Ibid., 223.

¹²Ibid., 226.

Romans 6:23, “for the wages of sin is death”—death is caused by sin. But, if according to supralapsarianism, transgression was logically decreed before human beings were created, than how can sin be the cause of damnation? Paul states that sin is the cause of damnation but supralapsarianism makes sin the means of damnation since one’s damnation was decreed before sin was ever committed. Hence, Arminius concluded that such a doctrine is profoundly “injurious to the glory of God” because it makes God the reason for the existence of sin; sin was necessary in order to effect the damnation God decreed of all eternity. The first decree of supralapsarianism could not happen unless in the third decree “God ordained that man should commit sin.” Sin is therefore unavoidable in God’s universe and some people, those who are condemned, could not avoid sin. Sin was necessary in order for God to receive all glory and majesty. The logical conclusion of all this according to Arminius is that “God is the author of sin”, “God really sins” by ordaining something evil (which is a moral decision at odds with God’s nature), and “God is the only sinner.”¹³ Perhaps of all the theological arguments Arminianism has fired at Calvinism, this is the strongest. How can God be consistent with his character of love if unconditional predestination also assumes that God decreed the existence of sin?

In his *Declaration of Sentiments*, Arminius concluded his list of arguments by stating his own understanding of the eternal decrees of God. God’s decrees are:

1. “to appoint his Son, Jesus Christ, for a Mediator, Redeemer, Savior, Priest and King [...]”;
2. “to receive into favor *those who repent and believe*, and, in Christ, for His sake and through Him, to effect the salvation of such penitents and believers as persevered to the end; but to leave in sin, and under wrath, *all impenitent persons and unbelievers*, and to damn them as aliens from Christ”;
3. “to administer *in a sufficient and efficacious manner* the means which were necessary for repentance and faith; and to have such administration instituted [...]”;
4. “to save and damn certain particular persons.”¹⁴

To this last decree Arminius adds that the foundation of this decree is the “foreknowledge of God, by which he knew from all eternity those individuals who *would*, through his preventing grace, *believe*, and, through his subsequent grace *would persevere*, [...] and by which foreknowledge, he likewise knew those who *would not believe and persevere*.”¹⁵

¹³Ibid., 228, 229.

¹⁴Ibid., 247, 248.

¹⁵Ibid., 248.

What's Arminian in Adventist Theology?

Although Adventists do not subscribe to an Augustinian or scholastic worldview, their theology is anchored and deeply rooted in the basic Arminian system of thought as they inherited it from Methodism. This provides Adventists with the foundation for their core beliefs regarding the character of God and the plan of salvation. In his analysis of the Arminian roots of Adventist beliefs, Russell Staples states, “The cluster of doctrines relating to the Fall and sin and salvation constitute a thoroughgoing evangelical Arminianism.”¹⁶ In fact, the Adventist theme of the great controversy between good and evil provides a theological framework that is dependent on an Arminian understanding of God’s relationship with sinners and the sinner’s need to respond to the gospel invitation.

Adventists believe that the core characteristic of God’s character is love, a selfless love on behalf of his creation, a love that guides all his actions toward the universe and humanity. God’s character of love is intrinsic to who he is and was such prior to the creation of any other beings. The creation of the universe, including angels and human beings, was an act of love. Yet, sadly, this perfect universe created by God became corrupted by sin and rebellion.

According to Adventist beliefs, Scripture teaches that the problem of evil started in heaven when a perfect angel created by God, Lucifer, decided of his own freewill to rebel against God and his government.¹⁷ Deceived by his self-confidence and pride, Lucifer decided to challenge God’s authority and to level against God accusations of tyranny and arbitrariness, that God’s government is based on arbitrary rules, that God is not a god of love but one of vindictiveness. Thus, Adventists understand the core of the problem of evil and sin in the universe to be at once a theological and an ethical problem—that God’s character of love is challenged and misunderstood, that God’s government of the universe and response to humanity’s sin is misrepresented. Satan’s rebellion against God thus began a cosmic controversy between God and Satan, between God’s government and Satan’s claims, a rebellion that spread to Earth with the disobedience of Adam and Eve.¹⁸

¹⁶Russell L. Staples, “Adventism,” in *The Variety of American Evangelicalism*, ed. Donald W. Dayton and Robert K. Johnston (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1991), 63.

¹⁷Scripture passages that speak of this great controversy include Job 1:6-12; Isa 14:12-14; Eze 28:12-19; Rev 12:7-17; Luke 10:18. Gregory A. Boyd’s books *God at War* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1997) and *Satan and the Problem of Evil* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2001) present an understanding of this great controversy that is similar to what Adventists have believed.

¹⁸The Seventh-day Adventist Fundamental Belief #8 on the Great Controversy states, “All humanity is now involved in a great controversy between Christ and Satan regarding the character of God, His law, and His sovereignty over the universe. This conflict originated in heaven when a created being, endowed with freedom of choice, in self-

God's response to Adam and Eve's transgression was the plan of salvation, a plan that had been devised by the Trinity "before the foundation of the earth" (Eph 1:4; Rev 13:8). This plan of redemption insists that only God can redeem humanity from the fall and that only God's Son could die for humanity. This plan was devised as a response of God's love, a self-sacrifice on behalf of his creation. Yet, since the core issue of the great controversy is a misunderstanding of God's character, God cannot force anyone to accept his offer of salvation. Forcing or preordaining someone's salvation would be tantamount to give credence to Satan's accusations. Instead, the entire plan of salvation is based on the freewill of individuals to accept or reject the salvation provided by Christ's death on the cross as an act of God's redeeming, selfless love. Adventists believe that no one will be forced to live with God for eternity. God's dealings with humanity since the beginning of sin have been for the ultimate purpose to bring an end to this rebellion by demonstrating his love, mercy and justice through Christ's life and sacrificial death, and through his people Israel and the Church. When the rebellion began in heaven, God could have easily destroyed all opposition but in doing so, he would have cast a shadow on his character and given some credibility to Satan's accusations. It was to reveal the true character of God and to answer the accusations of Satan that Christ came to this earth to redeem humanity. Christ's death for the salvation of humankind did not only make heaven accessible to men and women who repent of their sins and accept the offer of salvation, but before all the universe it justified and vindicated God in his dealing with the rebellion of Satan.

This Adventist theological understanding of the origin of evil and sin and the plan of salvation are based on core Arminian presuppositions: that God's character is essentially love, a moral quality that respects decisions made by other free created beings; that God created human beings in his image with freedom of choice; that sin broke humanity's relationship with God but in God's mercy the Holy Spirit grants to all individuals a measure of grace to allow them the capacity to make the right choice in regards to spiritual matters; that Christ's sacrificial death on the cross is for the benefit of all human beings; that salvation in Christ is offered to every one; that God's grace sustains those who persevere in faith unto the end; and that God's foreknowledge of those who will be ultimately saved or

exaltation became Satan, God's adversary, and led into rebellion a portion of the angels. He introduced the spirit of rebellion into this world when he led Adam and Eve into sin. This human sin resulted in the distortion of the image of God in humanity, the disordering of the created world, and its eventual devastation at the time of the worldwide flood. Observed by the whole creation, this world became the arena of the universal conflict, out of which the God of love will ultimately be vindicated. To assist His people in this controversy, Christ sends the Holy Spirit and the loyal angels to guide, protect, and sustain them in the way of salvation" (Rev 12:4-9; Isa 14:12-14; Eze 28:12-18; Gen 3; Rom 1:19-32; 5:12-21; 8:19-22; Gen 6-8; 2 Peter 3:6; 1 Cor 4:9; Heb 1:14).

lost respects every human being's freedom of choice and that God elects to salvation those whom he knows will make the right choice.

If Adventists have been so insistent on talking about the commandments of God, and particularly the observance of the Sabbath, it is because of this theme of the great controversy and of our Arminian roots. At the core of this controversy is the character of God. The misrepresentation of God's character by Satan is a core issue, but also part of Satan's challenge to God's character is a challenge to his law, which is a true representation of his character. Satan's aim is also to misrepresent and distort God's law. In Adventist thought, the character of God and the law of God are not two separate elements of this controversy; God's law is a reflection of his character, of who he is. Hence, Adventists argue, keeping the commandments is the best way to demonstrate one's faith in God, not to be saved but to thank God for salvation. The same goes for all Adventist lifestyle teachings on health and taking care of our minds and bodies. If it is true there is a controversy over God's character and his government of the universe, each human being is part of this controversy and has a role to play in it. Our decisions may impact our own salvation and that of others. God's grace is sufficient to save all sinners, but God will not force someone to live with him for eternity. While Satan uses lies and deception to fulfill his purpose against God and his people, God on the other hand uses only loving persuasion. He never forces someone to serve Him.

Seventh-day Adventism is fundamentally Arminian. Of course, Adventism has many other points in common with other Christian groups but at the core of its belief system is Arminianism. And for Adventists, Arminius and the Remonstrants are part of a long line of God's faithful people who sought to understand the Scripture to the best of their abilities and to share the good news of the plan of salvation with others. Many of them were persecuted for their faith. Nonetheless, their legacy lives on. Adventists consider them as their spiritual ancestors.

Appendix
The Remonstrance

Article One

“That God, by an eternal and unchangeable purpose in Jesus Christ his Son, before the foundation of the world, hath determined, out of the fallen, sinful race of men, to save in Christ, for Christ’s sake, and through Christ, those who, through the grace of the Holy Ghost, shall believe on this his son Jesus, and shall persevere in this faith and obedience of faith, through this grace, even to the end; and, on the other hand, to leave the incorrigible and unbelieving in sin and under wrath, and to condemn them as alienate from Christ, according to the word of the Gospel in John 3:36: ‘He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him,’ and according to other passages of Scripture also.” Biblical texts supporting this position include John 3:16, 17; Ezek 33:11; 2 Peter 3:9; 1 Tim 2:3-4; Acts 17:30-31.

Article Two

“That agreeably thereunto, Jesus Christ the Savior of the world, died for all men and for every man, so that he has obtained for them all, by his death on the cross, redemption and the forgiveness of sins; yet that no one actually enjoys this forgiveness of sins except the believer, according to the word of the Gospel of John 3:16, “For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” And in the First Epistle of John 2:2: “And he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for *the sins of* the whole world.” Other biblical texts supporting this position include John 1:29; 2 Cor 5:14-15; Heb 2:9; Isa 53:6; 1 Tim 2:6; Titus 2:11.

Article Three

“That man has not saving grace of himself, nor of the energy of his free will, inasmuch as he, in the state of apostasy and sin, can of and by himself neither think, will, nor do any thing that is truly good (such as saving Faith eminently is); but that it is needful that he be born again of God in Christ, through his Holy Spirit, and renewed in understanding, inclination, or will, and all his powers, in order that he may rightly understand, think, will, and effect what is truly good, according to the Word of Christ, John 15:5, ‘Without me ye can do nothing.’”

Article Four

“That this grace of God is the beginning, continuance, and accomplishment of all good, even to this extent, that the regenerate man himself, without prevenient or assisting, awakening, following and cooperative grace, can neither think, will, nor do good, nor withstand any temptations to evil; so that all good deeds or movements, that can be conceived, must be ascribed to the grace of God in Christ. but respects the mode of the operation of this grace, it is not irresistible; inasmuch as it is written concerning many, that they have resisted the Holy Ghost. Acts 7, and elsewhere in many places.”

Article Five

“That those who are incorporated into Christ by true faith, and have thereby become partakers of his life-giving Spirit, have thereby full power to strive against Satan, sin, the world, and their own flesh, and to win the victory; it being well understood that it is ever through the assisting grace of the Holy Ghost; and that Jesus Christ assists them through his Spirit in all temptations, extends to them his hand, and if only they are ready for the conflict, and desire his help, and are not inactive, keeps them from falling, so that they, by no craft or power of Satan, can be misled nor plucked out of Christ’s hands, according to the Word of Christ, John 10:28: “Neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand.” But whether they are capable, through negligence, of forsaking again the first beginning of their life in Christ, of again returning to this present evil world, of turning away from the holy doctrine which was delivered them, of losing a good conscience, of becoming devoid of grace, that must be more particularly determined out of the Holy Scripture, before we ourselves can teach it with the full persuasion of our mind.” Biblical texts supporting this position include Heb 3:6, 14; 6:4-6; 10:26, 35, 38; 1 John 2:24; 1 Tim 1:19; 4:16; 2 Tim 2:12; 1 Cor 9:27; Rom 11:22.

CREATION AND COVENANT: A HERMENEUTICAL APPROACH TO THE CORRELATION OF THE SEVENTH DAY AND THE BIBLICAL SABBATH

SERGIO L. SILVA

Ph.D. Candidate in Systematic Theology (Andrews University)
silvas@andrews.edu

Abstract

For centuries, scholars have debated the nature of the relationship between the seventh day (Gen 2:1-3) and the biblical Sabbath (Exod 20:8-11). While Covenant Theologians insist that the seventh day works as the theological foundation of the biblical Sabbath, New Covenant Theologians reject this relationship and insist the Sabbath is an institution given exclusively to the Israelites. This article argues that according to an exegetical-historical and theological reading of selected texts on the Sabbath, one must regard the seventh day as the theological foundation of the biblical Sabbath to sustain a consistent and coherent theological system that uses Scripture as its epistemological foundation.

Keywords: hermeneutics, epistemology, covenant, Sabbath, creation.

Introduction

The book of Genesis is, arguably, the most controversial book of the Pentateuch. This is especially true if one considers the pre-Abrahamic section of the book (Gen 1-11), which contains the accounts of the creation, fall, flood, Tower of Babel, and two genealogies. These chapters are foundational to some essential Christian doctrines, such as the creation, Sabbath, fall, redemption, atonement, and judgment. In addition, these chapters also testify of God's exclusive attributes, like omnipotence, omniscience, omnibenevolence, and so forth. But most important is the fact that despite much theological debate surrounding the book of Genesis, scholars now recognize that the pre-Abrahamic section of Genesis contains "the interpretive foundation of all Scripture."¹⁹

¹⁹John Rankin, "Power and Gender at the Divinity School," in *Finding God at Harvard: Spiritual Journeys of Christian Thinkers*, ed. Kelly Monroe (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996), 203. Rankin says, "Whether one is evangelical or liberal, it is clear that Gen 1-3 is the interpretive foundation of all Scripture." See also, Eugene H. Merrill, "Covenant and the Kingdom: Genesis 1-3 as Foundation for Biblical Theology," *Criswell Theological Review* 1, no. 2 (1987): 298; Richard M. Davidson, *Flame of Yahweh: Sexuality in the Old Testament* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2007), 16; Richard A. Muller, *The Study of Theology:*

Similarly, the book of Exodus is also permeated with theological significance, and though scholars may differ on how to divide its content, the central theme of Exodus—the departure of the people of Israel from Egypt—is a fairly unified concept.²⁰ Most important, however, are the theological nuances that permeate the book as a whole. Sarna pointed out, that in Exodus one is able to find “the different aspects of the divine personality.”²¹ He explains,

[Exodus] express[es] a conception of God that is poles apart from any pagan notions. There is but a single Deity, who demands exclusive service and fidelity. Being the Creator of all that exists, He is wholly independent of His creations, and totally beyond the constraints of the world of nature, which is irresistibly under His governance. This is illustrated by the phenomena of the burning bush, the ten plagues, and the dividing of the Sea of Reeds. As a consequence, any attempt to depict or represent God in material or pictorial form is inevitably a falsification and is strictly prohibited. The biblical polemic against idolatry appears here for the first time in the context of the Exodus.²²

It is in these two OT books that a hermeneutical impasse exists between Covenant Theology (hereafter CT) and New Covenant Theology (hereafter NCT). Generally speaking, proponents of CT insist on upholding the principles of God’s moral law—the Decalogue.²³ Though there are different interpretations of how

From Biblical Interpretation to Contemporary Formulation. Foundations of Contemporary Interpretation (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996), 579.

²⁰Nahum M. Sarna, *Exodus*, 1st ed., JPS Torah Commentary (Philadelphia, PA: Jewish Publication Society, 1991), xii. Note that Osborn and Hatton amplify this view: “The Lord’s deliverance and the people’s obligation.” See Noel D. Osborn and Howard Hatton, *A Handbook on Exodus*, UBS Handbook Series (New York: United Bible Societies, 1999), 2. For additional information on the structure and outline of the Book of Exodus see Osborn and Hatton, *A Handbook on Exodus*, 2, 3; John I. Durham, *Exodus*, ed. David A. Hubbard et al., WBC 3 (Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1998), xxx; Carl F. Keil and Franz Delitzsch, *Commentary on the Old Testament*, 10 vols. (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1996), 1:268-270.

²¹Sarna, *Exodus*, xiii.

²²Ibid.

²³Cairns’ definition says, “Covenant theology maintains that the Mosaic economy was an administration of the covenant of grace. God never intended the moral law to be a way of salvation for sinful Israelites. He did not teach or offer the Jews salvation by works. When He gave the Decalogue, he also gave the ceremonial sacrificial system, which plainly pointed to ‘the Lamb of God’ who alone could take away sin. Thus there is a deep sense of continuity between the OT and the NT. The differences are those between types and their fulfillment, between shadows and their substance. It is a matter of historical and spiritual development. But both OT and NT present the same redemptive purpose of God, the same way of salvation, and the same great eschatological hope. Both Testaments present these truths in terms of ‘the everlasting covenant.’ This covenant was successively proclaimed throughout the OT (Gen 3:15; Gen 9; Gen 12), afterwards becoming a

Christians should interpret the commandment on the Sabbath, most CTs are in favor of keeping the Decalogue, including the principle expressed in the fourth commandment.²⁴

A particular approach is taken by Seventh-day Adventists (hereafter SDA), the largest Sabbath-keeping Christian group in the western hemisphere. Since their denominational organization on May 21, 1863, SDAs have insisted that the keeping of the seventh-day Sabbath is a requirement to “all people as a memorial of Creation.” They maintain that “the Sabbath is God’s perpetual sign of His eternal covenant between Him and His people. Joyful observance of this holy time from evening to evening, sunset to sunset, is a celebration of God’s creative and redemptive acts.”²⁵ SDAs claim that Gen 2:2, 3 is the theological foundation of the Sabbath, which they insist is the perpetual day of rest and worship. The fact that “God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, ... [and] rested from all His work which God had created and made” gives all believers the right to enjoy the blessings of the seventh-day Sabbath as a memorial of creation and redemption throughout history (Exod 20:8-11; Deut 5:12-15). Besides connecting God’s example of resting on the seventh day with the fourth commandment, CTs among SDAs also recognize the perpetuity of the Sabbath in the NT (Matt 5:17-20; Heb 4:9-11; Rev 12:17), and insist that the Sabbath is applicable to all Christians.

Though the keeping of the Sabbath ordinance finds unified support among SDAs, it finds little to no support among New Covenant Christians (hereafter NCCs). Generally speaking, NCTs tend to argue that the Sabbath belongs to the “Sinaitic Covenant” or the “Old Covenant.” They presuppose that the Sabbath is an institution used by God as a sign of the covenant he made exclusively with the people of Israel (Exod 31:16-17) in the Sinai.²⁶ Presumably, “the Ten Commandments are the old covenant made with Israel at Sinai... which Christ

national covenant. According to the NT, believers are reckoned in the same covenant as OT saints (Rom 4; Gal 3; Heb 8 with Jer 31). In all cases, salvation is only on the ground of the blood and righteousness of Christ. Though the same covenant of mercy operates in both the OT and the NT, in the NT it is called a *new* and *better* covenant, because in the OT it was administered by Moses the servant, whereas in NT times it is administered personally by Christ the Son (Heb 3:5, 6).” See Alan Cairns, *Dictionary of Theological Terms* (Greenville, SC: Ambassador Emerald International, 2002), 113.

²⁴Instead of keeping the seventh-day Sabbath, most CTs apply the principle of the fourth commandment to Sunday—the day of Christ’s resurrection—and call it the Christian Sabbath. See Charles P. Arand et al., *Perspectives on the Sabbath: 4 Views* (Nashville, TN: B&H Academic, 2011), 119-171. See also Benjamin B. Warfield, “The Foundations of the Sabbath in the Word of God,” in *Sunday: The World’s Rest Day* (Garden City, NJ: Doubleday, Page & Company, 1916), 63-81.

²⁵General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, *Church Manual*, 17th ed. (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 2005), 16.

²⁶Charles P. Arand et al., *Perspectives on the Sabbath: 4 Views* (Nashville, TN: B&H Academic, 2011), 227, 228.

annulled by His death on the cross.”²⁷ To use Moo’s words, “The content of all but one [the Sabbath] of the Ten Commandments is taken up into ‘the law of Christ,’ for which we are responsible.”²⁸ With this presupposition in mind, NCTs reject that Gen 2:2-3 is the theological foundation of the Sabbath, and reject that God’s rest on the seventh day is related to the institution of the Sabbath in Exod 20. For NCTs, Gen 2:2, 3 has no connection with the Sabbath in Exodus.

The NCT position on the interpretation of Gen 2:2, 3 is similar to that of Gerhard von Rad, in that Gen 2:2, 3 has no connection with the Sabbath. Contrasting Gen 2:2, 3 with the concluding act in the Babylonian account of creation, von Rad declares, “How different, how much more profound, is the impressive rest of Israel’s God! This rest is in every respect a new thing along with the process of creation, not simply the negative sign of its end; it is anything but an appendix.” He observes, “it is significant that God ‘completed’ his work on the seventh day (and not, as seems more logical, on the sixth—so the LXX!). This ‘completion’ and this rest must be considered as a matter for itself.” Then, von Rad concludes, “One should be careful about speaking of the ‘institution of the Sabbath,’ as is often done. Of that nothing at all is said here. The Sabbath as a cultic institution is quite outside the purview.”²⁹ Thomas Arnold, a proponent of NCT, summarizes that approach well. He insists,

The Sabbath was a “perpetual covenant” as “a sign between Me and the sons of Israel forever. The Sabbath was not given as a command to Adam in Genesis 1-5 or to Noah in Genesis 9. The Sabbath was given much later as a special covenant command to Israel at Sinai [in Exod 20:8-11 and 31:16, 17].” Therefore, it is a violation of this rule to import this later Commandment for a human workweek followed by a Sabbath back into Genesis 1. The later use of the Genesis 1 example in the Fourth Commandment is legitimate and right. But the use of examples works only one way. The earlier event may serve as an example for a later command, but the later command may not be imported back into the earlier event.³⁰

²⁷Cairns, *Dictionary of Theological Terms*, 303.

²⁸Douglas J. Moo, “The Law of Christ as the Fulfillment of the Law of Moses: A Modified Lutheran View,” in *Five Views on Law and Gospel*, ed. Stanley N. Gundry, Counterpoints: Bible and Theology, (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1999; reprint, Kindle Edition (2010)), 376.

²⁹Gerhard von Rad, *Genesis: A Commentary*, trans. John H. Marks, OTL (London: SCM, 1961), 60.

³⁰Thomas P. Arnold, *Two Stage Biblical Creation: Uniting Biblical Insights Uncovered by Ten Notable Creation Theories* (Arlington Heights, IL: Arnold, 2008), 364, 365. Arnold’s translation of Exod 31:16, 17 says: “So the sons of Israel shall observe the Sabbath, to celebrate the Sabbath throughout their generations as a perpetual covenant. It is a sign between Me and the sons of Israel forever; for six days the LORD worked on [‘āsāh] the heavens and the earth, but on the seventh day He ceased work, and rested.” See *ibid.*, 365.

As we can see, Arnold maintains that it is hermeneutically incorrect to “import later biblical concepts into earlier events.”³¹ Even though he agrees “the ideas of work and rest are [present] in Genesis 1:1-2:4a,” Arnold insists that “Genesis has no command for a workweek for man and no mention of ‘Sabbath’ requirements for man. The first time a Sabbath for man was mentioned was to Israel at Sinai (Exod 16:23) several millennia later.”³² With this being said, Arnold and von Rad agree that Gen 2:2, 3 is not the theological foundation of the Sabbath.³³

After considering these conflicting views on the theological foundation of the Sabbath, this article attempts to answer two foundational questions: First, is the interpretation of Gen 2:2, 3 as the theological foundation of the biblical Sabbath (Exod 20:8-11) hermeneutically incorrect? Second, is the Sabbath an institution created exclusively to be a sign of God’s covenant with the people of Israel?

In this article I argue that the correlation of the Sabbath and the seventh day of the creation week is not a violation of a consistent and coherent hermeneutics. In fact, the interpretation of the seventh day as the theological foundation of the Sabbath seem to be required to sustain unity in the biblical metanarrative.³⁴ With this being said, the purpose of this article is to show that a consistent exegetical-historical and theological reading of key texts on the Sabbath validates my thesis.

³¹Arnold, *Two Stage Biblical Creation*, 364.

³²Ibid., 364, 365.

³³Arnold’s claim also presupposes that the days in the creation week were calculated differently than the days of the Israelite workweek. He insists, “For the first several millennia of history, the standard understanding of a ‘day’ was daytime followed by nighttime. ... Several millennia after Adam was created, Israel as a new nation began celebrating Jewish holy days of Passover, Sabbath, and festivals beginning in the evening (Exod 12:6, 18; Deut 16:4). But these later holy days cannot be imported back into Genesis 1:3-5, which began with light and ended with night. The seventh day in Genesis 2:2-3 was not even designated a Sabbath. The first mention of Sabbath was for Israel in Exodus 16, several millennia later.” See Arnold, *Two Stage Biblical Creation*, 360, 384-392. This interpretation is based on the so-called “morning theory” and has attracted the attention of some prominent scholars like A. Dillman, U. Cassuto, J. Milgrom, and N. Sarna. See G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren, *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1974), 6:25 fns. 180-182. Scholars who oppose this view and favor the “evening theory” include Richard Davidson, Roy Gane, and Jacques Doukhan. For an insightful article from an exegetical perspective see J. Amanda McGuire, “Evening or Morning: When Does the Biblical Day Begin?” *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 46, no. 2 (2008): 201-214.

³⁴According to Wolters, “the term ‘metanarrative’ has been appropriated in biblical hermeneutics to refer to the overall story told by the Christian Scriptures, which is not totalizing or oppressive (Middleton and Walsh), and which makes possible the ‘redemptive-historical’ level of biblical interpretation (Wolters). In this usage, the term has been given a positive rather than a negative valuation, and it has close links with the idea of ‘worldview.’” See Albert Wolters, “Metanarrative,” *DTIB*, (2005), 506, 507.

In order to accomplish this task, I will adopt an interdisciplinary approach to biblical interpretation, which I call an exegetical-historical and theological reading of the text. In short, this approach maintains that in addition to exegesis, consistent interpretation of Scripture requires the use of the historical and the theological components, working together within the entire scope of the biblical metanarrative.³⁵ Thus, the correct biblical interpretation requires an understanding of how the text was interpreted by the church in the past, to help bridge the gap between the exegete and the theologian.³⁶ Next, it requires an explanation of how an exegetical-historical and theological reading of the text can impact practical, devotional, homiletical, and pastoral tasks in the church.

With this in mind, and to verify whether the thesis in this article might be authenticated by an exegetical-historical and theological reading of the text, I will describe the hermeneutical principles guiding the interpretation of Scripture in this discussion,, followed by an application of these hermeneutical principles to the interpretation of Gen 2:2, 3, and Exod 20:8-11 and 31:16, 17.

Defining the Hermeneutical Approach

Scholars have noticed that every method of interpretation includes three distinct levels: the material level (ML), the teleological level (TL), and the foundational level (FL). Together, these levels form—epistemologically speaking—the “rationality and formal structure” of every method of interpretation.³⁷

³⁵Kaiser argues that the best way to interpret Scripture is to adopt a three elements hermeneutic. I will call this an exegetical-historical and theological reading of the text. The exegetical component seeks to expose the meaning of the text for the original author and for his immediate audience; the historical component deals with the interpretation of the text throughout history independently of tradition; and the theological component deals with the relationship of the exegetical and the historical components of the text. For the purpose of this paper, to limit its size, and to address the gap between exegetes and theologians, I have chosen to use existing exegetical material and focus on the historical and theological components of the method I am using. For more information see Walter C. Kaiser, *Toward an Exegetical Theology: Biblical Exegesis for Preaching and Teaching* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1981), 15-40.

³⁶For the purpose of avoiding extensive discussion, I am delimiting my descriptive analysis of Gen 2:2-3, Exod 20:8-11, and Exod 31:16-17 to post-Reformation scholars like, Matthews Henry, Carl F. Keil, Franz Delitzsch, H. D. M. Spence-Jones, Henry C. Groves, James G. Murphy, Robert Jamieson, Claus Westermann, Nahum M. Sarna, David T. Tsumura, D. A. Carson, Gordon J. Wenham, Jacques B. Doukhan, Martin Buber, Wayne G. Strickland, Douglas J. Moo, K. A. Mathews, Noel D. Osborn, Howard Hatton, and Douglas K. Stuart.

³⁷Fernando L. Canale, *Creation, Evolution, and Theology* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 2005), 90. Guley agrees: “All literature shares the rules of general hermeneutics (*hermeneutica profana*).” See Norman R. Guley, *Systematic Theology: Prolegomena*, 3 vols. (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 2003), 1:687. Canale uses the term

With this in mind, the hermeneutical approach of this article affirms—on the ML—the authority of Scripture as the source of theology, and presupposes the actuality of all events recorded in the OT and the NT. Consequently, it maintains that it is ultimately through Scripture that one should seek to understand Scripture, and that knowledge about the relationship of the natural and the supernatural realms coalesces intelligibly. Thus, divine actions in the natural realm—like creation and resting—should be interpreted in light of Scripture as a whole. Hence, on the TL, the hermeneutical approach of this article wants to uphold scriptural authority and promote theological consistency in the biblical metanarrative. Also, on the FL, the hermeneutical approach of this article adopts philosophical presuppositions that are in line with Scripture. Here, there are three sublevels that require attention (ontology, metaphysics, and epistemology).³⁸ The theological method of this article adopts “critical realism” as its view of reality (i.e., ontological view).³⁹ “Critical realism” maintains that the natural world is the reality that can be experienced by sensory perception, but that a holistic view of

hermeneutical level instead of *foundational level*; to avoid confusion with the hermeneutical method, I have chosen to use *foundational level* instead. See Canale, *Creation, Evolution, and Theology*, 86-123; Fernando L. Canale, *Basic Elements of Christian Theology* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Lithotech, 2005), 10-29; Hans Küng, *Theology for the Third Millennium: An Ecumenical View*, trans. Peter Heinegg, 1st ed. (New York: Doubleday, 1988), 134, quoted in Fernando L. Canale, “Evangelical Theology and Open Theism: Toward a Biblical Understanding of the Macro Hermeneutical Principles of Theology?” *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 12, no. 2 (2001): 20.

³⁸According to Canale, it is at these levels that “the guiding principles for interpreting biblical texts and constructing the content of Christian theology” are provided. See Canale, *Creation, Evolution, and Theology*, 103. He explains that on the foundational—or hermeneutical level,—“the principles of interpretation are about reality (ontology), articulation (metaphysics), and knowledge (epistemology). The principle of reality deals with the basic characteristics of God, human beings and the world. The principle of articulation deals with the way in which God, human beings, and the world interact. The principle of knowledge deals with the way in which human knowledge operates, the origin of theological knowledge, and the way in which we should interpret theological data.” For more information see Canale, *Creation, Evolution, and Theology*, 90, 91. In other words, (a) the ontological level deals with the theologian’s understanding of God, being, and the natural world; (b) the metaphysical level deals with the theologian’s understanding of how God relates to human beings and the natural world (i.e., protology); and (c) the epistemological level deals with the theologian’s understanding of how human knowledge is formed, and the way in which one should decide how to interpret theological data. See Canale, *Basic Elements of Christian Theology*, 21.

³⁹A. R. Peacocke, *Theology for a Scientific Age: Being and Becoming—Natural, Divine, and Human*, enlarged ed., *Theology and the Sciences* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1993), 351 fn. 12. For arguments against the use of critical realism in theology see Andrew Moore, “Theological Realism and the Observability of God,” *International Journal of Systematic Theology* 2, no. 1 (2000), 79-99.

reality—Reality—must account for the supernatural world and common-sense knowledge, which cannot be objectively experienced.⁴⁰ Thus, the ontological view discussed here presupposes the existence of God (i.e., the supernatural realm) and the reality of creation (i.e., the natural realm).

Consequently, in order for this ontological view to succeed and have meaning to the interpreter of Scripture, it requires a metaphysic that connects the existence of God with the reality of his creation in time. This principle of articulation (i.e., metaphysical view) rejects the timelessness of God,⁴¹ and adopts what Fernando Canale calls “the infinite analogical temporality of God.”⁴² In a nutshell, “the infinite analogical temporality of God” means that in his everlastingness, God can experience time in order to interact with his creation without being affected by time like humans are (i.e., God does not grow old). In Scripture, this is possible because “God’s time does not have exactly (univocally) the same meaning that time has for creation. Likewise, what time means for God is not completely different from what it means for man (equivocally). Instead, biblical thinking assumes that God’s time and created time are similar (analogical).”⁴³ Since the discussion assumes that God interacts supernaturally with his creation in time, this principle of articulation places the biblical metanarrative with all of its components (e.g., God, angels, creation, and sin) in direct connection with human reality, which impacts practical, devotional, homiletical, and pastoral tasks in the church.

Finally, I suggest that the principle of knowledge (i.e., epistemological view) used by the interpreter of Scripture must be committed to the *sola*, *prima*, and *tota scriptura* principles. Here, I am suggesting that it is ultimately through Scripture that knowledge about the relationship of the natural and the supernatural realms coalesces intelligibly. Hence, this research presupposes the reality of the natural and supernatural realms. It sustains that Scripture alone can settle the disagreements between the interpretations of these two realms, and allows for a supernatural relationship between God and humankind that transcends the prevailing naturalistic view of reality in science in the early twenty-first century.⁴⁴ In this view, each verse should be interpreted within the scope of the biblical metanarrative, because consistent biblical interpretation can only be obtained within a protology to eschatology scope (i.e., metanarrative). Thus, each passage in Scripture should be read, analyzed, and interpreted starting with the passage itself,

⁴⁰To simplify: natural realm (i.e., reality) + supernatural realm = Reality.

⁴¹For more information see Canale, *Basic Elements of Christian Theology*, 40-53.

⁴²*Ibid.*, 72-73.

⁴³*Ibid.*, 70.

⁴⁴For information on the philosophical reasoning guiding the naturalistic approach to reality, see Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, trans. Francis Haywood (London: Pickering, 1848).

its immediate context, the inner biblical-historical context, and then the broader biblical context.

Besides these philosophical presuppositions, this research approaches the topic of covenant in Scripture as the study of one everlasting covenant, instead of multiple covenants. Thus, the covenants made with Adam, Noah, Abraham, Israel, and David are seen as temporal expressions and reaffirmations of YHWH's everlasting covenant.⁴⁵ According to LaRondelle,

The divine covenants with Adam (Gen 2:2-3, 15-17), Abraham (Gen 12; 15; 17), Israel through Moses (Exod 19-34), and David (2 Sam 7), along with the promised "new covenant" to Israel (Jer 31; Ezek. 36), can be viewed as successive stages of God's single covenant of redeeming grace that is fulfilled in Jesus Christ. The apostle Paul pointed to this aspect: "For no matter how many promises God has made, they are 'Yes' in Christ" (2 Cor 1:20).⁴⁶

For these reasons, the distinction between the "new covenant" and "old covenant" is portrayed here as experiential rather than historical,⁴⁷ meaning that the "new covenant" was never intended to nullify the "old covenant" as some have suggested.⁴⁸ Commenting on Jer 31:31-33 and the new covenant promised to Israel, Hafemann explains:

⁴⁵Similarly, Pink states: "The first germinal publication of the everlasting covenant is found in Genesis 3:15. ... The continual additions which God subsequently made to the revelation He gave in Genesis 3:15 were, for a considerable time, largely through covenants He made with the fathers, covenants which were both the fruit of His eternal plan of mercy and the gradual revealing of the same unto the faithful. Only as those two facts are and held fast by us are we in any position to appreciate and perceive the force of those subordinate covenants." See Arthur W. Pink, *The Divine Covenants* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1973), 15, 16. Roy Gane explains it this way: "Cumulative phases of God's unified 'everlasting covenant' bring wave upon wave of gracious divine initiative throughout Old Testament times and on into the New Testament, where the comprehensive culmination in the ultimate revelation and only truly effective sacrifice of Jesus Christ washes over the human race with a tidal wave of grace." See Roy E. Gane, *The Role of God's Moral Law, Including Sabbath, in the "New Covenant"*, Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, 2003, <https://www.adventistbiblicalresearch.org/sites/default/files/pdf/Gane%20Gods%20moral%20law.pdf> (accessed December 28, 2014).

⁴⁶Hans K. LaRondelle, *Our Creator Redeemer: An Introduction to Biblical Covenant Theology* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 2005), 5.

⁴⁷For a detailed exposition on how the "old" and "new covenant" differ, see Skip MacCarty, *In Granite or Ingrained? What the Old and New Covenants Reveal About the Gospel, the Law, and the Sabbath* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 2007), 57-142.

⁴⁸Strickland, for example, says: "The Mosaic law naturally ended when God suspended his program with Israel (Rom. 9-11) and inaugurated his program with the church." See Wayne G. Strickland, "The Inauguration of the Law of Christ with the Gospel of Christ: A Dispensational View," in *Five Views on Law and Gospel*, ed. Stanley N. Gundry,

The movement of thought from Jeremiah 31:32 to 33 makes clear that the covenantal relationship between God and his people is maintained by keeping the law in response to God's prior act of redemption (cf. Jer 31:1ff.). *This is no less true of the new covenant than it was of the Sinai covenant before it* (cf. Deut 6:20-25). *Rather than suggesting that the law is somehow negated in the new covenant, Jeremiah 31:31-33 emphasizes that it is the ability to keep the law as a result of having a transformed nature, not its removal, that distinguishes the new covenant from the covenant at Sinai.* Nor is there any indication in this text, or in Jeremiah as a whole, that the future eschatological restoration will entail the giving of a new law, or that the "law" of the new covenant will be merely an abstract revelation of the general will of God quite apart from the specifics of the Mosaic-code. (The LXX manuscript tradition which reads the plural "laws" for the singular "Torah" in Jer 38:33 [MT 31:33] underscores this latter point). For Jeremiah, the "law written on the heart" is the Sinai law itself as the embodiment of God's will. *The contrast between the two covenants remains a contrast between the two different conditions of the people who are brought into these covenants and their correspondingly different responses to the same law. The former broke the Sinai covenant, being unable to keep it due to their stubborn, evil hearts; the latter will keep the new covenant as a result of their transformed nature.*⁴⁹

Altogether, this approach to CT seems to strengthen the hermeneutical claims of the ML, the TL, and the FL, while advancing theological consistency by interpreting Scripture from a protology to eschatology scope, or in light of the biblical metanarrative.⁵⁰

Having defined the hermeneutical principles, the next section will provide an interpretation of Gen 2:2-3, Exod 20:8-11, and Exod 31:16, 17 guided by these standards. The goal is to show the evidence for and against the thesis of this article.

Counterpoints: Bible and Theology, (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1999; reprint, Kindle Edition (2010)), 73-171.

⁴⁹Scott J. Hafemann, "The 'Temple of the Spirit' as the Inaugural Fulfillment of the New Covenant within the Corinthian Correspondence," *Ex Auditu* 12 (1996): 32 (emphasis supplied).

⁵⁰This may be called the *tota scriptura* principle. Bartholomew explains, "Theological interpretation is concerned with reading the Bible for the church today. In that process it inevitably assumes an understanding of the Bible as a whole. In this respect biblical theology connects not only with *sola scriptura* but also *tota scriptura*. Scripture as a whole is confessed to be God's word. The major contribution of biblical theology is to deepen our understanding of the shape, complexity, and unity of Scripture on its own terms. Barr (Concept) calls this type of biblical theology 'panbiblical' and says that we should not focus on it at the expense of all the biblical theological work done on smaller parts of the Bible. However, the intuition that motivates comprehensive biblical theology stems from the gospel itself, so that discernment of the inner unity of the Bible must remain the goal and crown of biblical theology." See Craig G. Bartholomew, "Biblical Theology," *DTIB*, (2005), 88.

Applying the Hermeneutical Principles to the Text

A Descriptive Analysis of Genesis 2:2, 3

These verses describe the seventh day of the creation week: “And on the seventh day God ended His work which He had done, and He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had done. Then God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because in it He rested from all His work which God had created and made.” In the hermeneutical impasse between CT and NCT, the question associated with this text is whether the seventh day of the creation week should be regarded as the theological foundation of the Sabbath, as prescribed in Exod 20:8-11 and Exod 31:16, 17. The answer to this question depends on the hermeneutical method used to interpret these texts. When following the exegetical-historical and theological principles described above, I suggest that a more consistent theological system emerges from Scripture by interpreting Gen 2:1-3 as the theological foundation of the biblical Sabbath. I have found exegetical, historical, and theological evidence to support this claim.

Exegetically speaking, I have observed that some contemporary scholars recognize the unique character of the seventh day of the creation week. There is a distinctiveness to the seventh day in the literary structure of the creation account, which seems to point to a special purpose for the seventh day in the order of creation.⁵¹ Westermann agrees: “The concluding verses, Gen 2:1-3 are very different from what has gone before. They are not part of the day-by-day succession which forms the framework of the first chapter. They do not describe the work of a day and the former structure is no longer there.”⁵² I have found four supporting evidences associated with the literary structure of Gen 2:1-3.

First, in contrast with the other six days, the seventh day is the only day that does not require a twofold divine action to be finished (see Table 1). While all the other days show the same divine pattern of action to transform the condition of the planet earth in Gen 1:2 (“the earth was without form and void”), on the seventh day God simply “rested . . . from all His work which He had done” (Gen 2:2b).

⁵¹For information on the literary framework of the creation account, see David Toshio Tsumura, *The Earth and the Waters in Genesis 1 and 2*, JSOT Sup 83 (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), 39, 40; Claus Westermann, *A Continental Commentary: Genesis 1-11*, trans. John J. Scullion (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1994), 80-93; Arnold, *Two Stage Biblical Creation*, 65-83; Lee Irons and Meredith G. Kline, “The Framework View,” in *The Genesis Debate: Three Views on the "Days" of Creation*, ed. David G. Hagopian (Mission Viejo, CA: Crux, 2001), 217-256.

⁵²Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, 167.

A second distinction is, this is the only time during the creation week that creation occurs by divine example instead of divine command,⁵³ suggesting that from the early stages of the history of human life the Creator designated the seventh day to be distinguished from all the other days of the week.

A third distinction is that the seventh day is the only one that lacks the summary model,⁵⁴ which is systematically used to conclude the descriptions of days one through six. Without exception, the words “there was evening and there was morning, the ‘X’ day” are used to delimit the time involved in the course of the six days in Gen 1. Again, this also points out the uniqueness of the seventh day in the creation narrative.

Table 1.
Literary Structure of the Creation Week

First day	light & darkness	Fourth day	“sun” & “moon”
Second day	sky & water	Fifth day	fish & birds
Third day	earth & seas vegetation	Sixth day	animals & humankind
Seventh day			
“God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it”			

The fourth distinction and perhaps the most striking, is the fact that “the seventh day is the very first thing to be hallowed in Scripture, to acquire that special status that properly belongs to God alone.”⁵⁵ Similarly, Mathews writes:

Of the creation week’s days, this “seventh day” is uniquely “blessed” and “sanctified” by the Creator. The specific explanation in the text for the seventh day’s special hallowedness is that God ceased from his work. God has already

⁵³Nahum M. Sarna, *Genesis*, 1st ed., JPS Torah Commentary (Philadelphia, PA: Jewish Publication Society, 1989), 14.

⁵⁴*Summary model* is the term I am using to refer to the words “And there was evening and there was morning, the ‘X’ day.” These words are used throughout Gen 1 to describe the period of time involved in days one through six of the creation week.

⁵⁵Gordon J. Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, ed. David A. Hubbard et al., WBC 1 (Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1987), 36. In relation to the theological significance of the sanctification of the seventh day, H. Ross Cole wrote an interesting article presenting strong exegetical evidence in favor of the seventh day as the theological foundation for the Sabbath. See H. Ross Cole, “The Sabbath and Genesis 2:1-3,” *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 41, no. 1 (2003): 10, 11.

“blessed” the created order, enabling it to propagate (1:22, 28); but here the dimension of time, the “seventh day,” is said to be “blessed” of God. *This “blessing” is explained by the subsequent act of consecration that is the first in the Bible.* When God “sanctified” (*qādaṣ*) the day, he declared that the day was especially devoted to him.⁵⁶

Westermann highlights the aspect of separation associated with the seventh day. For Westermann, this reveals that since the creation of structured time, God purposefully design the seventh day to be the apex, or, the goal of the work days of the week. He says:

Creation is set out on a time scheme comprising days of work and of rest. This is stated explicitly in 2:3. The root *שָׁדַק* has the meaning of separation. When God sanctifies the seventh day (i.e., declares it holy), he sets it aside from the works of the six days as something special. The sanctification of the seventh day determines the time which begins with creation as structured time, and within which one day is not just the same as another. The days each have their goal in a particular day which is different from the rest—a day which is holy and apart. Days of work are not the only days that God has created. The time which God created is structured; days of work have their goal in a day of rest.⁵⁷

Thus, the seventh day “introduces both the rest of God and the word *שָׁבַת*, and most certainly has been shaped to serve this purpose. Both sentences [i.e., “(1) And on the seventh day God ended His work which He had done, and (2) He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had done.”] echo the Sabbath command; both serve to comment and to emphasize.”⁵⁸

From a historical perspective, I observed that the discussion over whether the seventh day of the creation week is the foundation of the biblical day of rest caught the attention of both Calvin and Luther. On one hand, Calvin recognized the principle of rest and holiness associated with the seventh day in Gen 2:1-3, and suggested that all humanity should use this weekly cycle (six days of work and one of rest) to maintain a closer relationship with God.⁵⁹ Nevertheless, Calvin

⁵⁶K. A. Mathews, *Genesis*, NAC 1A (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 1995), 179 (emphasis supplied).

⁵⁷Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, 171.

⁵⁸*Ibid.*, 169.

⁵⁹Commenting on God’s example of resting and blessing the seventh day, Calvin says: “This is, indeed, the proper business of the whole life, in which men should daily exercise themselves, to consider the infinite goodness, justice, power, and wisdom of God, in this magnificent theatre of heaven and earth. But, lest men should prove less sedulously attentive to it than they ought, every seventh day has been especially selected for the purpose of supplying what was wanting in daily meditation. First, therefore, God rested; then he blessed this rest, that in all ages it might be held sacred among men: or he dedicated every seventh day to rest, that his own example might be a perpetual rule. The design of the institution must be always kept in memory: for God did not command men

went on to make a distinction between the seventh day of the creation week and the Sabbath. He insisted that only “in the Law, a new precept concerning the Sabbath was given, which should be peculiar to the Jews, ... a legal ceremony shadowing forth a spiritual rest, the truth of which was manifested in Christ. Therefore the Lord the more frequently testifies that he had given, in the Sabbath, a symbol of sanctification to his ancient people.”⁶⁰

Luther, on the other hand, did not differentiate the seventh day in Gen 2:1-3 from the Sabbath. He maintains that “God blessed the Sabbath and that He sanctified it for Himself. ... [Only] the seventh day He did sanctify for Himself. This has the special purpose of making us understand that the seventh day in particular should be devoted to divine worship. For ‘holy’ is that which has been set aside for God and has been removed from all secular uses.” And he concludes, “Therefore from the beginning of the world the Sabbath was intended for the worship of God.”⁶¹

Like Calvin and Luther, post-Reformation scholars have debated how to interpret the seventh day of the creation week (Gen 2:1-3). Groves, for example, acknowledges the fact that YHWH “blessed the seventh day and sanctified it,” and that the divine prescription attaches a special blessing and gives a unique character to the seventh day, “as a day to be set apart to sacred purposes.”⁶² Likewise, Murphy argued that in Gen 2:1-3 “we have the institution of the day of rest, the Sabbath (שַׁבָּת), on the cessation of God from his creative activity.” Murphy affirms, “the Sabbath therefore is founded, not in nature, but in history. Its periodical return is marked by the numeration of seven days.”⁶³

simply to keep holiday every seventh day, as if he delighted in their indolence; but rather that they, being released from all other business, might the more readily apply their minds to the Creator of the world. Lastly, that is a sacred rest which withdraws men from the impediments of the world, that it may dedicate them entirely to God. But now, since men are so backward to celebrate the justice, wisdom, and power of God, and to consider his benefits, that even when they are most faithfully admonished they still remain torpid, no slight stimulus is given by God’s own example, and the very precept itself is thereby rendered amiable. For God cannot either more gently allure, or more effectually incite us to obedience, than by inviting and exhorting us to the imitation of himself. Besides, we must know, that this is to be the common employment not of one age or people only, but of the whole human race.” See John Calvin, *Commentaries on the First Book of Moses, Called Genesis*, trans. John King (Bellingham, WA: Logos Research Systems, 2010), 1:105, 106.

⁶⁰Ibid., 1:106.

⁶¹Martin Luther, *Luther’s Works*, vol. 1, *Lectures on Genesis*, ed. Jaroslav J. Pelikan, trans. George V. Schick (St. Louis, MO: Concordia, 1958; repr., Logos Research System, 1999), 1:79, 80.

⁶²Henry C. Groves, *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis* (Cambridge: Macmillan, 1861), 33.

⁶³James G. Murphy, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Genesis* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1863), 76, 78.

Late in the twentieth century, Sarna agreed that the “seventh day” in Gen 2:1-3 is “an integral part of the divinely ordained cosmic order, [and] it cannot be abrogated by man. Its blessed and sacred character is a cosmic reality entirely independent of human effort.” Nevertheless, he insists—like Von Rad—that “the human institution of the Sabbath does not appear in the [Genesis] narrative.” Among other reasons, Sarna says, that is because “the Sabbath is a distinctively Israelite ordinance, a token of the eternal covenant between God and Israel. Its enactment would be out of place before the arrival of Israel on the scene of history.”⁶⁴ Similarly, Strickland writes: “the institution of the Sabbath rest comes with the travel to the promised land (Exod 16:23) and the Sinai legislation (Exod 20:11).”⁶⁵ Consequently, NCTs maintain that the Sabbath is not theologically founded on creation,⁶⁶ and NCCs are not required to observe the Sabbath.

Table 2.
The Seventh Day as the Theological Foundation of the Biblical Sabbath

Evidence in favor	Evidence opposed
Literary Structure of the Seventh Day <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Never <i>tohu wabohu</i> • Created by divine example, not by divine command • First hallowed in Scripture 	The absence of the word <i>Sabbath</i> prior to Exod 16:23 in the English translation.
Verbal Structure of Biblical Hebrew <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • שבת appears five times in its verbal form prior to Exod 16:23 	Exod 31:16-17—“the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath . . . It is a sign between Me and the children of Israel forever.”

The descriptive analysis of Gen 2:1-3 in Table 2 includes evidence in favor of and opposed to the interpretation of the seventh day as the theological foundation of the Sabbath. On one hand, the evidence in favor includes the literary structure of Gen 1:3-2:3 and arguments from historical theology. On the other hand, the opposing evidence includes the absence of the English word *Sabbath* prior to Exod 16:23 and 31:16, 17, which says “the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath. . . . It is a sign between Me and the children of Israel forever.”

⁶⁴Sarna, *Genesis*, 14.

⁶⁵Wayne G. Strickland, “The Inauguration of the Law of Christ with the Gospel of Christ: A Dispensational View,” in *Five Views on Law and Gospel*, ed. Stanley N. Gundry, Counterpoints: Bible and Theology, (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1999; reprint, Kindle Edition (2010)), 381.

⁶⁶Arnold, *Two Stage Biblical Creation*, 364, 365.

Before proceeding to a descriptive analysis of Exod 20:8-11, it is essential to respond to NCTs which claim that the absence of the English word *Sabbath* before Exod 16:23 indicates that the biblical Sabbath is not theologically founded in the creation account. In response, I suggest that the interpreter's epistemological view, which is foundational to any hermeneutical method, is essential in addressing this question. Earlier, in defining the hermeneutical approach I suggested that—because I presuppose that all Scripture is divinely inspired—a consistent hermeneutical method should embrace biblical metanarrative as its principle of knowledge. This approach allows for the use of passages years later in the interpretation of a given passage, without violating hermeneutical principles. In other words, the interpreter must remain committed to the protology to eschatology scope (i.e., from Genesis to Revelation), and consider all possible exegetical-historical and theological connections in Scripture. When this epistemological approach is taken, the correlation of the Sabbath ordinance into the seventh day of the creation week is not a hermeneutical violation. In this case, the seventh day must be regarded as the theological foundation of the Sabbath to sustain the unity of Scripture.

However, the correlation of the Sabbath principle or its rejection, should not be arbitrary. It should come from the text and be either theological or exegetical in nature. For instance, when NCTs argue that the absence of the English word *Sabbath* indicates the fourth commandment is not founded in creation, they seem to overlook the fact that the Bible was written in Hebrew and that its message was inherent in its language.⁶⁷ In short, they overlook essential exegetical information that can justify the absence of the word *Sabbath* prior to Exod 16:23 in the English Bible. This seeming arbitrary action, seems to compromise their interpretation of biblical text.

The Jewish philosopher Martin Buber explains that “contrary to the ore from which it is possible to extract the metal, it would be vain to try to separate the content of the Bible from its recipient [i.e., the Hebrew writer], every idea is one with the word which expresses it; it is an indissoluble totality.”⁶⁸ Buber continues, “With regards to the Bible, any attempt to dissociate the content from the form would be artificial and pertain to a pseudoanalysis.”⁶⁹ He concludes that “the alliterations, assonances, the repetition of the words, the structure of phrases, are not to be understood as esthetical categories, but rather as a part of the content of the message itself.”⁷⁰

⁶⁷Jacques Doukhan, *Hebrew for Theologians: A Textbook for the Study of Biblical Hebrew in Relation to Hebrew Thinking* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1993), xvii.

⁶⁸Martin Buber, *Werke: Schriften Zur Bibel* (München: Kösel, 1962), 1112, quoted in Doukhan, *Hebrew for Theologians*, xvii. See also André Lacocque, *But as for Me: The Question of Election in the Life of God's People Today* (Atlanta, GA: John Knox, 1979), 75, 76, cf. 51.

⁶⁹Buber, *Werke*, 1112, quoted in Doukhan, *Hebrew for Theologians*, xvii.

⁷⁰Buber, *Werke*, 1122, 1131, quoted in Doukhan, *Hebrew for Theologians*, xvii.

In addition to Buber's remarks on the holistic structure of the biblical message, scholars have also observed that contrary to the Hellenistic mindset, in the Hebrew mindset the action precedes the thought. This suggests that for the Hebrew-oriented society described in Scripture, it would be perfectly normal that the seventh day was known—and even kept—before the commandment was given to formalize the divine ordinance about the Sabbath.⁷¹ Doukhan emphasizes the same point when he says, “Hebrew thought does not construct the truth as a philosophical system; rather it is essentially the response to an event. Thus, in Hebrew, it is the thought that follows the event and not the reverse.”⁷² He continues, “In Hebrew, the verb seems to have preceded the noun. This observation ... tells us something about the mechanism of Hebrew thinking: the dynamics of the action prevails over the deliberations of the designation.”⁷³

If we apply Buber's and Doukhan's insights to the use of the Hebrew שבת in Scripture, we will discover that the Hebrew שבת occurs five times in its verbal form prior to Exod 16:23.⁷⁴ Out of these five occurrences, three are actions directly related to the seventh day (Gen 2:2, 3; Exod 5:5). Thus, even though the noun *Sabbath* does not appear in the English translation prior to Exod 16:23, there is strong evidence that the actions associated with the Sabbath (rest, contemplation of God's work, worship, etc.) are present in Scripture since creation, and throughout the history of the people of Israel.

Particularly important is Exod 5:5. Here we find a record of Pharaoh's discontent with the people of Israel resting: “And the Pharaoh said, ‘Look, the people of the land *are* many now, and you make them rest from their labor!’”⁷⁵ Pharaoh's comments follow what appears to be Moses' attempt to promote spiritual reform among the people (Exod 4:28-31).⁷⁶ Upon arriving in Egypt,

⁷¹Keil and Delitzsch disagree that the Sabbath was kept before Exod 20:8-11. They say: “The Fourth Word, ‘Remember the Sabbath-day, to keep it holy,’ presupposes an acquaintance with the Sabbath, as the expression ‘remember’ is sufficient to show, but not that the Sabbath had been kept before this. From the history of the creation that had been handed down, Israel must have known, that after God had created the world in six days He rested the seventh day, and by His resting sanctified the day (Gen 2:3). But hitherto there had been no commandment given to man to sanctify the day.” See Keil and Delitzsch, *On the Old Testament*, 1:398.

⁷²Doukhan, *Hebrew for Theologians*, 192.

⁷³*Ibid.*, 48.

⁷⁴Gen 2:2, 3, 8:22; Exod 5:5, 12:15.

⁷⁵A literal translation of Pharaoh's words to Moses—עם הארץ והשבתם אתם מסבלתם: ויאמר פרעה הנריבים עתה —renders them as “you [i.e., Moses and Aaron] make them shabbath from their labors.” Osborn and Hatton say, “And you make them rest is literally ‘and you [plural] cause them to stop.’” See *A Handbook on Exodus*, 111.

⁷⁶See Ellen G. White, *Patriarchs and Prophets: or, The Great Conflict Between Good and Evil as Illustrated in the Lives of Holy Men of Old* (Oakland, CA: Pacific Press, 1890), 757.

Moses told Aaron about his encounter with God, who told the elders and the people about Moses' experience. Once the report was given, Moses "did the signs in the sight of the people. So the people believed; and when they heard that the LORD had visited the children of Israel and that He had looked on their affliction, then they bowed their heads and worshiped" (Exod 4:30b-31). This interaction of Moses with the people of Israel seems to have led them to worship God and to "shabbat" (Exod 5:5) according to his example (Gen 2:2-4a).

Nevertheless, if NCTs like Arnold want to say the word *Sabbath* in its substantive form does not appear in the English translation before Exod 16:23, nothing can be done to stop them. But since the Bible was not originally written in English, NCTs should seek to recognize that both the theological foundation of the Sabbath and the concept of a six-day working week followed by a day of rest, are present in the Hebrew text since creation and were well-known by God's people.⁷⁷ To use Henry's words: "*The setting apart of one day in seven for holy work, and, in order to that, for holy rest, was a divine appointment ever since God created man upon the earth, and the most ancient of positive laws.*"⁷⁸

Having looked at the evidence from both sides, I suggest that the evidence in favor of the seventh day as the theological foundation of the Sabbath spearheads a stronger theological system than the one embraced by NCTs. As noticed by Jamieson:

The institution of the Sabbath is as old as creation, giving rise to that weekly division of time which prevailed in the earliest ages. It is a wise and beneficent law, affording that regular interval of rest which the physical nature of man and the animals employed in his service requires, and the neglect of which brings both to premature decay. Moreover, it secures an appointed season for religious *worship*, and if it was necessary in a state of primeval innocence, how much more so now, when mankind has a strong tendency to forget God and His claims?⁷⁹

Westermann agrees with Jamieson that Gen 2:2, 3 "introduce[s] expressly the rest of God with echoes of the Sabbath command. The conclusion of creation has

⁷⁷Ellen White states, "In their bondage the Israelites had to some extent lost the knowledge of God's law, and they had departed from its precepts. The Sabbath had been generally disregarded, and the exactions of their taskmasters made its observance apparently impossible. But Moses had shown his people that obedience to God was the first condition of deliverance; and the efforts made to restore the observance of the Sabbath had come to the notice of their oppressors." See *ibid.*, 258.

⁷⁸Matthew Henry, *Matthew Henry's Commentary on the Whole Bible: Complete and Unabridged in One Volume* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1996), 118 (emphasis supplied). See also H. D. M. Spence-Jones, *Exodus*, The Pulpit Commentary, 51 vols. (London: Funk & Wagnalls, 1909), 3:53.

⁷⁹Robert Jamieson, A. R. Fausset, and David Brown, *Commentary Critical and Explanatory on the Whole Bible*, 2 vols. (New York: Doran, 1871; reprint, Logos Research Systems, 1997), 1:18.

its effect in the history of humankind because the rest of the Creator has given rise to a day which has been sanctified and blessed.”⁸⁰ Kline adds, “By means of his Sabbath-keeping, the image-bearer of God images the pattern of that divine act of creation which proclaims God’s absolute sovereignty over man, and thereby he pledges his covenant consecration to his Maker. The Creator has stamped on world history the sign of the Sabbath as his seal of ownership and authority.”⁸¹

Altogether, the evidence in favor is not just consistent with CT in general and the SDA approach to CT in particular, but most importantly, it advances theological consistency by interpreting Scripture within its protology to eschatology scope, or biblical metanarrative, without falling into interpretations founded primarily on extrabiblical sources (e.g., tradition, secular philosophy, religious experience, etc.). Thus, I am convinced that the seventh day should function as the theological foundation of the Sabbath,⁸² to preserve the unity of the protological, soteriological, and eschatological message of Scripture.

Having shown that the Hebrew word שבת occurs five times in its verbal form prior to Exod 16:23, and that both the Sabbath and the concept of a six-day working week plus a day of rest are found in Scripture prior to those events, I want to turn to a descriptive analysis of Exod 20:8-11 and Exod 31:16, 17. I suggest that when the hermeneutical approach described above is used to interpret these other passages, the evidence will support the thesis of this article and advance a stronger theological system that functions consistently within the biblical metanarrative.

A Descriptive Analysis of Exodus 20:8-11

Generally speaking, the Decalogue is divided into two groups of laws: the first group deals with humankind’s obligations toward YHWH, and the second group deals with humankind’s obligations toward their neighbors.⁸³ In a sense, the

⁸⁰Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, 169.

⁸¹Meredith G. Kline, *Treaty of the Great King: The Covenant Structure of Deuteronomy* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1963), 18, 19.

⁸²For detailed studies favoring the seventh day of creation as theological foundation of the Sabbath, see Mathilde Frey, “The Sabbath in the Pentateuch: An Exegetical and Theological Study” (Ph.D. dissertation, Andrews University, 2011), 14-72. See also Cole, “The Sabbath and Genesis 2:1-3,” 5-12.

⁸³Calvin agrees with this division, saying, “Indeed, the reason is so obvious as not to allow us to remain in doubt with regard to it. God thus divided his Law into two parts, containing a complete rule of righteousness, that he might assign the first place to the duties of religion which relate especially to His worship, and the second to the duties of charity which have respect to man.” See John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, trans. Henry Beveridge (Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 1997), 2:8.11. See also Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown, *Commentary*, 1:62.

fourth commandment of the Decalogue functions as a springboard text.⁸⁴ It points back to the first group of laws and forward to the second group of laws, including both the moral and religious obligations humankind should seek to fulfill to honor YHWH and their neighbors.

Though these observations reveal the internal connections of the Sabbath within the Decalogue, scholars have also found external connections—intertextual and theological—between the fourth commandment and the seventh day. I am proposing here that these connections extracted from Scripture alone strongly indicate that the biblical Sabbath is theologically founded on creation.

On the biblical hermeneutical component of Exod 20:8-11, Sarna, signals the intertextual connection between the institutionalization of the Sabbath and the seventh day of the creation week. He states,

Already implied in [Exod] 16:23–30, the Sabbath (Heb. *shabbat*) is not established by the Decalogue as a fixed, weekly institution. *With the Creation as its rationale (as also reiterated in Exodus 31:13–17)*, the seventh day of each week is invested with blessing and holiness. *It is an integral part of the divinely ordained cosmic order and exists independent of human effort.* For this reason it is described here [in Exo 20:8] as “a sabbath of the LORD Your God.”⁸⁵

Douglas Stuart, also notices the intertextual connection involving the Sabbath and the seventh day. Even though he recognizes that the English word *Sabbath* does not appear in Scripture prior to Exod 16:23, Stuart points out that in Exod 16:4, 5 the biblical writer clearly acknowledges that YHWH had already instituted a law related to the seventh day. In Exod 16:4, 5, the biblical writer describes how YHWH required the people to collect a double portion of manna on the sixth day, similar to the collecting of the manna before the Sabbath in Exod 16:23. Stuart says:

This rule [i.e., the fourth commandment] looks both forward and backward in testing Israel’s faith in God’s provision. *It looks backward to the creation account, which specifies that God himself rested on the seventh day [now called the Sabbath];* it looks forward to the revelation of the fourth commandment, establishing Sabbath observance as part of the covenant, a commandment which itself looks back to the creation order.⁸⁶

Like Sarna and Stuart, Henry argued that the Sabbath prescribed in Exod 20:8 is intertextually connected to the seventh day of the creation week in Gen 2:2, 3. Henry maintains that Exod 20:8-11 “was not the enacting of a new law, but the

⁸⁴A “springboard text” functions as the conclusion of a section and at the same time provides an introduction to the section that will follow.

⁸⁵Sarna, *Exodus*, 111 (emphasis supplied).

⁸⁶Stuart, *Exodus*, 372 (emphasis supplied). See also D. A. Carson, *New Bible Commentary: 21st Century Edition*, 4th ed. (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1994), 105.

reviving of an old law⁸⁷ instituted by YHWH. In the proclamation of the fourth commandment, Henry says,

it is intimated that the Sabbath was instituted and observed before; but in their bondage in Egypt they had lost their computation, or were restrained by their task-masters, or, through a great degeneracy and indifference in religion, they had let fall the observance of it, and therefore it was requisite they should be reminded of it. Note, Neglected duties remain duties still, notwithstanding our neglect.⁸⁸

If Henry is right, the fact that the Israelites lost the computation of the days during their bondage in Egypt implies that they kept the Sabbath not only immediately after the exodus (Exod 16:23), but also before arriving in Egypt during Joseph's government (Gen 46:28-47:12). The point is that one cannot lose something that did not exist before. So, how could the Israelites have lost track of the observance of the Sabbath—call it the seventh day if you wish—if there was no command to observe the seventh day prior to the institutionalization of the Sabbath at Sinai? What Henry, Sarna, and Stuart seem to be aware of and what NCTs seem to ignore is that the behavior requirements surrounding the Sabbath and the seventh day throughout Scripture are not just similar, but identical (e.g., preparation, rest, worship). For theologians like Henry, Sarna, and Stuart, this seems to point to a theological connection that is found nowhere else in Scripture in relation to a day except in relation to the seventh day and the biblical Sabbath.

Theologically speaking, some scholars have also observed the connection between the fourth commandment and the seventh day. In relation to the hallowedness attributed to the seventh day and the Sabbath, for example, Wenham observes how the biblical concept of hallowedness connects past and future events involving a hallowed day in Scripture. Commenting on this point, Wenham notes that “*it is unusual for a day to be ‘hallowed,’ that is, made or declared holy.*” Though Wenham recognizes that the Piel form of the Hebrew verb $\Psi\Gamma\kappa$ may be declarative, he explains that in most cases $\Psi\Gamma\kappa$ “is usually factitive.”⁸⁹ This being said, he concludes, “Places, people, and religious objects may be hallowed, but *apart from the Sabbath* [and the seventh day in Gen 2:1-3], *only in Neb 8:9, 11 is a festival day called holy*” by God in all of Scripture.⁹⁰

⁸⁷Henry, *Commentary on the Whole Bible*, 124. See also James E. Smith, *The Pentateuch*, 2nd ed., Old Testament Survey Series (Joplin, MO: College Pres, 1993), Exod 20:1-17.

⁸⁸Henry, *Commentary on the Whole Bible*, 125.

⁸⁹Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, 36. For more information on how the factitive takes priority over declarative approach in the Hebraic mindset, see *ibid.*, 19-22.

⁹⁰*Ibid.* Hannah agrees, “The basis for this [fourth] commandment is God’s creating . . . in six days and resting on the seventh (Gen 2:2-3; Exod 16:23).” See John D. Hannah, “Exodus,” in *The Bible Knowledge Commentary: An Exposition of the Scriptures*, ed. John F. Walvoord and Roy B. Zuck, (Wheaton, IL: Victor Books, 1985), 1:139.

In agreement with Wenham, Skip MacCarty insists that Exod 20:8-11 in itself presents answers regarding its universal scope and everlastingness. When addressing the question of the universality and everlastingness of the Sabbath, MacCarty suggests that “the commandment itself points to the answers.” He calls attention to the Sabbath’s “universal application to servants, animals, and ‘the alien within your gates,’ and its universal reference to the Lord who made ‘the heavens ... earth ... sea ... and all that is in them.’” According to MacCarty, “in the Sabbath Moses recognizes not merely a human law but a universal law.”⁹¹

Arguing in favor of the seventh day as the theological foundation of the biblical Sabbath, MacCarty says that the absence of the English word *Sabbath* in Scripture prior to Exod 16:23 and the Sabbath’s use as a symbol of God’s covenant with Israel in Exod 31:16, 17 do not indicate that the Sabbath was not observed prior to Exod 16:23. He observes that prior to Gen 9:9-6, while no explicit command against murder is recorded in Scripture, “Cain was held accountable for the murder of Abel” (Gen 4:6-11). Similarly, while no command against adultery is recorded in Scripture prior to Exod 20:14, “Joseph knew that adultery was ‘sin against God’” (Gen 39:9).⁹² He adds,

Instructively, the early chapters of the Bible do not explicitly state that God loves people, is merciful or compassionate, or will forgive sins; that was all revealed in the covenant He made and the Law He gave at Sinai (Exod 20:6; 34:6-7). Those characteristics, as well as the continued observance of the Sabbath by God’s people, were all assumed in those early chapters of the Bible that cover at least 2,500 years of human history.⁹³

In essence, Wenham’s and MacCarty’s observations about the theological connection of Exod 20:8-11 and Gen 2:1-3 seem to support the thesis of this article. That is, in order to obtain a consistent and coherent theological system that stems from Scripture alone and operates in the context of the biblical metanarrative, the seventh day must be regarded as the theological foundation of the biblical Sabbath. Further discussion indicates that this approach should impact not only the interpretation of Exod 31:16-27 (which says the Sabbath was the perpetual sign of God’s covenant with the Israelites), but also the interpretation of every passage on the Sabbath, which I suggest is a sign of the everlasting covenant of YHWH with humankind in all ages.

A Descriptive Analysis of Exodus 31:16, 17

Generally, the book of Exodus is divided into three main sections. The first main section (Exod 1:1-12:36) describes the life of the Israelites in Egypt; the second

⁹¹Skip MacCarty, “The Seventh-Day Sabbath,” in *Perspectives on the Sabbath: 4 Views*, ed. Christopher J. Donato, (Nashville, TN: B&H Academic, 2011), 11.

⁹²*Ibid.*, 12.

⁹³*Ibid.*

(Exod 12:37-18:27) describes the journey of the people of Israel from Egypt to the Mount Sinai; and the third (Exod 19:1-40:38) presents the covenant and the laws given by YHWH at Sinai.⁹⁴ Sarna points out that Exod 31:16, 17 belongs to “the concluding—and, appropriately, the seventh—literary unit within the pericope of the instructions for the Tabernacle.” Similar to the seventh day in the creation week,⁹⁵ this concluding literary unit in Exodus “is devoted to the observance of the law of the Sabbath.”⁹⁶ Here, an intertextual connection is established. Sarna affirms, “Quite deliberately the present unit features Creation as the rationale for the Sabbath (v. 17), as is found in the Decalogue (20:8-11), rather than the Exodus, as in the version in Deuteronomy (5:12-15). It is in the Creation narrative of Genesis that the first occurrence of the idea of the holy is encountered, and it relates to time—the Sabbath.”⁹⁷

Besides this intertextual connection, there is another component that supports the thesis of this article and is frequently neglected by NCTs. Following the exegetical-historical and theological reading, it is in the immediate context of Exod 31:16, 17—which begins in verse 12—that YHWH (the “Whom?”)⁹⁸ specifically addresses the primary reason he wants to use the Sabbath as a covenantal sign. Verse 13 says, “Speak also to the children of Israel, saying: ‘Surely *My Sabbaths you shall keep*, for it is a sign between Me and you throughout your generations, that you may know that I am the Lord who sanctifies you’” (emphasis supplied). Here, YHWH begins his instructions about the Sabbath by claiming authority over this day. He chooses to use the Sabbath because it belongs to him. Though YHWH used the Sabbath as a covenantal sign with Israel, he never surrendered his authority over the Sabbath to Israel. Osborn and Hatton

⁹⁴For an outline of the book of Exodus, see Durham, *Exodus*, xxx; *Andrews Study Bible: Light. Depth. Truth* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 2010), 73. A different outline is offered in Keil and Delitzsch, *On the Old Testament*, 1:268-270.

⁹⁵Henry, *Commentary on the Whole Bible*, 138.

⁹⁶Sarna, *Exodus*, 201.

⁹⁷Ibid.

⁹⁸The “Whom?” is a question related to the author of the text—YHWH in this case. Although Moses is generally recognized as the author of the book of Exodus, it is clear in the text that the words in vv. 13-17a are a transcription of the words dictated by God to Moses, who then announced them to the people. “Whom?” is one of the five most common questions (Whom? What? When? Where? Why?) used by scholars to determine the meaning of a biblical text. For information on hermeneutics, see J. Scott and J. Daniel Hays Duvall, *Grasping God's Word: A Hands-on Approach to Reading, Interpreting, and Applying the Bible* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2005); Grant R. Osborne, *The Hermeneutical Spiral: A Comprehensive Introduction to Biblical Interpretation*, 2nd ed. (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2006); Moisés Silva, ed., *Foundations of Contemporary Interpretation* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996); Kevin J. Vanhoozer, *Is There a Meaning in This Text? The Bible, the Reader, and the Morality of Literary Knowledge* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1998).

understood the significance of this point. The phrase “My Sabbaths you shall keep” means “literally ‘Surely my Sabbaths you [plural] will guard.’”⁹⁹

Osborn’s and Hatton’s declaration results in two positive insights on Exod 31:13. First, because YHWH uses the plural instead of the singular to claim ownership over the day, verse 13 is a reference to the weekly biblical Sabbath and not the sabbatical festivals. Keil and Delitzsch came to the same conclusion more than a century before; the divine claim in Exod 31:13 is not about “sabbatical festivals, since the words which follow apply to the weekly Sabbath alone.”¹⁰⁰ Second, this declaration implies that though the Israelites were to keep the Sabbath as a sign of God’s covenant with them, it was not their own day to keep. YHWH explicitly says the weekly Sabbath belongs to himself. It is a divine claim of ownership over the Sabbath, which is strengthened in verse 15: “but the seventh [day] is the Sabbath of rest, holy to the LORD.” Hence, the Sabbath is not given to Israel as a covenantal sign; it is only used as a perpetual sign of God’s covenant with the Israelites. Notwithstanding, the Sabbath remains the property of the Creator.

Commenting on this passage, Sarna observes how YHWH’s ownership of the Sabbath is also reflected in his control over the seventh day as “an integral part of the cosmic order ordained by God.”¹⁰¹ Similarly, Kline explains that at creation, “the Creator has stamped on world history the sign of the Sabbath as his seal of ownership and authority.”¹⁰² According to Kline, this suggests that fundamentally “the Sabbath [in Exod 31:12-18] is related to God’s eternal covenant (v. 16), as a sign of the relationship between himself and his people.” Most important for the purpose of this article, Campbell concludes that Exod 31:16 “is not telling us that the Sabbath was merely an institution for ethnic Israel, for we know that its significance was wider than that. It was made for all men (Mark 2:27), not just for Israel. But it has especial significance for those who are in a covenant relationship with the Lord.”¹⁰³

Conclusion

How should one respond to claims that the Sabbath is not theologically founded on creation; that the Sabbath is an institution created much later than the seventh day of creation; that it is hermeneutically incorrect to import the concept of the Sabbath back into the creation account; and that the Sabbath should be regarded as a covenant sign between YHWH and the people of Israel?

⁹⁹Osborn and Hatton, *A Handbook on Exodus*, 743.

¹⁰⁰Keil and Delitzsch, *On the Old Testament*, 1:463.

¹⁰¹Sarna, *Exodus*, 201.

¹⁰²Kline, *Treaty of the Great King*, 18, 19.

¹⁰³Iain D. Campbell, *Opening up Exodus*, Opening up Commentary (Leominster, England: Day One Publications, 2006), 124, 125.

After surveying literature by both CTs and NCTs, and completing a descriptive analysis of Gen 2:2, 3, Exod 20:8-11, and Exod 31:16, 17, I conclude that there is strong and reliable evidence to support the claim that the seventh day should function as the theological foundation of the Sabbath. This evidence was shown through an exegetical-historical and theological reading of the text, using a hermeneutical approach—ontology, metaphysics, and epistemology—that derives from Scripture. In short, the ontological principle is based on critical realism; the metaphysical principle is based on the infinite analogical temporality of God; and the epistemological principle is based on the protology to eschatology scope in Scripture, or biblical metanarrative. When applied to the interpretation of Gen 2:2, 3, Exod 20:8-11, and Exod 31:16, 17, these hermeneutical approaches led me to conclude the following.

First, the biblical Sabbath is theologically founded on the seventh day of the creation week, and it was not used only as a sign of YHWH's covenant with the people of Israel. This is indicated exegetically in the literary structure of the creation account, which shows the uniqueness of the seventh day in relation to the other days of the creation week. It is indicated theologically by the hallowedness of the seventh day; no other weekly day is called hallowed in Scripture but the seventh day and the biblical weekly Sabbath. In addition, it is indicated by the use of the Hebrew *שבת* in its verbal form five times prior to Exod 16:23, which suggests that the principles of rest, contemplation of God's creation, and possibly worship on the seventh day were followed by God's people before the fourth commandment was given.

Second, Exod 20:8-11 begins with the presupposition that God's people were familiar with the observance of the Sabbath. While it is possible for Exod 20:8 to be a reference to Exod 16:23, the linkage of the fourth commandment with the seventh day promotes the biblical metanarrative, and therefore, it should be preferred.

Third, restricting the divine commandment in Exod 31:16, 17 to the people of Israel is inconsistent with the overall context of the passage (verses 12-18). Here, before telling the Israelites that the Sabbath is a sign of his covenant with them, YHWH claims ownership of the Sabbath, emphasizing that the Sabbath was "holy to the LORD" (Exod 31:15) before it was holy for the people of Israel. The English words "My Sabbaths" are a reference to the weekly Sabbaths and not the sabbatical festivals given to the people of Israel.

All things considered, I am convinced it is not hermeneutically incorrect to interpret the seventh day of the creation week as the theological foundation of the biblical Sabbath. In fact, the theological echoes of the Sabbath (Exod 20:8-11, 31:16, 17) can and should be linked consistently to Gen 2:2, 3, as a sign of God's ownership and authority over all creation and history. Hence, I suggest that because there is no explicit command revoking the Sabbath ordinance,¹⁰⁴

¹⁰⁴Warfield, "Foundations of the Sabbath," 76ff.

observance of the fourth commandment is required of all humans who are part of God's everlasting covenant.

T TYPOLOGY AND ADVENTIST ESCHATOLOGICAL IDENTITY: FRIEND OR FOE?

Erick Mendieta
Ph.D. Candidate in Old Testament (Andrews University)
mendieta@andrews.edu

Abstract

For Seventh-day Adventists the significance of typology is not only a matter of historical research. Davidson has rightly argued that “the historic Adventist interpretation of the sanctuary ... stands or falls depending upon the validity of its hermeneutic method.” This study tries to show that in Seventh-day Adventism typology has proven to be a defining force in theology, thinking, and at times even in practice. Since typology’s first appearance in early Adventism, it has provided assistance to the understanding of Scripture but has also been the source of much misunderstanding. The need to explore its nature, characteristics, and application has been an ongoing concern for Adventism and it must continue to be so.

Keywords: typology, literalistic interpretation, Adventist hermeneutics.

Typology in Christianity

Since the work of Leonard Goppelt, who produced the first comprehensive survey of New Testament typology from a modern historical perspective, the scholarly community and the Christian Church have studied typology with renewed interest from different angles, especially with regard to discussions on the use of the Hebrew Bible (HB) in the New Testament.¹

The importance of Biblical typology for the traditional and historical Christian understanding of the relationship of the HB and New Testament cannot be overstated.² However, the value of a typological approach, as the history of biblical interpretation shows, does not come without the possibility of misuse.

¹Leonhard Goppelt, *Typos, The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1982); idem, “τύπος, ἀντίτυπος, τυπικός, ὑποτύπωσις,” *TNDT*, 8:246-259.

²G. K. Beale, *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Exegesis and Interpretation* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2012); D. L. Baker, *Two Testaments, One Bible: The Theological Relationship between the Old and New Testaments*, 3rd ed. (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2010); Kenneth Berding et al, *Three Views on the New Testament Use of the Old*

A survey of recent literature on the topic of Biblical typology gives evidence not only of the ongoing discussion about the role of typology in Biblical hermeneutics today, but of whether it even has a place in proper exegesis.³ Nonetheless, among the reasons for the continuous consideration of the use and value of typology in Christian biblical interpretation is the prevalence of its use by biblical writers and early Christian interpreters that suggests the contemplation of typology as a distinctive approach of Christian interpretation and understanding of the HB in light of the Messianic identity of Jesus. Also among scholars who discuss typology in connection with the relationship between the HB and New Testament, typology seems to describe this relationship between the two as operating mainly under the rubrics of promise/fulfillment, salvation history, and eschatological expectation.⁴

Typology in Adventism

Today, Adventism also needs to discuss and reassess the use and value of typology for Adventist eschatological identity and hermeneutics. At first glance this seems unnecessary since Adventism is unique in its prolific use and appreciation of typology.

However, a brief survey on the history of typology in early Adventism, the development of Adventist typological hermeneutics, and the role that typology has played in theological controversies in Adventism emphasizes two needs:

Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2008); Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., "Does the New Testament Accurately Use the Old Testament?," in *Introduction to Biblical Hermeneutics: The Search for Meaning*, ed. Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., and Moisés Silva (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2007); G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson, *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2007); Stanley E. Porter, *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament*, McMaster New Testament Studies (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2006); Craig A. Evans, *From Prophecy to Testament: The Function of the Old Testament in the New* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2004).

³Matthew Levering, "Readings on the Rock: Typological Exegesis in Contemporary Scholarship," *Modern Theology* 28, no. 4 (2012): 707-731; Benjamin J. Ribbens, "Typology of Types: Typology in Dialogue," *JTI* 5, no. 1 (2011): 81-95; Tibor Fabiny, "Typology: Pros and Cons in Biblical Hermeneutics and Literary Criticism (from Leonhard Goppelt to Northrop Frye)," *Revista de Filología Hispánica* 25, no. 1 (2009): 138-152.

⁴John E. Alsup, "Typology," *ABD* 6:682-685; G. R. Osborne, "Typology," *The Zondervan Encyclopedia of the Bible, Q-Z*, ed. Moisés Silva and Merrill C. Tenney (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan 2009), 5:952, 953. Osborne also suggests that while typology can be placed within the framework of a "promise-fulfillment" relationship between the testaments that this concept is related to salvation history. He adds that behind this approach is the idea of corporate solidarity, in which a king or high priest represented the nation in his actions. See Carl E. DeVries, "Type, Typology," *BEB* 2:2110; G. R. Osborne, "Type; Typology," *ISBE* 4:930.

acknowledging the importance of typology in understanding Adventist eschatological identity, and at the same time, being aware of the risk of misguided understandings concerning typology throughout our denominational history.

Typology and the Historical Theological Identity of Early Adventism

The indicators that typology played an important role in the formation of the theological identity of early Adventism are indisputable. Adventist church historians recognize the role biblical typology had in defining the theological identity of early Adventism. The initial biblical understanding of Adventism was marked by eschatological expectations based on a historicist prophetic interpretation of the book of Daniel, as well as the typological interpretations of the sanctuary rituals.⁵ Historically, Seventh-day Adventism is not only a prophetic movement; it is also a typological movement.

While the foundations for such an approach could be traced to William Miller,⁶ it was through the influential writings of Samuel Snow⁷ and O. R. L. Crosier,⁸ that the basis for typological thinking and interpretation in Seventh-day Adventism was set.⁹

⁵C. Mervyn Maxwell, *Magnificent Disappointment: What Really Happened in 1844 and its Meaning for Today* (Boise, ID: Pacific Press, 1994), 47-57; P. Gerard Damsteegt, "Historical Background (Early Nineteenth Century)," in *Daniel and Revelation Committee Series*, vol. 5, *Doctrine of the Sanctuary: A Historical Survey*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1989), 12-16; Richard W. Schwarz, *Light Bearers to the Remnant: Denominational History Textbook for Seventh-day Adventist College Classes* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1979), 48-51; LeRoy Edwin Froom, *The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers: The Historical Development of Prophetic Interpretation*, vol. 4 (Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1954), 724-826.

⁶George R. Knight, *William Miller and the Rise of Adventism* (Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 2010), 159-163; idem, *Lest We Forget: Daily Devotionals* (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 2008), 31f. Knight states that Miller, writing on October 6, the day he finally accepted the October 22 date, exclaimed in the headline article of the *Midnight Cry* of October 12, "I see a glory in the seventh month, one year and a half ago [the May 1843 article], yet I did not realize the force of the types. ... Thank the Lord, O my soul. Let Brother Snow, Brother Storrs, and others be blessed for their instrumentality in opening my eyes."

⁷Samuel S. Snow, *True Midnight Cry*, October 4, 1844, 1, 2.

⁸O. R. L. Crosier, "The Law of Moses," *Day-Star Extra*, February 7, 1846, 37-44.

⁹P. Gerard Damsteegt, "Among Sabbatarian Adventists (1845-1850)," in *Daniel and Revelation Committee Series*, vol. 5, *Doctrine of the Sanctuary: A Historical Survey*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1989), 20-41.

Furthermore, this perspective, in general terms received clear support from Ellen White in her writings¹⁰, and also from the writings of other SDA pioneers¹¹ like J. N. Andrews¹², Uriah Smith,¹³ and Stephen N. Haskell¹⁴. This array of support gives typology solid standing and recognition within early Adventist hermeneutics.

Typology in early Adventism was not only the key to better understanding and interpreting the prophecies in the book of Daniel in light of the sanctuary rituals, but it was also a means to discover the sanctuary doctrine itself. In addition, typology was a method used to evaluate, experience, and understand Adventism identity, role, and message in salvation history. Without typology early Adventists would not have been able to understand and interpret the first disappointment in the spring of 1844, and again, in the fall of the same year. The use of typology moved them closer to clarifying their position from Scripture, using it to advance their comprehension of the sanctuary. Consequently, it became the “key which unlocked the mystery of the disappointment of 1844. It opened to view a complete system of truth, connected and harmonious, showing that God’s hand had directed the great advent movement and revealing present duty as it brought to light the position and work of His people.”¹⁵ Therefore, typology in early

¹⁰Ellen G. White, *The Great Controversy Between Christ and Satan* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1911), 399f.

¹¹Paul A. Gordon, *The Sanctuary, 1844, and the Pioneers* (Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1983), 32. Gordon quotes Uriah Smith answering the charge that Seventh-day Adventists base their position on the sanctuary on one of E. G. White’s visions saying, “Works upon the sanctuary are among our standard publications. Hundreds of articles have been written upon the subject. But not in one of these are the visions referred to as any authority on this subject, or the source from whence any view we hold has been derived. Nor does any preacher ever refer to them on this question. The appeal is invariably to the Bible, where there is abundant evidence for the views we hold on this subject.” Gordon also argues that a search of many articles in the *Review and Herald* supports this understanding. The writers do not quote Ellen White as the authority for the sanctuary teaching of the church.

¹²P. Gerard Damsteegt, "Continued Clarification (1850-1863)," in *Daniel and Revelation Committee Series*, vol. 5, *Doctrine of the Sanctuary: A Historical Survey*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1989), 60-70.

¹³Uriah Smith, *Looking Unto Jesus or Christ in Type and Antitype* (Battle Creek, MI: Review and Herald, 1898).

¹⁴Stephen N. Haskell, *The Cross and its Shadow* (South Lancaster, MA: Bible Training School, 1914).

¹⁵White, *The Great Controversy*, 423; Richard Rice, *Reign of God: An Introduction to Christian Theology from a Seventh-day Adventist Perspective* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1997), 331. Rice asserts that the doctrine of the sanctuary enabled early Adventists to affirm the validity of their “Adventist experience.” Their understanding gave them the

Adventism opened the way to discern the importance of the sanctuary in understanding the ministry of Jesus in heaven.

But for some, in the aftermath of 1844, typology became the foundation of their misunderstanding of the meaning of sanctuary rituals and date setting. Hans K. LaRondelle states that after 1844 the Millerite movements fractured into various factions where conflicting approaches to typology and to the prophetic time periods, gave rise to different apocalyptic movements that renewed the focus on the imminence of the Second Coming.¹⁶

This was also true for early Sabbatarians. For example, Joseph Bates, one of the founders of Seventh-day Adventism, would draw from his notions of typology that the Day of Atonement was perhaps the year of atonement. Hence, Bates suggested the possibility of Jesus coming on the fall of 1845. Later, he would also argue that the high priest's work of sprinkling the blood "seven times" before the ark in the Most Holy Place on the Day of Atonement represented seven years, which meant that the Lord would come on the Day of Atonement in 1851.¹⁷

This incident, among other early interpretational controversies related to the sanctuary, demonstrated to early Sabbatarians the need to adopt a standard for explaining typology and its implications. Sabbatarians responded by combining common sense, biblical contextual evidences of the types and their antitype as it is explained in the NT, and pragmatic inferences.¹⁸ Two important insights concerning the types and their fulfillment are worth mentioning: First, the antitype commences on the day of the type, but may extend forward a great distance.¹⁹ Second, although there are many type-antitype relationships, this correspondence with the antitype does not apply in every detail. Caution has to be exercised against a too literalistic view of typology.²⁰

Another important issue that has marked the use and abuse of typology in Adventism is the notion that early Seventh-day Adventists had about themselves.

conviction that God had been leading in the events preceding the Great Disappointment and that they were not merely victims of a prophetic miscalculation.

¹⁶Hans K. LaRondelle, "The Heart of Historicism," *Ministry*, September 2005, 25.

¹⁷Jon Paulien, *What the Bible Says About the End-Time* (Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1994), 20f.

¹⁸J. N. Andrews, "The Sanctuary and its Cleansing," *Review and Herald*, October 30, 1855, 69; C.W. Sperry, "The Sanctuary," *Review and Herald*, February 7, 1856, 148.

¹⁹Damsteegt, "Continued Clarification (1850-1863)," 83. Andrews argued that it was so with "the work in the holiest on the day of atonement [sic]. Its antitype must commence at that time, and of course must occupy a space corresponding to its magnitude and importance." See Andrews, "The Sanctuary and its Cleansing," 69.

²⁰Damsteegt, "Continued Clarification (1850-1863)," 83.

As Paulien stated, “They thought of themselves as modern Israel making their way through the wilderness of this earth into the heavenly Promised Land.”²¹

Typology and Adventist Hermeneutical Identity

As has been observed, typology played a significant role in early Adventist hermeneutics. Typology continued to be used in connection with the sanctuary doctrine and its hermeneutics. For example, in the seminal book *Questions on Doctrine* (QOD), the validity for using typology to discuss, explain and interpret the sanctuary rituals in connection with Adventist beliefs is taken for granted. Nonetheless, it offers some hermeneutical principles to work with typology and states that while the “types and shadows of the Levitical ritual do have a spiritual significance, it should not be expected that every detail in the sanctuary of old had a typical meaning.”²² Also, it is stated that “it is better to see and study the great *realities* of the sacrifice and priestly ministry of Christ than to dwell too much upon the *details* of the typical service, which gave but an inadequate portrayal of the sacrifice and ministry of Christ.”²³ Therefore it is suggested “that it is far better to interpret the earthly tabernacle in the light of the heavenly, rather than to circumscribe the antitypical realities by the limitations of too close an application of the type.”²⁴ Again, it is possible to see a rejection of an inordinate attention to the details and a concern about the danger of using a too literalistic view of typology.

As the theological interaction of Adventism grew, typology in Adventism began to be discussed not only in connection with the Sanctuary but also in connection with issues related to the greater debate of typology within Biblical hermeneutics in general. Afterwards, typology was explored in connection with the nature of Scripture, the unity of Scripture, and the interpretation of Scripture.²⁵

A leading voice during this period was Gerhard Hasel, who, in his discussion of the theology of the HB, would bring to Adventists’ attention the scholarly debate about the role, function, and value that typology has for biblical studies

²¹Paulien, *What the Bible Says About the End-Time*, 21. A similar trajectory is found in Taylor G. Bunch, *The Exodus and Advent Movement in Type and Antitype* (n.p.: n.p., [1937]).

²²*Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine: An Explanation of Certain Major Aspects of Seventh-day Adventist Belief* (Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1957), 379.

²³Ibid. The book suggests that the book of Hebrews offers a clear example which presents the essence of these details in its antitypical significance.

²⁴Ibid.

²⁵Typology will be discussed among these topics in articles found in Gordon M. Hyde, ed., *A Symposium on Biblical Hermeneutics* (Washington, DC: Biblical Research Committee, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1974).

and Christian theology, and the concerns we should have about its use as well as some guiding principles for its use.²⁶

Hasel suggested the following ideas related to typology and its use:

a. Typology is a valid approach if it does not develop into a hermeneutical method that is applied to all texts like a divining-rod.²⁷ Not all texts are typological.

b. Typological correspondence must be rigidly controlled on the basis of direct relationship between various OT elements and their NT counterpart in order to block the access to exegesis of arbitrary and fortuitous personal views.²⁸ Typology has to have strict contextual controls, both in the OT and NT.

c. Typology is not primarily concerned with finding a unity of historical facts between the OT prefiguration and its NT counterpart. It is more concerned with recognizing the connection in terms of a structural similarity between type and antitype.²⁹ Typology is not concerned with all the details.

d. While the OT context must be preserved in its prefiguration so that NT meanings are not read into the OT texts, it seems that a clear NT indication is necessary so that subjective imaginative and arbitrary typological analogies can be avoided. The *a posteriori* character of the typological approach should not be suppressed.³⁰ The safest movement in typological analysis is from the NT back to the OT.

Again, around the same time typology was discussed within the book *A Symposium on Biblical Hermeneutics*. In it, typology was clearly identified as a general hermeneutical principle of biblical interpretation in the Advent Movement.³¹ Typology was also recognized as a valid hermeneutical principle used by NT writers for the OT,³² and was acknowledged as an illustrative example of the fuller import and deeper meaning of Scripture. That is to say, "God as the author of Scripture placed within the type a prefiguration of what is later identified as

²⁶Gerhard F. Hasel, *Old Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1991), 178-181.

²⁷Ibid., 179.

²⁸Ibid.

²⁹Ibid., 180.

³⁰Ibid., 181.

³¹Don F. Neufeld, "Biblical Interpretation in the Advent Movement," in *A Symposium on Biblical Hermeneutics*, ed. Gordon M. Hyde (Washington, DC: Biblical Research Committee, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1974), 120, 121.

³²Frank B. Holbrook, "New Testament Uses and Interpretation of the Old Testament," in *A Symposium on Biblical Hermeneutics*, ed. Gordon M. Hyde (Washington, DC: Biblical Research Committee, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1974), 137-139.

antitype. The greater import and deeper meaning of the type is discerned most adequately through further inspired revelation."³³

Particularly, W. G. C. Murdoch made an important treatment of typology in this book, in his article on the "Interpretation of Symbols, Types, Allegories and Parables." The importance of this article is the attempt to define more clearly what a biblical type is from an Adventist perspective. Murdoch proposes the following definition of a biblical type:

A biblical type, by contrast, is like a shadow cast on the pages of earlier literature, which presents a limited account of a truth, the full embodiment of which is amplified in a later revelation. A type invariably points forward in time to its antitype. Types are rooted in history yet are prophetic in nature. Their basic ideas lie in their earthly and human correspondence to a heavenly and divine reality. Genuine OT types are not concerned with unessential similarities between type and antitype (counterpart). They are realities (persons, events, things) of the OT, which later are shown by inspired writers to have a corresponding spiritual reality superseding the historical fact.³⁴

However, later on, Murdoch clarifies that "care must be exercised to differentiate between type and prediction. Although a type has reference to the future, it is not in itself a prediction. Rather, it is recorded as a historical fact without evident reference to the future."³⁵ Essentially, Murdoch proposes that while biblical types are prophetic in nature, they are not predictive.

Murdoch also considers that in the interpretation of the OT types in the NT, "there is a great loss in attempts to separate the study of the NT from a careful exegetical and theological exposition of the OT."³⁶ Nonetheless, Murdoch thinks that typology can legitimately be used in the interpretation of the OT to bring out the correspondence between God's methods of dealing with His people before and after the cross of Christ.³⁷ Murdoch also indicates that not every type meets its complete counterpart in the NT. There often remains a further eschatological significance.³⁸ Finally, Murdoch offers valuable criteria for the interpretation of

³³Gerhard F. Hasel, "General Principles of Interpretation," in *A Symposium on Biblical Hermeneutics*, ed. Gordon M. Hyde (Washington, DC: Biblical Research Committee, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1974), 187, 188.

³⁴W. G. C. Murdoch, "Interpretation of Symbols, Types, Allegories, and Parables," in *A Symposium on Biblical Hermeneutics*, ed. Gordon M. Hyde (Washington, DC: Biblical Research Committee, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1974), 209.

³⁵Ibid., 214.

³⁶Ibid.

³⁷Ibid., 216.

³⁸Ibid.

types.³⁹ Here, an important dictum is worth mentioning: “Sound typology must rest on the guidance of inspired writers. When the interpreter moves out of the areas designated by inspiration to be types, he needs to acknowledge that he is moving into the realm of speculation.”⁴⁰

Another prominent figure in the development of the Adventist understanding of typology and its hermeneutical function was LaRondelle. He considered the typological structure an essential element in a multiplex approach to understanding the mysteries of the biblical apocalyptic.⁴¹ According to LaRondelle typology presupposes a redemptive history in the past, the present, and the future, culminating in the historical advent of Christ Jesus.⁴² He also recognizes that the typological structure is characterized both by its analogy and intensification of type and antitype.⁴³ For him this type-antitype relationship is qualified by the Christological-eschatological understanding introduced by Christ Himself.⁴⁴

LaRondelle’s interest and study of typology enriched and expanded Adventist understanding of typology. A significant contribution of his hermeneutical assessment of typology is his study of the function and nature of typology within the framework of Covenant Theology, contrasted against Dispensationalist

³⁹Ibid., 216, 217. Murdoch considers that a genuine application of typology contributes much to the understanding of the Bible by adding to the vertical aspect of revelation the horizontal aspect of salvation. According to Murdoch there are certain criteria that are necessary to sound interpretation of types: (a) The specific points of correspondence must be carefully noted between the types and the antitypes. (b) The points of difference and contrast between the types and the antitype should be also noted. (c) The points of correspondence and differences should be studied in the light of the historical context of each. (d) An attempt must not be made to discover meaning in the minutia of detail. Here the NT is a guide as it treats the broad themes of the plan of redemption rather than the incidentals of the type. (e) Sound typology must rest on the guidance of inspired writers. When the interpreter moves out of the areas designated by inspiration to be types, he needs to acknowledge that he is moving into the realm of speculation. (f) The interpreter should seek understanding of God’s purpose in giving both the type and the antitype. There should be an evident similarity of meaning between them, although the later usually represents a more vital and broader event or principle than the former.

⁴⁰Ibid., 217.

⁴¹Hans K. LaRondelle, "Intepretation of Prophetic and Apocalyptic Prophecy," in *A Symposium on Biblical Hermeneutics*, ed. Gordon M. Hyde (Washington, DC: Biblical Research Committee, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1974), 232.

⁴²Ibid.

⁴³Ibid., 233.

⁴⁴Ibid.

eschatology, to understand and interpret the OT and Eschatology from a Christological perspective.⁴⁵

However, some of LaRondelle's typological concepts are worth mentioning: In his view typological interpretation is distinct from both the grammatical-historical method and the allegorical approach.⁴⁶ Typology is the theological-Christological interpretation of the history in the HB by the New Testament, which goes beyond mere exegesis.⁴⁷ For LaRondelle the study of historical correspondences between God's redemptive acts in the OT and the salvation that the NT writers had beheld in Jesus Christ is called Christian typology.⁴⁸ Therefore he argued that a valid definition of a biblical type could be: "A type is an institution, historical event, or person, ordained by God, which effectively prefigures some truth connected with Christianity."⁴⁹ However, it is the authority of the NT which establishes the divinely *pre-ordained* connection between a type and antitype and discloses the *predictive* nature of the type.⁵⁰ LaRondelle typology's predictive nature is retrospective,⁵¹ while at the same time it is based on the historical exegesis of the

⁴⁵Hans K. LaRondelle, *The Israel of God in Prophecy: Principles of Prophetic Interpretation* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1983), 35-55. LaRondelle considers that this Christological focus and eschatological perspective distinguishes typology from any accidental parallel situation. Wherever historical persons, events, or institutions are understood as foreshadowing some aspect of Christ's ministry, a typological perspective becomes visible. The relation of type-antitype is not simply one of repetition but one of an eschatological completion. The antitype is therefore not a more developed form of the type, but a new and unique work of God, through the Messiah, so that the antitype in some respects can even stand in opposition to the type (e.g., the sacrificial cultus, Adam). Hans K. LaRondelle, "Surprises in Biblical Typology, Part 1," *Ministry*, July 2007, 12-14; idem, "Surprises in Biblical Typology, Part 2," *Ministry*, September 2007, 11-12; idem, *How to Understand the End-Time Prophecies of the Bible: A Biblical-Contextual Approach* (Bradenton, FL: First Impressions, 2007).

⁴⁶LaRondelle, *The Israel of God in Prophecy*, 36. He argues that the grammatical-historical exegesis focuses exclusively on one period of time as the context of Scripture. It must be asked, however, whether the meaning of an event or prophecy in the OT can be determined fully by the original historical situation. The meaning of single events can often be fully understood only in the light of their consequences in later history.

⁴⁷Ibid., 45.

⁴⁸Ibid., 36.

⁴⁹Ibid. LaRondelle states that the New Testament writers, under divine inspiration, disclosed surprising correspondences between God's redemptive acts in the HB and the salvation they had beheld in Jesus Christ.

⁵⁰Ibid., 37.

⁵¹Ibid., 45, 46. Typology "takes more than the literal sense of a passage. The New Testament does this when it sees Christ as the theme and fulfillment of all the Old Testament, without limiting this to what is explicitly Messianic prophecy. ... Typological interpretation shows that the partial and fragmentary revelation in the Old Testament

OT in order to grasp a better understanding or greater sense (the *sensus plenior*) of God's redemptive-historical acts for the whole human race.⁵²

LaRondelle also offers the following characteristics of New Testament typology:

a. New Testament typology does not deal with the minutiae and incidentals, nor does it teach a one-to-one correspondence or complete identity between type and antitype. Consequently dissimilarity between type and antitype must be recognized.⁵³ Again, a too literalistic typology should be avoided.

b. In order to discover the typological pattern between the two testaments and grasp the real essentials of the OT salvation history, and to distinguish them clearly from merely external similarities, more is needed than what a purely historical exegesis can offer. It requires the enlightenment and guidance of the Holy Spirit.⁵⁴ Typology interpretation is not only an exegetical endeavor, but also a charismatic event.

c. The discovery of a new typological pattern in the Scriptures must be based on clear New Testament authority.⁵⁵

Furthermore, this period provided another enormous step forward in the development of our understanding of typology because for the first time Adventism focused their study on the why and how of typology without taking it for granted and tried to see what the Bible had to say about it. A major breakthrough in our understanding of typology came from the doctoral work of

pointed forward to Christ. ... Typology reads into Scripture a meaning which is not there in that it reads in the light of the fulfillment of the history. ... Nevertheless it does not read a new principle into the context; it interprets the dealings of God with men from the literal context, and then points to the way in which God has so dealt with men in Christ." See Hans K. LaRondelle and Jon Paulien, *The Bible Jesus Interpreted: Seeing Jesus in the Old Testament*, (Loma Linda, CA: Jon Paulien, 2014), 61, 62. Christian typology is defined by this messianic progression of salvation history. Because the ancient types and prophecies were but dimly understood, Christian typology must start with Jesus as the true Interpreter of the Scriptures. He opens the mind to a deeper understanding that goes beyond a surface reading of Scripture (see Luke 24:45). This hermeneutical starting point offers a serious safeguard against unwarranted conclusions on the basis of an Old Testament type or prophecy alone. Although there is a circle of correspondences in type and antitype, the defining standard of this two-way relationship lies in the New Testament.

⁵²LaRondelle, *The Israel of God in Prophecy*, 46. He declares, "We affirm that the genuine typological sense does not superimpose a different sense on the literal meaning of the words of Scripture, but pertains to the prophetic meaning of the things, or events, expressed by the words of Scripture. True typological interpretation of the HB does not create a second meaning or allegorization beyond the literal sense but listens 'to how the historical meaning of the text continues to speak in the New Testament situation.'"

⁵³Ibid., 48.

⁵⁴Ibid.

⁵⁵Ibid.

Richard M. Davidson in his dissertation titled “Typological Structures in the Old and New Testaments.”⁵⁶

As an objective of his study, Davidson proposed to “ascertain the nature of biblical typology by allowing its conceptual structures to emerge from within Scripture through a semasiological analysis of the term τύπος and NT cognates and an exegetical investigation of NT hermeneutical τύπος passages.”⁵⁷ Davidson argued that as result of his exegetical analysis of the five NT hermeneutical τύπος passages, five τύπος structures consistently emerge.

There is an historical structure (including the elements of historicity, correspondence, and progression) and four theological structures—the eschatological (involving inaugurated/appropriated/consummated fulfillment aspects), the Christological-soteriological (in which Christ and his salvific work are the ultimate orientation point of the τύπος/ἀντίτυπος), the ecclesiastical (comprised of individual, corporate, and sacramental dimensions), and the prophetic (consisting of the aspects of prefiguration, divine design, and prospective/predictive [*devoir-être*]).⁵⁸

Davidson proposes that “typology can be defined as the study of persons, events, or institutions in salvation history that God specifically designed to predictively prefigure their antitypical eschatological fulfillment in Christ and the gospel realities brought about by Christ.”⁵⁹

Davidson’s work on typology has refined and defined most⁶⁰ of the ongoing scholarly discussion on typology within Adventism.⁶¹ But in addition to this, it

⁵⁶Richard M. Davidson, *Typology in Scripture: A Study of Hermeneutical TYPOS Structures*, Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertations Series 2 (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1981).

⁵⁷Ibid., 1.

⁵⁸Ibid., 2, 3.

⁵⁹Richard M. Davidson, “Biblical Interpretation,” in *Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology*, ed. Raoul Dederen, vol. 12 (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 2001), 83.

⁶⁰Alberto R. Treiyer, “Antithetical Or Correspondence Typology?,” in *Daniel and Revelation Committee Series*, vol. 4, *Issues in the Book of Hebrews*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1989), 187-198. Ninow fully adopts Richard Davidson’s typological framework and states that “these elements provide a proper hermeneutical control for defining biblical types.” See Friebert Ninow, “Typology,” *Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. David Noel Freedman, Allen C. Myers, and Astrid B. Beck (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000), 1341.

⁶¹Richard M. Davidson, “Typology and the Levitical System, Part 1,” *Ministry*, February 1984, 16-19, 30; idem, “Typology and the Levitical System, Part 2,” *Ministry*, April 1984, 10-13; idem, “Typology in the Book of Hebrews,” in *Daniel and Revelation Committee Series*, vol. 4, *Issues in the Book of Hebrews*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1989), 121-186; idem, “Sanctuary Typology,” in *Daniel and Revelation Committee Series*, vols. 6-7, *Symposium on*

also has made a significant contribution to the discussion of typology outside⁶² of Adventism by establishing a connection between the contextual relationship of the types and the antitypes, within a comprehensive framework of systematic theology.⁶³

Yet, according to Edward Glenny, “the most controversial and innovative aspect of Davidson’s theory of typology is his belief that types are predictive and there must be some indication of the existence and predictive quality of OT types

Revelation, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1992), 6:99-130; idem, "Interpreting Scripture: An Hermeneutical 'Decalogue'," *JATS* 4, no. 2 (1993): 95-114; idem, "New Testament Use of the Old Testament," *JATS* 5, no. 1 (1994): 14-39; idem, "The Second Advent and the 'Fullness of Time'," *Ministry*, June-July 2000, 41-47; idem, "Revelation/Inspiration in the Old Testament: A Critique of Alden Thompson's 'Incarnational' Model," in *Adventist Theological Society Publications*, vol. 1, *Issues in Revelation and Inspiration*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook and Leo R. Van Dolson (Berrien Springs, MI: Adventist Theological Society Publications, 1992), 105-135.

⁶²Dockery considers that up to the time of his book the most complete work on the subject (typological hermeneutics) to date is Davidson’s *Typology in Scripture*. See David S. Dockery, *Biblical Interpretation Then and Now: Contemporary Hermeneutics in the Light of the Early Church* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1992), 33, 34. Zuck uses Davidson semasiological conclusions and states that, “*Typos* then originally carried the idea of the result of a blow or what gives a blow or impression. From that developed the thought of mark, mold, stamp, cast, form, model, outline, or sketch.” See Roy B. Zuck, *Basic Bible Interpretation: A Practical Guide to Discovering Biblical Truth*, ed. Craig Bubeck, Sr. (Colorado Springs, CO: Cook, 1991), 170. Cf. Osborne, "Type; Typology," *ISBE* 4:930-932; Paul S. Karleen, *The Handbook to Bible Study: With a Guide to the Scofield Study System* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), 143-166; Alsup, "Typology," *ABD* 6:682-685; C. A. Evans, "Typology," in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, ed. Joel B. Green and Scot McKnight (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1992), 862-866; I. Howard Marshall, "Counter-Response in Favor of C.H. Dodd's View: An Assessment of Recent Developments," in *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts? / Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New*, ed. G. K. Beale (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1994), 195-216; G. P. Hugenberger, "Introductory Notes on Typology," in *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts? / Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New*, ed. G. K. Beale (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1994), 331-341. According to Mitchell’s opinion Davidson’s work on typology is the most careful recent attempt to define typology. In his commentary, Mitchell decided to follow a modified adaptation of Davidson five structures but sometimes some of his interpretations are very close to allegory. See Christopher Wright Mitchell, *The Song of Songs*, Concordia Commentary (Saint Louis, MO: Concordia 2003), 75.

⁶³Sung Wook Chung, "The Current State of Symbolic Interpretation of the Bible in Global Evangelical Theology" (paper presented at Evangelicalism, Inerrancy, and the Evangelical Theological Society: Retrospect and Prospect at Baltimore, MD, on November 20, 2013).

before their antitypical fulfillment—otherwise they cannot be predictive.”⁶⁴ However, Glenny misses the fact that Davidson is not the only one who argues for the predictive nature of typology.⁶⁵ Furthermore; he does not take into account that the predictive element of typology is the logical outcome of the theological foundations of biblical typology.⁶⁶ Likewise, this seems to be a logical

⁶⁴W. Edward Glenny, "Typology: A Summary of the Present Evangelical Discussion," *JETS* 40, no. 4 (1997): 637. While Glenny considers that Davidson is to be commended for his attempt to develop the structures of typology from the Biblical text. He considers that this element in particular needs further study and elaboration.

⁶⁵Ellis validated Davidson's point when he declares that "for the NT writers a type has not merely the property of 'typicalness' or similarity; they view Israel's history as *Heilsgeschichte*, and the significance of a type in the HB lies in its particular *locus* in the divine plan of redemption. When Paul speaks of the Exodus events happening *typikōs* and written 'for our admonition,' there can be no doubt that, in the apostle's mind, Divine intent is of the essence both in the occurrence and in their inscription. The rationale of NT typological exegesis is not only 'the continuity of God's purpose throughout the history of his Covenant,' but also His Lordship in molding and using history to reveal and illumine His purpose. God writes His parables in the sands of time." See E. Earle Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1957), 127, 128. Waltke states that "typology entails divine determination." Since God divinely determined the type, it follows that the type is a divine *prediction*. See Bruce K. Waltke, "Kingdom Promises as Spiritual," in *Continuity and Discontinuity: Perspectives on the Relationship Between the Old and New Testaments: Essays in Honor of S. Lewis Johnson, Jr.*, ed. John S. Feinberg (Westchester, IL: Crossway, 1988), 278; cf. Gerhard F. Hasel, "Fulfillments of Prophecy," in *in Daniel and Revelation Committee Series*, vol. 3, *The Seventy Weeks, Leviticus, and the Nature of Prophecy*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Washington, DC: Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1986), 309. Davidson states that while he felt flattered by Glenny's kind ascription to him for providing an "innovative" view of typology by emphasizing the predictive/prophetic element, he recognizes that his study has merely exegetically confirmed and drawn the logical consequences of the classical or traditional understanding of the subject as already set forth in previous centuries by Patrick Fairbairn, Milton Terry, Louis Berkhof, Leonhard Goppelt, and others who saw typology as a species of prophecy and essentially predictive. See Richard M. Davidson, "The Eschatological Hermeneutic of Biblical Typology," *TheoRHEMA* 6, no. 2 (2011): 13, 14.

⁶⁶S. Lewis Johnson, *The Old Testament in the New : An Argument for Biblical Inspiration, Contemporary Evangelical Perspectives* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1980), 56. The fundamental basis of typology is theological. Biblical typology is built squarely on *the sovereignty of God*. It is He who controls history, and therefore guides events in such a way that types find their correspondence in antitypes. Glenny misses the notion that Davidson's typological structures, four out five, are theological including the prophetic (consisting of the aspects of prefiguration, divine design, and prospective/predictive [*devoir-être*]).

outcome for the argument of a “fuller import and deeper meaning” of biblical typology already proposed in Adventism by Hasel.⁶⁷

It is important to acknowledge that Adventist hermeneutics has experienced significant growth in its understanding of typology, its nature and characteristics.⁶⁸ However, from a personal perspective, the application of such improvement is not proportionate to the growth in understanding for, the issue seems to be absent from Adventist scholarly work.⁶⁹ This may be a sign that scholars have

⁶⁷The issue of *sensus plenior* and typology is among the most discussed items in the ongoing debate of typology. Jonathan Lunde recognizes that typology is suggested to be closely related to the notion of *sensus plenior*, with some scholars collapsing the two together and others seeking to draw a fine distinction between them. See Jonathan Lunde, "An Introduction to Central Questions in the New Testament Use of the Old Testament," in *Three Views on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (ed. Kenneth Berding and Lunde Jonathan; Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2008), 18-22.

⁶⁸The growth and influence of typology is perceived from its brief mention in “Methods of Bible Study” to its presence in the DARCOM series and his discussion in the *Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology* in the chapter “Biblical Interpretation.” See “Methods of Bible Study,” (Washington, DC: General Conference Committee, 1986), 4. Under the discussion of interpreting prophecy item number 4 states: “The norms for interpreting prophecy are found within the Bible itself: The Bible notes times prophecies and their historical fulfillments; the New Testament cites specific fulfillments of Old Testament prophecies about the Messiah; and the Old Testament itself presents individuals and events as types of the Messiah.” See Davidson, “Biblical Interpretation,” 83-85.

⁶⁹Frank B. Holbrook, *Light in the Shadows: An Overview of the Doctrine of the Sanctuary* (Washington, DC: Biblical Research Institute, 1980), 12, 13. In this overview of the doctrine of the sanctuary Holbrook argues that the two keys are important in assisting us in correctly interpret the sanctuary symbolism: (a) The Israelite sanctuary is described as a parable; and (b) The Israelite sanctuary is described as a shadow-type. According to Holdbrook, we generally designate these ritual “shadows—as *types*.” A dictionary definition of *type* is “a person or thing regarded as the symbol of someone or something that is yet to appear.” Types are, therefore, like prophecies. Instead of being embodied in words, the sanctuary shadow-types were prophecies embodied in rituals which *foreshadowed*—“foretold”—the coming death of Jesus and His priestly ministry in heaven. Here again, shadow-types can be subject to a variety of interpretations, but we may be guarded from misapplications of both sanctuary symbols and types if we study them in the clear light of the plan of salvation as taught throughout the Scriptures. While Hardinge’s book mentions Davidson’s dissertation as one of the resources to understand typology it seems from his rules on how to interpret sanctuary typology that he does not incorporate it concepts into his analysis. Hardinge suggest some obvious rules for the study of Sanctuary symbology: (a) The student should constantly pray himself in that frame of mind which will allow the Spirit to “guide him into all truth.” (b) No meaning should be deduced which produces tensions with other portions or the Scriptures dealing with the topic. (c) No interpretation should be proposed which runs counter verified human

mixed feelings about the value and validity of typology in the exegetical task. It may also indicate that Adventist scholars have a limited understanding of the significance of biblical typology in helping us understand Scripture beyond the traditional use of typology in Adventism (e.g., Sanctuary and Revelation).⁷⁰

knowledge and experience. (d) Every passage dealing with the concept should be brought to bear upon it with the help of good concordances. (e) The contexts of each passage, book, author and the Scriptures as a whole should be kept in mind. (f) Hebrew and Greek lexicons should be consulted to ensure that the meanings of the words are clearly understood. (g) Grammars should provide ideas as to the thrust of phrases and sentences. (h) Reliable histories and books on archaeology should be studied. (i) “The law of first mention” should be applied. This stresses that the context of the first time any idea is introduced in Scripture sets the tone for its use in the rest of the Bible. (j) “The law of last mention” rounds out this meaning. (k) “The law of full mention” looks for some passage in Scripture where the idea is discussed at length. (l) The writings of Ellen G. White should be compared with Scripture. See Leslie Hardinge, *With Jesus in His Sanctuary: A Walk Through the Tabernacle Along His Way* (Harrisburg, PA: American Cassette Ministries, 1991), 48. This is an excellent introductory book to biblical hermeneutics from an Adventist perspective that adopts fully Davidson typological analysis. A whole chapter is dedicated to discuss typology and offers worksheet to do typological analysis. See Lee J. Gugliotto, *Handbook For Bible Study: A Guide to Understanding, Teaching, and Preaching the Word of God* (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 2000).

⁷⁰Roy Adams, *The Sanctuary Doctrine: Three Approaches in the Seventh-day Adventist Church* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1981), 278. Roy Adams considers that the “strict typological approach” only seems to deal with questions related to the theological significance of the immediate sanctuary and paraphernalia. There is a growing awareness of the typological nature of the OT within itself. Steiner mentions Sailhamer’s assessment that in the Pentateuch there is a rich use of “narrative typology,” by means of which “later events are written to remind the reader of past narratives” (e.g., Gen 41 – Exod 12 foreshadowed in Gen 12:10-20; or Exod 25-40 in Gen 1-3), Steiner states that Sailhamer also finds evidence in the strategy of the Pentateuch that the author worked “within a clearly defined hermeneutic,” namely, “an eschatological reading of his historical narratives” in which “the narrative texts of past events are presented as pointers to future events. See V. J. Steiner, “Literary Structure of the Pentateuch, *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Pentateuch*, eds. T. Desmond Alexander and David W. Baker (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2003), 547. The traditional approach to figure out biblical connections was called “typology”—observing how the narrative patterns of the HB foreshadowed the Messiah. The basis of typology is the belief that stories of biblical persons or events point toward the Christ. Traditional typology made each connection singularly between particular narrative elements and Jesus the Messiah. Biblical readers were invited to consider the relationship, for example, between Jacob and Jesus, or Joseph and Jesus, or Judah and Jesus, or David and Jesus, and so forth. One of the problems with the exclusively “Jesus and x” approach to the relationship between the Testaments was that it flattened the biblical narratives into many small units that each said the same thing. It prevented readers from hearing the interconnected and dynamic story that culminated in the Messiah. Schnittjer, for example, proposes a *Polyacoustic reading*—hearing multiple and

Typology in Adventism is far from being exhausted. Nonetheless, we could claim that we have discovered more precise tools to help us explore the text in relation to typological themes. Yet, several enquiries remain to be explored and tested. For example: What is the extent of typology?⁷¹ Are types only those expressly mentioned in the Bible? Does this approach limit the legitimate use of types, for some types (traditionally understood) not mentioned in the NT (e.g., Abraham sacrificing Isaac)? Are the types given in the NT examples for finding others in the OT?⁷² There is also the question of how the concept of corporate personality relates to typology.⁷³ How do intertextuality, allusion, and typology relate to each other? What parameters can be used to establish a clear distinction between symbol and type? How does typology express itself in the Writings, especially in books like Job and the hermeneutically challenging Song of Songs, which has a long history of allegorical interpretation?⁷⁴

In essence, what is indicative from analyzing the development of hermeneutical controls for typology in Adventism is the need to limit the inappropriate and harmful use of typology when interpreting the Scriptures.

complementary sounds—is the attempt to hear the building echoes of biblical narrative that culminate in the Messiah. See Gary Edward Schnittjer, *The Torah Story: An Apprenticeship on the Pentateuch* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2006), 24.

⁷¹"Interpretation of Prophecy," *Baker's Dictionary of Practical Theology*, ed. Ralph G. Turnbull (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1967), 131. This article argues that according to some teachers, if a whole is typical, then the parts are also typical. On this basis, the details of the tabernacle and its furnishings are considered as types, and a significance is sought in each detail, with an antitype in Christ. This is considered strictly speaking, as an application of the allegorical method, rather than the typical.

⁷²DeVries, "Type, Typology," 2:2110; Osborne, "Typology," 5:954. Osborne argues that there are two kinds of typological figures: (a) an innate type that is specifically mentioned in the NT (e.g., 1 Cor 10:6; 1 Pet. 3:21); and (b) an inferred type that does not use the terminology but is based upon the principles (e.g., the uses of OT texts in Hebrews or Revelation). Both are valid uses of typology, but the latter are more open to fanciful and allegorical exegesis so must be studied carefully. See Patrick Fairbairn, *The Typology of Scripture: Viewed in Connection with the Whole Series of the Divine Dispensations* (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1900); Osborne, "Type; Typology," 4:930.

⁷³Bruce Corley, Steve Lemke, and Grant Lovejoy, *Biblical Hermeneutics: A Comprehensive Introduction to Interpreting Scripture* (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 2002), 88. The history of salvation often appears in the New Testament as the history of individuals—Adam, Abraham, Moses, David, Jesus—yet they are individuals who also have a corporate dimension embracing the nation or the race.

⁷⁴Mitchell, *The Song of Songs*; Marian G. Berry, *The Prophetic Song of Songs* (Albia, IA: Prophetic Song of Songs, 1985); Theodore E. Wade, *The Song of Songs: Tracing the Story of the Church* (Auburn, CA: Gazelle, 1992).

Typology in Adventist Theological Controversies

It is unmistakable that typology is strongly affected by theology. But, on the other hand, it is not always obvious how typology has affected theology, particularly in Adventism. However, Adventist history has given us enough evidence to support the idea that, behind several theological controversies, typology and typological thinking (i.e. analogical thinking) have played a fundamental role.

a. Date Setting Controversies: John Paulien argues in his book *What the Bible says about the End-Time* in the chapter titled “The ‘When’ of the End” that “logical analogy and a Bible text” have been the basis behind the reasoning of several attempts at date setting controversies in Adventism. Interestingly, several of them could clearly be recognized as using typological thinking. For example, Bates’ arguments were based on sanctuary rituals on the Day of Atonement. Also, arguments have been made from the wilderness experience of Israel before entering Canaan (used more than once), Noah’s preaching before the flood, and from the Old Testament year of Jubilee (Predictive and prophetic elements of typology).⁷⁵

b. Atonement Concept Controversies: For example, Roy Adams considers that Uriah Smith’s position on the atonement in relation to the cross is based “on a rigid interpretation of the ancient typical system.”⁷⁶ Adams argues that Smith saw in the Old Testament sacrificial system of atonement as something occurring within the sanctuary once a year. Accordingly, he believed that the locus of the antitypical atonement should likewise be within the sanctuary and in this case the heavenly.⁷⁷

Adams also proposes that Andreasen’s experiential understanding of the notion of defilement and cleansing of the sanctuary constituted a major thrust of his sanctuary theology (Ecclesiological typology). In this scheme, argues Adams, the sanctuary to be cleansed is not simply the heavenly, but the earthly sanctuary of the human heart.⁷⁸ The so-called “Last Generation” theology is grounded in typology. It is not only argued on the basis of Sanctuary typology, but on a Job typology as well. Andreasen states “Job’s case is recorded for a purpose. While we grant its historicity, we believe that it has also a wider meaning. God’s people in the last days will pass through an experience similar to Job’s.”⁷⁹ In more recent times, Herbert Douglass echoes this fact when he states “the characters of last-day

⁷⁵Paulien, *What the Bible Says About the End-Time*, 19-24.

⁷⁶Roy Adams, *The Sanctuary: Understanding the Heart of Adventist Theology* (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 1993), 133.

⁷⁷Ibid.

⁷⁸Adams, *The Sanctuary Doctrine*, 190, 191.

⁷⁹M. L. Andreasen, *The Sanctuary Service*, 2nd ed. (Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1947), 314.

Christians who ‘keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus’ are the same quality as those of Enoch, Daniel, and *all* the others in times past who became sanctified overcomers, in so doing vindicating the wisdom and power of God. Job’s experience will be reproduced” (Experiential and Ecclesiological elements of typology).⁸⁰

c. Israelite Festival Controversy: The typological foundation of this controversy in Adventism is explicit. According to Bacchiocchi, it is a wrong assumption to consider that the annual Feast came to an end with the sacrifice of Christ simply because they were connected with the sacrificial system. The reason that Bacchiocchi gives to sustain his positions is “that the continuity or discontinuity of the Feast is determined not by their connection with the sacrificial system, but by the scope of their typology.”⁸¹ Bacchiocchi adds:

If the Feasts had typified *only* the redemptive accomplishments of Christ’s first Advent, then obviously their function would have terminated at the Cross. But, if the Feast foreshadow *also* the consummation of redemption to be accomplished by Christ at His second Advent, then their function continues in the Christian church, though with a new meaning and manner of observance.⁸²

Interestingly, in his first book on the Israelite festivals, Bacchiocchi establishes the foundation of his argument for typology without offering any clear definition of typology, its nature, or characteristics. Amazingly, also, he does not incorporate in his bibliography any previous material discussed on the issue from Adventist history either popular or scholarly, neither on typology or the Israelite feasts. In addition, he does not mention a single article, dictionary entry or book dedicated to biblical typology outside of Adventism!

However, in his second book Bacchiocchi corrected these deficiencies in his analysis and defined biblical typology and assents to Davidson’s definition and structures of typology.⁸³ Nonetheless, while it seems that Bacchiocchi’s intent is “not to point out some of the deficiencies in the typological interpretation of Adventist pioneers, but rather to build upon their foundation by expanding the understanding of the typical nature and antitypical fulfillment of the Fall Feast,”⁸⁴ there is a significant gap between his stated intentions and his procedure.

⁸⁰Herbert E. Douglass, *Why Jesus Waits: How the Sanctuary Message Explains the Mission of the Seventh-day Adventist Church*, rev. ed. (Riverside, CA: Upward Way, 1987), 82.

⁸¹Samuele Bacchiocchi, *God’s Festivals in Scripture and History: The Spring Festivals*, vol. 1 (Berrien Springs, MI: Biblical Perspectives, 1995), 13.

⁸²Ibid.

⁸³Samuele Bacchiocchi, *God’s Festivals in Scripture and History: The Fall Festivals*, vol. 2 (Berrien Springs, MI: Biblical Perspectives, 1996), 19-25.

⁸⁴Ibid., 17.

While Bacchiocchi's typological approach faced strong opposition in Adventist scholarly circles,⁸⁵ his book, among others, has promoted a modified practice of the Israelite feasts within Adventism. However, this incident illustrates the tension that exists in Adventism between the theory of typology and its application. After all, typology in Adventism should not only have exegetical concerns but hermeneutical as well.

Typology in the Future of Adventism

According to G. R. Osborne in the post-Reformation period several distinct schools of thought developed in connection with typology. Among conservative scholars there were three major positions: (1) Johannes Cocceius (1603–1669) applied any OT event or person that resembled a NT parallel, thereby coming close to an allegorical approach; (2) John March (1757–1839) asserted that the only types were those explicitly stated to be types in the NT; and (3) Patrick Fairbairn (1805–1874) mediated between the two by accepting both innate (explicit) and inferred (implied) types, stating that many more correspondences existed in the NT period than happened to be enumerated in the texts themselves.⁸⁶

Today in Adventism similar proposals could be perceived suggesting three different approaches to typology:

a. Closed Typology: While Adventism has not clearly proposed a closed typology; it has certainly promoted it by suggesting the danger of exploring beyond the explicit stated types in the NT.⁸⁷ Perhaps this is the safest form of typology in Adventism (exegetically grounded).

b. Controlled Typology: Adventism has always tried also to develop controls to typological interpretation by sometimes arguing from common sense, Christian tradition, as well as from biblical controls. However, as Adventism grew and interacted theologically, typology, through the contributions of scholars like Hasel, Murdoch, LaRondelle, and Davidson, experienced a significant hermeneutical advance in acquiring sound biblical parameters used to detect typological relationships in the Scriptures. The most detailed hermeneutical system for a

⁸⁵Angel Manuel Rodriguez, *Israelite Festivals and the Christian Church*, Biblical Research Institute Releases, no. 3 (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, 2005); H. Ross Cole, "The Sacred Times Prescribed in the Pentateuch: Old Testament Indicators of the Extent of Their Applicability" (Ph.D. dissertation, Andrews University, 1996).

⁸⁶Osborne, "Type; Typology," 4:930; Norman R. Gulley, *Systematic Theology: Prolegomena*, vol. 1 (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 2003), 698f.

⁸⁷Hasel, *Old Testament Theology*, 181; Murdoch, "Interpretation of Symbols, Types, Allegories, and Parables," 217; Tom Shepherd, "Interpretation of Biblical Types, Parables and Allegories," in *Biblical Research Institute Studies*, vol. 1, *Understanding Scripture: An Adventist Approach*, ed. George W. Reid (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, 2006), 226.

controlled typology within Adventism today is Davidson’s typological structures (exegetically and theologically grounded).

c. Quasi-Controlled Typology: Scholars within Adventism advance a more open view of typology. For example, Adams proposes “a quasi-typological approach” that, unlike “the strict typological approach,” attempts to draw out the possible theological or religious significance of certain incidental aspects of the “sanctuary complex.”⁸⁸ Adams argues that the value of the quasi-typological approach is that it allows Adventists to say something theologically significant about the sanctuary independent of (though not unrelated) those “distinctive aspects that dominate the traditional presentation of the subject. It draws from the sanctuary something deeply theological and spiritual that could provide an intellectually and experiential ‘currency’ of various cultures and peoples.”⁸⁹

However, Adams himself considers that “in approaching the biblical text in this way, one needs to be constantly on guard against allegorical speculations, into which this method can easily degenerate.”⁹⁰ It becomes evident, in Adams’s approach, that the motivation behind it is the use of typology with theological, homiletical and pastoral purposes (pastorally grounded).⁹¹

⁸⁸Adams, *The Sanctuary Doctrine*, 278.

⁸⁹Ibid., 282.

⁹⁰Ibid.; Roy Adams, *The Nature of Christ: Help for a Church Divided over Perfection* (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 1994), 134. Here Adams discusses the danger that an uncontrolled view of analogical thinking could lead to dangerous conclusions. His advice is be “careful how you draw the parallels.”

⁹¹Adams, *The Sanctuary Doctrine*, 282. Another clear example is John S. Nixon, *Redemption in Genesis: The Crossroads of Faith and Reason* (Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 2011), 10-13. While Nixon calls his approach “faithful reasoning” the thrust of his book is typology he states “in the pages that follow, we will look for Jesus in the stories told in the first book of the Bible, beginning in places where His presence is hidden. We will search out hints of Him and His attributes in shadows and symbols, in metaphors and figures of speech, and, most of all, in the lives of men and women of yore—believers in the true God, who walked and talked and lived and died in the days before the Messiah came to earth” Nixon suggest that the effect of seeing “through the clarifying lens of Christ, we will see redemption anew as that which calls us to self-abandonment and deeper reliance on Him. Nixon proposes that Jesus is the ultimate meaning of Eden’s lamb, of Noah’s ark, of Sodom’s destruction, of Abraham’s ram in the thicket. See Ivor Myers, *Operation Blueprint, Earth’s Final Movie: The Ultimate Search & Rescue Mission* (Roseville, CA: Amazing Facts, 2013). This popular book offers an unexpected twist between traditional sanctuary typology with prophetic interpretation. It clearly follows the approach of “analogical logic and a Bible text.”

Conclusion

Typology arose in Adventism as a unifying force, and while somehow limited, was working together with these elements. Adventist typology needs to be continually developed and integrated with clear exegetical, theological and ecclesiological concerns.

Furthermore, in a church hermeneutically divided⁹² between literal⁹³ or principle approaches,⁹⁴ Adventist typology hermeneutics has always existed in tandem with these two approaches. It is also accepted by members in both groups.⁹⁵ Adventist history has continually rejected a too literalistic approach to typology. At the same time, it has constantly discarded the over spiritualization of typology. It seems typology is showing Adventism a way toward hermeneutical unity.

For Seventh-day Adventists, the significance of typology is not only a matter of historical research. Davidson has rightly argued that “the historic Adventist interpretation of the sanctuary ... stands or falls depending upon the validity of its hermeneutic method.”⁹⁶

This study has tried to show that typology in Adventism has proven to be a defining force in our theology, our thinking and even, at times, our practices. Since its first appearing in early Adventism, typology has provided assistance to our understanding of Scripture, but also has been the source of much misunderstanding. The need to explore its nature, characteristics, and application has been an ongoing concern for Adventism and it must continue to be so.

⁹²For a more complete picture of the hermeneutical divisions within Adventism see Ján Barna, *Ordination of Women in Seventh-day Adventist Theology: A Study in Biblical Interpretations* (Belgrade, Serbia: Preporod, 2012).

⁹³See for example Samuel Koranteng-Pipim, *Receiving the Word: How New Approaches to the Bible Impact our Biblical Faith and Lifestyle* (Berrien Springs, MI: Berean Books, 1996), 265,271; Samuele Bacchiocchi, *Women in the Church: A Biblical Study on the Role of Women in the Church* (Berrien Springs, MI: Biblical Perspectives, 1987).

⁹⁴Richard M. Davidson, "Headship, Submission, and Equality in Scripture," in *Women in Ministry: Biblical & Historical Perspectives*, ed. Nancy J. Vyhmeister (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1998).

⁹⁵Representatives of the different hermeneutical perspectives within Adventism acknowledge the value and validity of typology as an acceptable exegetical method. See for example fns. 93 and 94.

⁹⁶Davidson, "Typology and the Levitical System, Part 1," 17.

ADVENTIST ESCHATOLOGICAL IDENTITY AND THE INTERPRETATIONS OF THE TIME PERIODS OF DANIEL 12:11-12

ABNER F. HERNANDEZ

Ph.D. Candidate in Church History (Andrews University)
abnerh@andrews.edu

Abstract

In recent years some Seventh-day Adventist scholars began applying the time periods in Dan 12:5-13 to the future. Rejecting the traditional historicist Adventist understanding that places the three and a half times, the 1290 and 1335 days, as prophetic periods already fulfilled in the past, they claim that these time periods should be understood as literal days still to come. Likewise, some Adventist scholars interpret the time periods of Dan 12 as merely a literary device that seems to suggest an apparent “delay” of the time of the end. There are others who think it is not possible to state with certainty the manner in which these prophecies were to be fulfilled or that it is possible to approach these periods from a multi-perspective view of prophetic interpretation. This article describes, analyzes, and evaluates the different interpretations throughout the history of Adventist theology and their impact on the eschatological identity of Adventism.

Keywords: Eschatology, Daniel prophecies, Adventist identity, historicism, Adventist futurism.

Introduction

Adventist interpreters have had a history of disagreements in their attempts to explain the meaning behind the prophetic time periods of 1290 and 1335 in Dan 12:11-12. According to Gerhard Pfandl, the proper interpretation of Dan 12:11-12 constitute one of the ten biggest issues that Seventh-day Adventist theologians are presently contending with.¹ The general consensus that characterizes Adventist interpretations of the 1260 days and 2300 days seems to be absent in the interpretation of the time periods of the 1290 and 1335 days.

The purpose of this study is to describe and evaluate the interpretations and hermeneutical principles used in Dan 12:11-12 among Seventh-day Adventist interpreters with special attention given to major thinkers and proponents, and to

¹Gerhard Pfandl. “Ten Big Ones,” *Adventist Review*, 2004. Online: <http://www.adventistreview.org/2004-1536/story2-1.html> (accessed September 3, 2011).

elucidate the impact of each interpretation for the eschatological identity of the church.

While there are some Adventist interpreters and commentaries that prefer to maintain an undefined position regarding the historical fulfillment of these prophecies,² the present study argues that Adventist interpretations of Daniel 12:11-12 may be categorized into three main approaches. The first approach, symbolic times interpretation, (which is the predominant view among Adventist interpreters) argues in favor of symbolic and historicist interpretation of these prophecies. The second approach (literal times interpretation) defends a literal interpretation of these days, whereas the third (idealist interpretation) proposes that these periods can be connected with several historical events, as well as an ahistorical spiritual lesson regarding the meaning of the days.

The Traditional Historicist Interpretation

Since the Reformation, the time prophecies of Daniel and Revelation generated special attention. A significant group of biblical interpreters approached Daniel's prophetic periods using a historicist methodology.³ In the late years of the 18th century, Thomas Newton in his *Dissertations on the Prophecies*⁴ and John Bacon in his work *Conjectures in Prophecies*⁵ dedicated extensive exegetical work to the prophecies

²For instance, the *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* states that the proper interpretation of these prophecies widely depends on the interpretation of the "daily," Francis D. Nichol ed., "A thousand two hundred and ninety days," in *The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, vol. 4 (Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1976), 880. See also, C. Mervyn Maxwell, *God Cares: The Message of Daniel for You and Your Family* (Boise, ID: Pacific Press, 1981), 299-304; Edwin R. Thiele, *Outline Studies in Daniel* (Berrien Springs, MI: Emmanuel Missionary College, 1947), 148; G. Arthur Keough, *God and Our Destiny*, Adult Sabbath School Lessons, January–March 1987 (Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 1986), 96. Clifford R. Goldstein, *The Gospel 1844, and Judgment*, Adult Sabbath School Bible Study Guide, July–September 2006 (Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 2006).

³See for instance Robert Fleming, *Apocalyptic Key: And Extraordinary Discourse on the Rise and the Fall of Papacy* (Edinburg: Johnstone, Hunter, and Company, 1879); Joseph Mede, *The Works of the Pious and Profoundly-Learned Joseph Mede*, 4th edition (London: Roger Norton, 1677), 717-724; 903-923.

⁴Thomas Newton, *Dissertations on the Prophecies which Have Remarkably Been Fulfilled, and at This Time are Fulfilling in the World*, vol.1 (London: W. Baynes, 1803), 373-378. Although Newton published his work in 1754, it was still very influential during the early decades of 19th century. He was also one of the most influential theologians with a historicist approach to Daniel and Revelation's prophecies during the last decades of the 18th Century.

⁵John Bacon, *Conjectures in Prophecies [microform]: Written in the Fore Part of the Year 1799* (Boston: David Carlisle, 1805). What is important in his pamphlet is the use of "days by years" principle, connecting the prophecy of 1290 and 1335 with Papal apostasy. He also connected the time periods of Daniel 12 with the 2300 days of Daniel 8:14. He dated these

of Dan 12. The new interest in Daniel's prophecies reached its climax in the early years of 19th century in the Millerite movement.⁶ William Miller and a group of itinerant preachers presented the most credible premillennial approach to the time prophecies of Daniel.⁷ Miller developed a series of hermeneutical principles of biblical and prophetic interpretation. His twelfth rule which deals directly with prophetic interpretation is especially important for this study.⁸ According to this rule, a biblical interpreter of Daniel and Revelation's prophecies has to discover the "true historical event for the fulfillment of a prophecy." Essentially the

periods, apparently following Thomas Newton, from A.D. 606. Another important theologian of the 18th century was John Gill, "The sure performance of prophecy." A sermon preached to the society which support the Wednesday's evening lecture in Great East-Cheap, January 1st, 1755. By John Gill, D.D., London, 1755. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*. Gale. Andrews University James White Library. <http://find.galegroup.com/ecco/infomark.do?&source=gale&prodId=ECCO&userGroupName=mlc21040&tabID=T001&docId=CW121731766&type=multipage&contentSet=ECCOArticles&version=1.0&docLevel=FASCIMILE>, accessed June 30, 2014.

⁶For expositors of Daniel and Revelation's prophecies of the early decades of the 19th century see LeRoy Edwin Froom, *The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers*, vols. 3-4 (Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1950). Some representative interpreters are, George S. Faber, *The Sacred Calendar of Prophecy: Or A Dissertation of the Prophecies, Which Treat of the Grand of Seven Times, And Especially of the Its Second Moiety or the Latter Three Times and Half* (London: W. E. Painter, 1844); Adam Clark, *Bible Commentary, Daniel, Revelation* (New York: J. Emory and B. Waugh for the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1826); Edward Irving, *Babylon and Infidelity Foredoomed of God* (Glasgow: Chalmers and Collins, 1826).

⁷The Millerite movement was part of the Second Great Awakening in United States. Most of the theologians and preachers of the Second Great Awakening held a postmillennial view of the biblical prophecies. It seems to me, comparing Miller's works with other prophetic interpretations of the time, that Miller presented an appellate, consistent, and biblical premillennial approach to Daniel and Revelation's prophecies. Charles E. Hambrick-Stowe arrived to a similar conclusion: Miller's "interpretative scheme constituted the first convincing premillennialist challenge to American Protestantism's bland postmillennialism," *Charles G. Finney and the Spirit of American Evangelicalism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1996), 206. Indeed, Miller's premillennial views impacted former postmillennialist theologians like Walter Scott, Barton W. Stone and others, see E. Brooks Holifield, *Theology in America: Christian Thought from the Age of the Puritans to the Civil War* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003), 301.

⁸William Miller, "Miller's Letters No. 5: The Bible Its Own Interpreter," *Signs of the Times*, May 15, 1840, 25.

⁹William Miller, *Evidences from Scripture and History of the Second Coming of Christ, about the Year 1843, and his Personal Reign of 1000 Years* (Brandon, VT: Vermont Telegraph Office, 1833), 3-6. He stated, "To know whether we have the true historical event for the fulfillment of a prophecy. If you find every word of the prophecy (after the figures are understood) is literally fulfilled, then you may know that your history is the true event. But if one word lacks a fulfillment, then you must look for another event, or wait its future

interpreter has to compare the biblical meaning with the account of world history to determine the historical event that literally, and completely fulfilled every word of the prophecy. This historicist approach to biblical prophecy marked the eschatological identity of the Millerite movement.

Following the historicist method of prophetic interpretation, Miller connected the beginning of the 1290 and 1335 years with the removal of the “daily sacrifice abomination” which he identified with pagan Rome.¹⁰ He believed that the civil power of Rome would enjoy a total of 666 years of supremacy from 158 B.C. to A.D. 508. From this time, A.D. 508, the 1290 years and 1335 years would end in A.D. 1798 and 1843 respectively.¹¹

The “prophetic chart” developed by Charles Fitch and Apollos Hale accurately summarized, unified, and improved the Millerite positions on the prophetic times of Daniel. LeRoy Froom states that this chart “was a distinct advance over all previous diagrams and charts” primarily because it “corrected certain former inaccuracies, and omitted a number of untenable positions previously held.”¹² Perhaps, the most significant omissions were Miller’s connection of Rev 13 with Dan 11 that directly identified the “daily” with paganism.¹³ Interestingly, this omission somewhat weakened the identification of A.D. 508 as the starting point for these prophecies because the chart does not offer a biblical or historical explanation for its conclusions. Nevertheless, Fitch’s prophetic chart maintained two essential points, first, the year of A.D. 508 as the starting point of the 1290 years and 1335 years, and second, the harmony of these periods with all other prophetic periods in the book of Daniel.

development. For God takes care that history and prophecy doth agree, so that the true, believing children of God may never be ashamed. Ps. xxi. 5. Isa xiv. 17-19. 1 Pet. ii. 6. Rev. xvii. 17. Acts iii. 18.” Miller also assumed other features of historicism like the principle “a day for a year.”

¹⁰Miller, *Evidences*, 24, 30.

¹¹It should be noted that Miller calculated the starting point of these periods by connecting Rev13:18 with Dan 11:31. He assumed that the number of the beast refers to the years that the fourth kingdom would have dominion over Jews and Christians. For him, “pagan Rome becoming the fourth kingdom in 158 years before Christ would cease, 508 years after Christ” (Miller, *Evidences*, 25, 30). J. V. Himes and Josiah Litch, “Synopsis of Miller’s Views,” *Signs of the Times*, January 25, 1843, 148, 149, presented a summary of Miller’s ideas stating “The number 1335 days, from the taking away of Rome Pagan, A. D. 508, to set up Papal Rome, and the reign of Papacy, is 1290 days, which was fulfilled in exactly 1290 years, 1798. This proves that the 1335 days were to be considered years, and that Daniel will stand in his lot in A. D. 1843.”¹¹ Therefore, in 1798, Papal Rome will be broken, leaving 45 years to spread the Gospel in preparation for the second coming and eternity. See J. V. Himes, Josiah Litch, and S. Bliss, eds., “Synopsis of Miller’s Views,” *Signs of the Times*, January 25, 1843, 148, 149.

¹²Froom, *The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers*, 4:734.

¹³Froom, 4:737.

Early Seventh-day Adventist Interpretations

Miller and Millerite preachers' interpretation strongly impacted the Sabbatarian Adventist pioneers and Seventh-day Adventist eschatology. James and Ellen G. White, Joseph Bates, Hiram Edson, and other Sabbatarian Adventists continued defending the accuracy of the 1843 "prophetic chart." In November 1850, referring to this chart Ellen G. White stated, "I have seen that the 1843 chart was directed by the hand of the Lord and that it should not be altered; that the figures were as He wanted them."¹⁴ Hiram Edson, like White, defended the same view about the accuracy of the figures and harmony of the dates in the 1843 chart. In the *Review and Herald* of January 10, 1856, he said:

The advent chart of 1843, without doubt, was arranged in the order of God's counsel . . . there was no mistake in the figures given on the chart for the beginning of the 2300 days, there must also of necessity be, and there was, a harmony of the dates of 1260, the 1290, and the 1335 days with that of the 2300 days. These were all correct.¹⁵

Edson's article is significant for two reasons: first, it shows clearly that the Sabbatarian Adventist pioneers still held the same Millerite view about the beginning and the ending of the 1290 and 1335 days. Second, they continued to link closely the prophetic times of Daniel 12 with the rest of the time prophecies in the book of Daniel. Uriah Smith, for instance, stressed this second point emphasizing that "the first vision with its long period of 2300 years would be

¹⁴This declaration was first published in Ellen G. White, "Dear Brother and Sister," *Present Truth*, November 1, 1850, 87. In this publication, her statement is slightly different, "The Lord showed me that the 1843 chart was directed by his hand and that no part of it should be altered; that the figures were as he wanted them. That his hand was over and hid a mistake in some of the figures, so that none could see it, until his hand was removed." Later this quotation was repeated in Ellen G. White, *A Sketch of the Christian Experience and Views of Ellen G. White* (Saratoga Springs, NY: James White, 1851), 61; and Ellen G. White, *Early Writings* (Battle Creek, MI: Seventh-day Adventist Publ. Assn., 1882), 74. Interestingly the CD Rom, *Ellen G. White Writings: Comprehensive Research Edition* added a note explaining that the commentary about the chart of Ellen G. White "applies to the chart used during 1843 movement, and has special reference to the calculation of the prophetic periods as it appears on that chart."

¹⁵Hiram Edson, "The Time of the Gentiles, And the Deliverance and Restoration of the Remnant of Israel from the Seven Times, or 2520 years of Assyrian or Pagan and Papal Captivity Considered," *Review and Herald*, January 10, 1856, 113. Interestingly, Edson quotes Ellen G. White almost verbatim stating, "It is evident that God saw fit to suffer a mistake in some of the figure on the 1843 chart, but for a wise purpose hid that mistake until the proper time arrived for the mistake to be developed." The reference to "figures" seems to refer to the events that they expected to be fulfilled in relation with the 2300 mornings and evenings of Daniel 8:14.

continually in Daniel's mind, and the other periods mentioned, the 1260, 1290, and 1335 days, would come in merely as subdivisions of that."¹⁶

Modern Adventist Scholarship

Most of the modern Adventist interpreters of Daniel continue, using an exegetical approach, supporting the traditional position of the Adventist pioneers.

William H. Shea, for instance, embraces all the central presuppositions of Adventist historicism. The prophecies of Daniel, he says, "begin in the historical time of the prophet himself and then extend into the future beyond the prophet's day."¹⁷ This approach is used to interpret the 1290 and 1335 days where the arguments are supported through a careful analysis of the structure and context of Dan 12:11-12. Regarding this portion, he states that it is "an epilogue, or an appendix, to the prophecies of 11:2 – 12:4."¹⁸

Shea argues that the structure of Daniel indicates that the time periods always follow the report of the vision.¹⁹ Therefore, the time components are never part of the visions, but they are part of the explanations. Shea further explains that the prophetic times "are connected by the events that they describe . . . they never date new events."²⁰ Consequently, for Shea, the times of Daniel 12 are "dating events that have already been described in Daniel 11."²¹ Shea argues that the union of church and state in A.D. 508 seems to be the correct time as the starting point for these periods, ending in A.D. 1798 and 1843 respectively.²²

In his book, *Daniel: The Seer of Babylon*, Gerhard Pfandl—like Shea before him—uses exegetical arguments to explain the 1290 and 1335 days.²³ Pfandl, however, makes a more extensive analysis. He supports his interpretation through three significant exegetical points. First, there is a notable parallelism between Dan 12:11 and 11:31 indicating that both texts represent the same historical events.

¹⁶Uriah Smith, "The 1335 Days," *Review and Herald*, July 2, 1867, 40. See also Uriah Smith, *Daniel and the Revelation* (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 2005), 323-334.

¹⁷William Shea, *Daniel: A Reader's Guide* (Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 2005), 8, 9.

¹⁸Ibid., 272.

¹⁹William H. Shea, "Time Prophecies of Daniel 12 and Revelation 12-13," in Frank B. Holbrook, ed., *Symposium on Revelation -Book I*, Daniel and Revelation Committee Series, vol. 6 (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1992), 327-360; William Shea, *Daniel: A Reader's Guide*, 272.

²⁰Shea, 272.

²¹Ibid.

²²William Shea, *Daniel: A Reader's Guide*, 274-276. See also, Jacques B. Doukhan, *Secrets of Daniel: Wisdom and Dreams of a Jewish Prince in Exile* (Hagerstown, MD: Pacific Press, 2000), 186-189.

²³Gerhard Pfandl, *Daniel: The Seer of Babylon* (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 2004), 118.

Second, the concept of the *tamid* or “daily” closely links the prophetic passages of Dan 8:11, 11:31, and 12:11. Consequently, the meaning of the previous passage lends meaning to the others. Finally, although the guiding angel did not give Daniel a specific moment for the starting point of the 1335 days, for Pfandl, “the context seems to imply that it began at the same time as the 1290 days.”²⁴

A year after his book was published, Pfandl enlarged and enriched his arguments, presenting a small pamphlet entitled *Time Prophecies in Daniel 12*. In this publication, Pfandl adds (mostly using structural analyses), that Daniel’s prophecies are presented “according to the principle of repetition and enlargement.”²⁵ According to this principle, each vision “is always followed by explanations.”²⁶ In view of this fact, Dan 12:5-13 stands as an “epilogue” or enlargement “to the preceding vision”²⁷ of Dan 11 and not as a “new vision with a new topic.”²⁸ Moreover, he states that the Hebrew words *pala*²⁹ and *tamid*³⁰ also link these final sections with the events of Daniel 11 as a reference to the horrible blasphemies pronounced by the king of the north.³¹ Therefore, on the basis of this observation, Pfandl concludes that the 1290 and 1335 days begin with the conversion of Clovis in A.D. 508 ending the first in A.D. 1798 and the second in A.D. 1843/1844.³²

In summary, the traditional Adventist interpretation argues that the prophecies of Dan 12 should be interpreted using the year by day principle and the historicist principle of hermeneutic. In this manner, the 1290 days and the 1335 days represent an equal amount of years starting in A.D. 508 and ending in A.D. 1798 and 1843 respectively. As we have seen, this approach has been historically supported by a significant number of Adventist scholars from historical and exegetical perspectives. The next section examines and discusses the literal approach to these prophetic times closely.

²⁴Ibid, 119.

²⁵Gerhard Pfandl, *Time Prophecies in Daniel 12*, Biblical Research Institute Releases, no. 5 (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventist, 2005), 1.

²⁶Ibid, 2.

²⁷Ibid, 3.

²⁸Ibid.

²⁹Cf. Dan 11:36 and 12:6.

³⁰Cf. Dan 11:31 and Dan 12:11.

³¹Ibid.

³²Pfandl, *Daniel: The Seer of Babylon*, 119. Another important contribution from an exegetical and historical approach is Frank W. Hardy, “The 1290 and 1335 days of Daniel 12: Past or Future?” in Ron du Preez ed., *Prophetic Principles: Crucial Exegetical, Theological, Historical, and Practical Insights* (Lansing, MI: Michigan Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 2007), 271-298.

The Literal Times Interpretation

The traditional historicist interpretation remained unchallenged for decades among Adventist biblical scholars, theologians, and laymen. However, a series of recent studies have defunct this interpretation. On the one hand, some Adventist scholars and pastors suggest that these prophetic periods cover a literal period in the past, just a few years after Daniel's death. This approach is known as the Preterist School of prophetic interpretation. On the other hand, in recent times Adventist preachers, scholars, and laymen began to emphasize a new futurist approach as an appropriate interpretation of the 1290 and 1335 days. In this section, I will briefly summarize their positions.

Unfulfilled Preterism

The Preterist School of prophetic interpretation understands that the prophetic fulfillment of the prophecies occurred in the authors' own time or shortly after the author's death. Consequently, the time prophecies of Daniel must be interpreted in the historical context of the prophet. It is important to acknowledge that the Preterist School has made little impact on Adventist prophetic interpretation.³³ However, while rejecting some of presuppositions of the Preterist School, a few Adventist authors believe that Dan 12 was completely fulfilled in the past.³⁴

Early in his career Raymond F. Cottrell seems to have supported the traditional historical interpretation.³⁵ Nevertheless, later, in his extensive analysis

³³The hermeneutical presuppositions of preterism widely disagree with key concepts of Adventist theology in terms of authorship, date, inspiration, and accuracy of the Scriptures. For a brief description of the principal presuppositions of the preterist school see Alden Thompson, "Apocalyptic: Daniel," in *Introducing the Bible: The Old Testament and Intertestamental Literature*, vol. 1, eds. Douglas R. Clark and John C. Brunt (New York: University Press of America, 1997), 527.

³⁴For instance, Carlos Nina Ortiz, a former professor and pastor at Universidad Adventista Dominicana (UNAD), holds the point of view that the 1290 and 1335 days are not connected with the 1260 days and the papal abomination. He connected these periods with the abomination that caused desolation announced by Jesus (Matt 24:15, 16), the imperial army of Rome. Therefore, he maintains that the 1290 and 1335 days are literal days. The starting point of this prophecies is the besiege of Jerusalem by Gaius Cestius Gallus, 14 of Tishri A. D. 66, ending the 1290 days when Titus Flavius Caesar again besieged the city on 14 of Nissan A. D. 70. The 1335 days, in his view, did not end the abomination 45 days later, but only marked its climax. His interpretation, however, lacks biblical and historical support and is erratic in many points. Carlos Nina, *Las profecias de Daniel 12 y el tiempo del fin* [The Prophecies of Daniel 12 and the Time of the End] (Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic: Carlos Nina Ortiz, 2004), 89-103.

³⁵Raymond F. Cottrell, *The Prophecies of Daniel and Revelation: Part 1 – Daniel: A Syllabus for use in Lower Division College Classes* (Angwin, CA: Pacific Union College, 1951), 105.

of Dan 10–12, *The Eschatology of Daniel 10 to 12*,³⁶ he defends a contextual interpretation of Dan 12:11-12. For him, a contextual approach indicates that all the prophetic times of Daniel reached their fulfillment in the years directly after the restoration of Israel from the Babylonian exile. In his opinion, the 2300 (reduced to 1150 literal days), 1260, 1290, and 1335 days shared the same point of beginning, namely, “the desecration of the temple and the cessation of its ritual service,” at the hand of the last king of the north.³⁷

According to Cottrell, each of these sequences of literal days concluded also in a number of sequential events. The events started with “the restoration of the temple (the end of the 1150 days), the deliverance of the Jews (end of the 1260 days), the crushing of the tyrant (end of the 1290 days), and finally the inauguration of the everlasting and righteous reign of the Messiah and the resurrection of Daniel and the saints (end of the 1335 days).”³⁸ In this way, he suggests that God expected to fulfill Daniel’s vision by ending the problem of sin, inaugurating his kingdom, and dedicating the everlasting sanctuary. Unfortunately, in his opinion, the vision was not completely fulfilled because of the unfaithful behavior of God’s people.

Future Fulfillment

Alberto R. Timm³⁹ and Gerhard Pfandl⁴⁰ identify the interpretation of a future fulfillment for the prophecies of Daniel 12 as the more challenging interpretation for Adventist eschatology. It is important to note that neither the proponents nor their conclusions about a future fulfillment for these prophecies could be identified with the hermeneutical presuppositions and principles of the futurism school of interpretation. Among the proponents of this future fulfillment are pastors, laymen, and well-known scholars. It is beyond the scope of this paper to trace the line of influence of this new interpretation among Adventist scholars, but it seems that Robert Hauser was one of the first in presenting this idea.⁴¹ This

³⁶Raymond F. Cottrell, *The Eschatology of Daniel 10 to 12*, unpublished manuscript, n.p., 1994 (Raymond F. Cottrell Collection, Bx. 13, Fld. 20), Andrews University, Center for Adventist Research, Berrien Springs, MI.

³⁷Ibid., 114.

³⁸Ibid., 114.

³⁹Alberto R. Timm, “The 1,290 and 1,335 Days of Daniel 12,” online at <http://www.adventistbiblicalresearch.org/documents/daniel12.htm>, accessed November 13, 2011.

⁴⁰Pfandl, *Time Prophecies in Daniel 12*, 1.

⁴¹Robert Hauser, *Give Glory to Him: The Sanctuary in the Book of Revelation* (Angwin, CA: Robert W. Hauser, 1983). While he did not completely reject the Adventist position, he suggested that these prophecies could have future applications. He says, “But didn’t these prophecies have a fulfillment in the past? Yes. From Ellen G. White’s discussion about the

interpretation, evidently, found a receptive place in the thinking of lay members such Marian G. Berry⁴² and Charlene Fortsch.⁴³ This “new style of futurism”⁴⁴ has recently reached both Adventist pastors and scholars.

For instance, Siegfried Schwantes, an Old Testament theologian and former professor of the Seventh-day Adventist Seminary, Andrews University, and Kenneth Cox, a well-known Adventist evangelist, clearly expect a literal fulfillment of these days just before the second coming of Jesus.⁴⁵ Similarly, Samuel Nunez, an Old Testament scholar, advocates this interpretation using a more academic approach. His careful study of the Hebrew words and the structure of Daniel could offer an appealing support for this new interpretation.⁴⁶ The discussion will now focus on describing some of his principal arguments.

However, before considering Nuñez’s arguments, it is worthwhile to highlight two principal assumptions held by advocates. First, the 1260, 1290, and 1335 days are literal days to be fulfilled in the future.⁴⁷ Second, the events of the 1260, 1290,

1843 chart we can assume that the historical application ... in Daniel 12 was correct. However, we cannot assume from what is said that it was the only application” (ibid., 204). That he could be the first Bible student in presenting this idea could also be supported on the basis of Victor Michaelson response to his ideas one by one as early as 1985. See Michaelson, *Delayed Time-Setting: Heresies Exposed* (Payson, AZ: Leaves-Of-Autumn Books, 1985).

⁴²Marian G. Berry, *Warning in the 1260, 1290, 1335 Days Timelines of Daniel 12* (Brushton, NY: Teach Services, 1990).

⁴³Charlene Fortsch, *Daniel: Understanding the Dreams and Visions* (Anaheim, BC, Canada: Prophecy Song, 2006). Fortsch does not explain completely her ideas about the future fulfillment of these periods. However, she embraces the concept that the prophetic days of Daniel 12: 11-12 are literal days for the future. For instance, “The following timelines cannot move backward and be interpreted in the timeframe of the Dark Ages. They can only move forward to events in the future...These timelines reveal the final events at the close of this world’s history” (ibid., 343).

⁴⁴Michaelson, 7.

⁴⁵Kenneth Cox, *Daniel: A Closer Look at the Book that Tells What Will Happen in the End Times* (Coldwater, MI: Remnant Publications, 2005), 149-155. Siegfried J. Schwantes, *Comentario o Livro de Daniel*, online at <http://www.scribd.com/doc/51712214/DANIEL-SIEGFREID-J-SCHWANTES-PH-D>, accessed Nov 13, 2011, says that this epilogue has its focus on “the end of the time,” therefore the 1290 and 1335 days must be considered literal days. All the events described in Daniel 12: 11-12 will happen during a final crisis of 1290 days followed by a time of trouble of 45 days that will end with the second coming of Jesus Christ (ibid., 133). Schwantes is an acknowledged scholar of Old Testament studies. He holds a PhD from The Johns Hopkins University.

⁴⁶Samuel Nuñez, *Las profecías apocalípticas de Daniel: La verdad acerca del futuro de la humanidad* [The Apocalyptic Prophecies of Daniel: The Truth about the Future of Humanity] (Mexico, DF: Samuel Nunez, 2005).

⁴⁷Hauser, 202; Berry, 135; Fortsch, 343; Schwantes, 133; Cox, 155; Nunez, 191, 195.

1335 days begin with a universal or national Sunday law.⁴⁸ It should be noted, nevertheless, that Nuñez does not widely focus on the events and the exact moment in which these prophetic times will be fulfilled.⁴⁹ Instead, he spends time and exegetical effort to demonstrate that these days must be understood literally as part of the time of the end.⁵⁰

According to Nuñez, there are several exegetical reasons to interpret these prophetic times literally. First, Nuñez points out that the chiasmic structure of Dan 12 indicates that verses 1-6 and 8-13 deal with events of the “time of the end.”⁵¹ Thus, the prophetic periods enclosed in these sections should refer to the time and history of the last days. Second, wherever the Old Testament uses the word *yom* or *yamim* (day, days) with an ordinal or cardinal number the described measure of time is always literal.⁵² Because the time periods of Dan 12:11-12 are expressed by cardinal numbers, they should be understood literally. For Nuñez this is self-evident, due to the fact that the symbolic periods in Dan 7 (*iddan*), Dan 8 (*ereb boqer*), Dan 9 (*sabnim*), and Dan 12:7 (*mo’ed* - time) never use the term *yom* (day). Third, Daniel uses the same strategy in all literary visions. He first describes the vision and then comes the prophetic period: (a) 7:2-14 and 7:25, (b) 8:3-12 and 8:14, 26, (c) 11:2-12:4 and 12:7, 11, 12.⁵³ The only periods, according to Nuñez, to be understood literally in these literary structures are those presented in verses 11 and 12 of Dan 12.

Additionally, Nuñez suggests other conclusions to support his position that could not easily and necessarily be assumed from his exegetical work. For instance, he argues that the Hebrew terms in chapter 12 *tamid* (continuous) and *shiqqus shomen* (desolating abomination) relate to events of the end. These events are identified with the future actions of the king of the north against the heavenly ministry of Christ, especially in relation to the attacks upon the fourth commandment of God’s law.⁵⁴ It seems that Nuñez does believe that the “daily” and the “desolating abominations” of the previous chapter share similarities with Dan 12. However, the historical events and time of fulfilment of these two

⁴⁸In this aspect they differ. Nunez separates the 1260 from the 1290 and 1335 days (195), though the Sunday law initiates both periods. Hauser (208) and Berry (138) initiate the 1335 days with a National Sunday Law in the USA and the 1260 and 1335 days with a Universal Sunday Law worldwide.

⁴⁹Although he states that a Sunday law will be the starting point of these prophecies, he is not as descriptive as Hauser and Berry, 195, 196.

⁵⁰Samuel Nuñez, “The Prophecy of the Man Clothed in Linen in Daniel 12:5-13,” unpublished manuscript, San Marcos, CA, n.d.

⁵¹Ibid., 19.

⁵²Ibid., 40.

⁵³In this specific exegetical aspect, Nuñez concurs with Shea and Pfandl.

⁵⁴Ibid.

chapters are different, and the active agents of chapters 8 and 12 point to different historical identities, namely the little horn and the king of the north. Finally, Nuñez also affirms that while in the first three visions of the book (chapters 2, 7, 8) the literary structure tends to be symbolic, the last chapters (11 and 12) tend to be literal. In summary, for Nuñez, the words of the “man clothed in linen” (12:9) indicate that the vision of Dan 12 should be understood as pointing to the time of the end; it is about events that ought to happen in the end time.⁵⁵

As has been observed, the literal interpretation recognizes the time prophecies of Dan 12 as literal days. In this approach, some interpreters tend to see the fulfillment of these times in the past, while others believe that they will be fulfilled in the future. The futurist approach to these prophecies has obtained support and acceptance in some circles of the Adventist church. Nonetheless, the support of this view remains insignificant in comparison with the support of the traditional historicist view. The idealist interpretation of Dan 12:11-12 in Adventist eschatology will now be discussed.

The Multi-Perspective and the Idealist Interpretations

Desmond Ford’s multiple fulfillments or “apotelesmatic principle” and Zdravko Stefanovic’s literary approach to Dan 12 represent minor approaches in Adventist studies of Dan 12. Ford proposes an interpretation that harmonizes all the major systems of prophetic studies; the Historicist, Preterist, Futurist schools. Stefanovic argues for an idealist or spiritual approach that minimizes the historical application and fulfillment of apocalyptic prophecies.

The Multi-Perspective Approach of Desmond Ford in Daniel 12

Desmond Ford approaches Daniel’s book from a historical-grammatical-contextual-critical method of interpretation.⁵⁶ F. F. Bruce, in the foreword of Ford’s *Commentary of Daniel*, indicates that Ford wrote his dissertation “based on the primary exegesis of the Biblical text . . . that establish what the author meant and what the first readers understood, or were intended to understand.”⁵⁷ Bruce, however, stresses that Ford in his commentary “moves beyond it to explore and set forth the plenary sense”⁵⁸ of Daniel’s visions.

Ford briefly outlines his position about the 1290 and 1335 days. In doing so, he heavily relies on the works of Wordsworth and Fausset to suggest that these dates could be understood by “year-day as well as day-day principles.”⁵⁹ In other

⁵⁵Nuñez, *Las profecías apocalípticas*, 191-196.

⁵⁶Desmond Ford, *Daniel* (Nashville, TN: Southern Pub. Assn., 1978), 5.

⁵⁷Ibid.

⁵⁸Ibid.

⁵⁹Ibid., 283.

words, for Ford these prophetic periods could be interpreted as literal or symbolic days. Consequently, the 1290 and 1335 days have had two complete fulfillments.

First, the primary and intended historical event of the prophecy is identified with Antiochus Epiphanes and his repulsive actions in the temple of Jerusalem. Second, these prophecies also have experienced a secondary fulfillment throughout the history of the medieval church and the “antichrist’s supremacy from A.D. 538 to 1798.”⁶⁰ Nevertheless, Ford does not limit possible fulfillments of these prophecies to these two events. He is also open to another probable “*apotelesmatic fulfillment*” in the last days. He states, “[Daniel] is saying that in this time of the end there will be a repeat performance of what happened throughout the Christian history.”⁶¹ Conveniently, Ford seems to purposefully accommodate his arguments to combine three hermeneutical methods and conclusions of prophetic interpretations, namely, the widely recognized academic preterism, the historicism of his own tradition, and some kind of prophetic futurism. This represents an idealist approach opening a place in the table to all these multiple fulfillments.

The Idealist Approach of Zdravko Stefanovic in Daniel 12:11

Zdravko Stefanovic, a professor of Old Testament studies, wrote the most recent commentary on Daniel from an Adventist perspective entitled *Daniel, Wisdom to the Wise: Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. The commentary has received excellent reviews “for opening up a fresh perspective while preserving the historic Adventist understanding.”⁶²

Stefanovic divides his commentary into three principal parts. First, *the notes* explore “the linguistic, literary, and historical aspects of the original text.”⁶³ These exegetical notes support the second section, *the exposition*, where he suggests, “what the text meant at the time it was written based on what the author likely intended to say.”⁶⁴ These two sections seem to present the author’s point of view about the meaning of Daniel’s prophetic visions.⁶⁵ The last section contains the

⁶⁰He does not explain when these days started and finished.

⁶¹Ford, *Daniel*, 283.

⁶²See the declaration of Alden Thomson on the back cover of Zdravko Stefanovic, *Daniel, the Wisdom to the Wise: Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 2007).

⁶³Stefanovic, *Daniel*, 12.

⁶⁴Ibid.

⁶⁵Stefanovic clearly states the main purpose of his work affirming that “this commentary is biblical expository, it focuses on the text and themes from the book of Daniel and on the points of teaching that are derived from them. Because of its focus on the biblical text, this commentary is *not* intended to be a resource tool providing a wealth

summary of teaching where the author explains “what the text means today.”⁶⁶ It is also important to note that in chapters 2 and chapters 7–12, instead of the summary of teaching, there are *applications of Daniel’s prophecies* presenting the traditional historical understanding of these chapters.⁶⁷ However, it seems the author is careful to distance himself from the historical applications of Daniel’s prophecies. He objectively presents the traditional positions but he does not advocate or support any particular interpretation. His exegetical methodology seems to lead him to abandon the task of finding any historical fulfillment for Daniel’s visions.⁶⁸

Therefore, according to Stefanovic “it is difficult to come up with a symbolic meaning”⁶⁹ about the 1290 and 1335 days. Consequently, neither a literal meaning nor what Stefanovic terms “symbolic meaning” is obvious in the context of Dan 12.⁷⁰ Aided by his exegetical approach, Stefanovic proposes a “literary approach” to Dan 12:11-12 explaining,

The most satisfactory way to look at the numbers given in these passages is literal. When these two numbers are put together with the expression *time, times, and half* from verse 7, then the three numbers, namely, 1,260 days, **1,290 days**, and **1,335 days**, appear in a numerical progression. This progression lets the reader of the book know that a seeming or apparent “delay” in the expectation of the end is possible from the human point of view.⁷¹

Hence, for Stefanovic, God did not reveal to Daniel a historical sequence of his actions throughout history or for the future of God’s people, or even for Daniel’s time.⁷² God merely informed Daniel that his battles against antagonistic

of material on apocalyptic literature nor any other disciplines such as dogmatic theology or church history.” See Stefanovic, *Daniel*, 12.

⁶⁶Ibid.

⁶⁷Ibid.

⁶⁸See the book reviews written by Angel M. Rodriguez and Frank W. Hardy: Rodriguez, “[Book Review] Daniel: The Wisdom to the Wise: Commentary on the Book of Daniel,” *Ministry*, March 2008, 28, 29; Hardy, “[Book Review] Daniel: The Wisdom to the Wise: Commentary on the Book of Daniel,” *Ministry*, March 2008, 29.

⁶⁹Stefanovic, *Daniel*, 12, 444.

⁷⁰Ibid., 447.

⁷¹Ibid., 447, 448.

⁷²Proponents of the idealist approach to Daniel and Revelation argue that biblical prophecies are not primarily intended as a reference to specific historical events, but as a manifestation of spiritual lessons and/or the way in which God deals throughout history with injustice, evil, and oppression. In such a way, the historical applications of the time prophecies of Daniel and Revelation are minimized or denied. For instance, Willard H. Hinkley specifically states about Daniel’s prophecies that “We should regard the book of Daniel as a whole, knowing that it was written for the sake of its spiritual meaning, and not for the purpose of recording historical events in a connected series,” *The Book of*

spiritual forces, those who are in open opposition to his purposes, would endure longer than Daniel and the believers could previously anticipate.

A Brief Evaluation of the Interpretations

Here, the different positions discussed above are briefly evaluated. First, the symbolic approach to Dan 12:11-12 seem to represent the most plausible interpretation for these prophetic periods. Apparently, the traditional historicist interpretation respects the literary, contextual, and thematic structure of the book of Daniel. Also, from a historical perspective the symbolic interpretation has demonstrated the accuracy of the historical events in connection with the 1290 and 1335 days. Recently, Jean Carlos Zukowski defended the accuracy of the year and events of A. D. 508 as the beginning point of these prophetic periods. He suggests that the religious-political commitments between the state and the church experienced in this year a level of compromise never seen before in the history of the Christian church.⁷³

However, it seems some areas need further work and clarification. First, the historicist school of interpretation may need to clarify its methodology and hermeneutic. For instance, many interpretations claim to use a historicist approach to the book of Daniel but they arrived at different conclusions about the historical and prophetic fulfillments of Daniel's numerical prophecies.⁷⁴ Second, it seems that the proper interpretation of the starting historical year of the 1290 and 1335 days is closely related to the proper identification of the historical or spiritual entity that the "daily" is pointing to.

Daniel: Its Prophetic Character and Spiritual Meaning (Boston: Massachusetts New-Church Union, 1894), 7-13; see also Jonathan Menn, *Biblical Eschatology* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2013), 194, 195; Robert H. Mounce, *The Book of Revelation* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1977), 29, 43; John F. Walvoord, *The Revelation of Jesus Christ* (Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1966), 17.

⁷³Jean Carlos Zukowski, "The Role and Status of the Catholic Church in the Church-State Relationship Within the Roman Empire from A.D. 306 to 814," PhD diss., Andrews University, 2009, 341-351. He states, "A.D. 508 and 538 are singled out as the key dates when the models of relationships between church and state and between rulers and clergy changed," 340. He also says, "This study proposes that A.D. 508 is the most significant year for the church-state relationship in Clovis's reign, since it marked the culmination of the union between the Franks and the Catholic Church," 348.

⁷⁴This affirmation was particularly true within the historical, social, and theological context of William Miller and Adventist pioneers. But, this tendency is still alive among Seventh-day Adventists, Jehovah's Witnesses, and the Advent Christian Church, heirs of Albany Conference and William Miller. See Clarence H. Hewitt, *The Seer of Babylon: Studies in the Book of Daniel* (Boston, MA: Advent Christian Publication Society, 1948), 365-367. Hewitt is a prominent theologian and professor at Aurora University, a Christian College associated with the Advent Christian Church. This group is a branch of the Albany Conference, one of major groups that resulted from the great disappointment of 1844.

While the pioneers widely identified the *tamid* with the *continuing paganism* of Roman power, more recent Adventist scholarship takes the position that the “daily” points to the heavenly ministry of Jesus Christ. Early in the Adventist interpretation of these prophetic periods, John N. Loughborough noticed that those who argue that the “daily” represents the Jewish daily sacrifices or the permanent ministry of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary “found no event to which either the 1290 or 1335 years would reach.”⁷⁵ Therefore, modern Adventist scholars that identify the “daily” with the continual intercession of Jesus in the heavenly sanctuary need to make clear what specific historical actions of Christ’s intercession was taken away by the actions of the little horn during the years A.D. 508 and A.D. 538.⁷⁶ In this manner, the traditional historicist interpretation would more accurately present the year A.D 508 as the starting point of the 1290 and 1335 days.

It seems that Nuñez’s position presents some essential points of concern.⁷⁷ First, it appears to be inconsistent with the structure of Dan 12 to take out verse 7 in order to interpret the 1260 days following the traditional Adventist position.⁷⁸ In contrast, Berry consistently interprets verse 7 as a literal time in the future together with the 1290 and 1335 days.⁷⁹ Second, Nuñez implies that the Hebrew term *yom* accompanied with cardinal numbers requires a literal interpretation, forgetting that the expression belongs to the apocalyptic section of the book of Daniel. In prophetic sections of the Bible, the word “day” requires a symbolic understanding. Third, Nuñez does not offer any historical or scriptural evidence

⁷⁵J. N. Loughborough, “The Thirteen Hundred and Thirty-Five Days,” *Review and Herald*, April 4, 1907, 9, 10. More recently, Frank W. Hardy and the *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* have made the same observation, that without a proper understanding of *tamid* it is impossible to comprehend the 1290 and 1335 days. See Hardy, 282; Nichol, 880.

⁷⁶For further discussion on this topic see, John W. Peters, “The Mystery of the Daily: An Exegesis of Daniel 8:9-14” in <http://www.spvbible.org/studies>, accessed November 15, 2011. See also the response to Peters, Gerhard Pfandl, “Evaluation of the ‘Mystery of the Daily’ by John Peters,” and the response to Pfandl by John W. Peters “Response to Gerhard Pfandl’s Evaluation of ‘The Mystery of the Daily’” in <http://www.spvbible.org/miscellaneous>, accessed November 15, 2011. For a historical development of the daily controversy see Denis Kaiser, “The History of Adventist Interpretation of the ‘Daily’ in the Book of Daniel from 1831 to 2008,” M.A. thesis, Andrews University, 2009.

⁷⁷The most extensive answer to Nuñez’s interpretation is that of Ruben Tenorio, “Los 1260, 1290 y los 1335 días en el contexto de Daniel 8–12” [The 1260, 1290, and 1335 days in the Context of Daniel 8 to 12] and “Daniel 11 y 12: Interpretación y estructura” [Daniel 11 and 12: Interpretation and Structure] papers presented at the Simposium Teológico, Montemorelos University, June 2009.

⁷⁸Nuñez, 170. He translates the preposition of the verse 7 *le* as “after” instead of “for” or “during.” Thus, the text reads “How long shall the fulfillment of these wonders *be?* ... that it shall [be] **after** (not *for*) a time, times, and half *a time?*” (emphasis supplied).

⁷⁹Berry, 196.

to relate the abomination of desolation to the imposition of worship on Sunday in the last days.⁸⁰ Apparently, the abomination of desolation is not limited to supplanting the Lord's day, but more specifically to the obscuring of Christ's salvific work by human provisions of salvation. Finally, Nuñez frequently offers alternative translations of the Hebrew text in order to support his theological conclusions. Nuñez, evidently, leaves the historicist school of interpretation, at least in Dan 12, to venture into a speculative interpretation of the 1290 and 1335 days.

In order to defend a literal fulfillment in Daniel's context of these prophecies, Cottrell applies features of classical prophecies to apocalyptic literature. While classical prophecies are conditioned on the human response to a divine invitation, apocalyptic prophecies are not. He says, "Inasmuch as predictive prophecy is a declaration of the divine purpose, and its fulfillment in history is conditional upon the response of those to whom it is addressed, non-fulfillment within the original historical context makes these predictions subject to reinterpretation by later inspired writers."⁸¹ It must be noted, however, that although he acknowledges that unfulfilled apocalyptic prophecies could be reinterpreted by authorized prophets, he does not mention any possible reinterpretation of Daniel's prophecies as a valid one.

Stefanovic's approach like an idealistic spiritualization of Daniel's prophecies and contains enormous implications for Daniel studies in general and Adventist eschatology in particular. If the prophetic periods of Dan12 signify only a delay in God's purpose for his people, then Daniel becomes a book without eschatological and prophetic emphasis. All the historical positions assumed by the church throughout history become irrelevant and unnecessary.

Finally, Desmond Ford, in his attempt to unite the research methods and conclusions of four conflicting schools of prophetic interpretation, argues in favor of a multi-perspective approach to the interpretation of Daniel's prophecies. Such multi-perspective approach is summarized in his interpretative axiom, "it must be said that each of the systems is right in what it affirms and wrong in what it denies."⁸² One of the main problems with Ford's approach is that his "apotelesmatic principle" attempts to find some truths in all systems of prophetic interpretation without necessarily criticizing the degrees of errors inherently present in those systems.

The Eschatological Identity of Seventh-day Adventists: A Reflection

Before concluding this study, it is important to discuss briefly some main points of the theological and eschatological identity of Seventh-day Adventist Church in

⁸⁰Nuñez, 189.

⁸¹Ibid., 125.

⁸²Ford, 68.

relation with the interpretations of the time prophecies of Dan 12. Does Seventh-day Adventist eschatology have a specific identity? If it does, how does such identity relate to the theological identity of the Adventist Church? One would argue that, taking into account the general consensus of Adventist interpreters, the main mark of the eschatological identity of the Seventh-day Adventist Church is a historicist approach to the eschatological prophecies of Daniel and Revelation. From this key aspect of Adventist eschatological identity arise two main hermeneutical principles. First, all prophecies of Daniel and Revelation flow in a harmonious historical continuum from 457 B.C. to A.D. 1844. Second, in order to fulfill that historical continuum, the prophecies expressed as “days” must be interpreted by the year-day principle.

Obviously, if we agree that the eschatological identity of the Adventist Church is closely related to the principles mentioned above, then, the literal and idealistic approaches to Dan 12 stand in conflict with such identity. Both approaches, at least in their position of Dan 12, dispute the year-day principle and the historicist continuum of apocalyptic prophecies.

Nevertheless, Adventist theology is also characterized by a dynamic understanding of biblical truth. According to George R. Knight the concept of “present truth” as an identifying mark of Adventist theology involves a rejection of “creedal rigidity” as well as an acceptance of “progressive understanding” of the biblical doctrine.⁸³ In this sense Roberto Badenas rightly claims, “for Adventist Christianity, the very word ‘truth’ ought to mean discovery and growth.”⁸⁴ Apparently, this reality of the theological identity of the Church continues to call us to be open to different ways of biblical interpretation or understanding without *a priori* closing the door in favor of historical dogmatic positions.

In other words, Adventists should not assume historical positions on theology and eschatology as “final truth,” but rather they should engage in a continual, humble, and diligent searching of the truth that opens the way to an always-increasing light. In faithful acceptance of this identity, Adventist interpreters should continue to evaluate those positions that seem to depart from the traditional understanding of the Church. In doing so, they should reinforce those elements that seem to nurture the apocalyptic and eschatological vision of the

⁸³George R. Knight, *A Search for Identity: The Development of Seventh-day Adventist Belief* (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 2000), 21-26. It is also important to highlight that the concept of “present truth” was also viewed as the truths they discovered after the disappointment. In other words, they viewed particular components of biblical truth of being of special importance in the time of the end as truths that should be proclaimed especially.

⁸⁴Roberto Badenas, “Dealing with ‘Present Truth’: 2 Peter 1:12 Revisited,” in *Exploring the Frontiers of Faith*, eds. Børge Schantz and Reinder Bruinsma (Lüneburg, Germany: Advent-Verlag, 2009), 211.

Church. A renewed exposition of traditional interpretations could benefit the postmodern mindset of young believers and support the Adventist continual expectation for the second coming of Jesus Christ.

Certainly, the sense of “present truth” requires an always-increasing knowledge and study of the biblical teaching. Honest prayer and meticulous biblical scrutiny should mark such continual searching of the truth. New light does not necessarily negate or undermine established truth. It could be also adding new perspectives or approaches to widely accepted teachings. In doing this task, two counsels from the pen of Ellen G. White seems essential to remember. White proposes that on one hand, traditional truth is always open to correction by the Word of God; new light is always welcome in the community of faith. She stated,

There is no excuse for anyone in taking the position that there is no more truth to be revealed, and that all our expositions of Scripture are without error. The fact that certain doctrines have been held as truth for many years by our people, is not a proof that our ideas are infallible . . . No true doctrine will lose anything by close investigation.⁸⁵

On the other hand, she admonished that the enemy of God is always ready to introduce doctrinal errors as new scriptural light into the Christian community. She pointed out, “the great deceiver has many agents to present any and every kind of errors to ensnare souls—heresies, prepared to suit the varied tastes and capacities of those whom he would ruin.”⁸⁶ Therefore, new light should be carefully tested by the testimony of Scripture and the community of faith.

Conclusions and Implications

Evidently, most Seventh-day Adventist theologians have been univocal in their belief that the traditional historicist approach represents the best interpretation of Dan 12:11-12. This group of interpreters defends a historicist approach to apocalyptic prophecies. In the past thirty years, some Adventist theologians have been inclined to interpret these prophetic days as literal days in the past or in the future. Other interpreters prefer multiple fulfillment approach or idealist spiritualization as the proper meaning of the 1290 and 1335 days. These new positions have challenged the historical view of the Church. This shift from uniformity to diversity has historical, social, and theological reasons worth investigating in future studies.

Two implications of this study merit attention. One is that, the church has two great sources of identity. On one hand, the theological identity of “present truth” is applied as a general approach to biblical studies. On the other hand, the

⁸⁵Ellen G. White, *Councils to Writers and Editors* (Hagerstown, MD: Pacific Press, 1993), 35.

⁸⁶Ellen G. White, *The Great Controversy Ended . . . A Glimpse into Eternity* (Silver Spring, MD: Better Living Pub., 2002), 292.

eschatological identity described above as an approach to biblical prophecies. It seems critical that Adventist theologians work with these two identities in mind to further develop Adventist approaches to biblical prophecies. In other words, current works on prophetic interpretation from an Adventist perspective should appreciate both the concept of a progressive truth as well as the apocalyptic nature of Adventist eschatology. Secondly, it seems obvious, (at least in prophetic studies of Daniel and Revelation), that there is currently an existing diversity of theological approaches within the Adventist Church. The question to ponder is, What kind(s) of diversity can be accepted without losing or endangering the theological and eschatological identity of the Church?

WOLCOTT HACKLEY LITTLEJOHN: DEFENDER OF THE FAITH

KEVIN M. BURTON
M.A. Candidate in Historical Theology (Andrews University)
burtonk@andrews.edu

Abstract

Wolcott Hackley Littlejohn was an influential writer, speaker and leader within the early years of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Before he became an active member, he lost his sight and was no longer able to read or write. Nevertheless, he read continuously and wrote copiously through the eyes and hands of another. Littlejohn was also a profound speaker who drew the attention of people from different faiths. He made numerous lasting contributions to Adventism, but his life was at times wrapped up in controversy. In the 1870's he challenged George Ide Butler and his philosophy of leadership and in the 1890's he received pointed critiques from Ellen Gould White because of a controversial article that he published. Throughout his life, Littlejohn proved to be a remarkable man and adept theologian. This article attempts to provide a brief historical overview of his life and contributions to the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

Keywords: blindness, religious liberty, leadership, extremes, Review and Herald, Battle Creek College, Ellen G. White, James White, G. I. Butler, A. R. Henry.

Introduction

The Littlejohn family stood out as some of the most influential politicians, churchmen, businessmen, and civic leaders within Allegan County, Michigan, for some seventy years, or more.¹ One of the members of this clan became a Seventh-

¹Henry F. Thomas, *A Twentieth Century History of Allegan County* (Chicago: Lewis Publishing, 1907), 58. Two members of Littlejohn's family are particularly worthy of note, but fall outside the limitations of this article. The first, Reverend Augustus Littlejohn, one of Wolcott's uncles became very well known as a revivalist preacher and prohibitionist and spent considerable time traveling across America with an internationally recognized temperance lecturer, John B. Gough. "Sad End of a Famous Revivalist," *Worthington (MN) Advance*, February 9, 1888, 3, online: <http://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov> (accessed September 24, 2014), hereafter cited as *Chronicling America*. While Augustus Littlejohn did achieve a fair amount of popularity perhaps the most famous churchman within the Littlejohn family was Abram Newkirk Littlejohn, Wolcott's first cousin. A. N. Littlejohn became a Bishop in the Protestant Episcopal Church and primarily served on the Atlantic coast. He eventually became the Bishop of the Diocese of Long Island, and in addition to

day Adventist—Wolcott Hackley Littlejohn. Like the rest of his family, Wolcott embodied the character traits of a gentleman and a scholar. Though Littlejohn was a fairly prominent figure in the early years of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, his life and work has been largely overlooked.² Consequently, this article provides a very brief historical sketch of Littlejohn's life and highlights some of his significant contributions to Adventism.

During his lifetime, Littlejohn was well known by Adventists and non-Adventists alike. The *Allegan Gazette* stated that Littlejohn was a “noted Bible student, preacher, and author” and a “distinguished churchman.”³ Likewise, Clifford Russell stated that “his life was of unusual mental activity, and he was known as a sound reasoner and a profound logician” in Adventist publications.⁴

his work in New York he gained worldwide acclaim for his work in England, Paris, and Rome. See “Bishop Littlejohn Dead: Head of Diocese of Long Island Expires Suddenly at Williamsburg, Mass.,” *New-York Tribune*, August 4, 1901, 14, *Chronicling America*. It is important to mention these two relations since it highlights, to some degree, the prominence of the Littlejohn family in America. There were many other prominent men in the Littlejohn clan, enough to make the name generally recognizable within the religious and political realm. These men, including both Augustus and Abram Littlejohn spent time in Allegan, Michigan and Wolcott may certainly have been influenced greatly by them all.

²Prior to this publication, only five documents relating to Wolcott Hackley Littlejohn are known to exist. The first two are term papers written by seminary students. These documents were never published and presumably contain mistakes. Nevertheless, they are somewhat helpful and can be accessed at the Center for Adventist Research, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich. (hereafter referred to as CAR). Valerius (Larry) Kositsin, “Correspondence between W. H. Littlejohn and E. G. White,” 1978, White Estate Document File 3109, CAR; Lloyd Wayne Perrin, “Wolcott Hackley Littlejohn: Preserver of the Faith,” 1980, White Estate Document File 3109, CAR. Three short publications are also available which relate to Littlejohn. The first is a book chapter written by E. K. Vande Vere that briefly highlights Littlejohn's career as President of Battle Creek College. Emmett K. Vande Vere, *The Wisdom Seekers: The Intriguing Story of the Men and Women Who Made the First Institution for Higher Learning Among Seventh-day Adventists* (Nashville, TN: Southern Pub. Assn., 1972), 48-52. The last two publications are encyclopedia entries and are largely based upon Littlejohn's obituaries in Adventist periodicals. See *SDA Encyclopedia*, 1996 ed., s. v. “Littlejohn, Wolcott Hackley;” and Eike Mueller, “Littlejohn, Wolcott Hackley,” in *The Ellen G. White Encyclopedia*, eds. Denis Fortin and Jerry Moon (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 2014), 455.

³“Death of Former Allegan Resident: Son of Brilliant Man—Inherited Unusual Mentality and Developed it Though Greatly Handicapped—Was Buried Here—Interesting Life Review,” *Allegan (MI) Gazette*, November 11, 1916, 7, Allegan District Library, Microfilm 026, January 1, 1916 to August 4, 1917.

⁴C. A. Russell, “Life Sketch of Elder W. H. Littlejohn,” *Review and Herald*, November 30, 1916, 16; C. A. Russell, “Elder W. H. Littlejohn,” *Lake Union Herald*, November 22, 1916, 6, 7.

These statements are apt descriptors of W. H. Littlejohn and his distinguished career.

Littlejohn was an excellent public speaker and was considered by some to be one of Adventism's "ablest speakers from the West."⁵ He gave the funeral sermon for two prominent Adventists: Deacon John White (James White's father) and Joseph Bates.⁶ During a presentation regarding the Health Institute, Ellen White commented that Littlejohn delivered "the most able [and] pointed speech I ever listened to [on the subject] . . . Every word could be put in print just as he uttered them."⁷ His name was also well recognized outside of Adventism and he often drew in large numbers of non-Adventists when he spoke publicly. While at the Illinois camp meeting in the fall of 1884, Isaac D. Van Horn reported, "The outside attendance was not large [at the camp meeting] till Sunday afternoon, when between 4,000 and 5,000 were out to hear Elder Littlejohn on "The Rise and Progress of the National Reform Association."⁸

In addition to being a profound public speaker, Littlejohn also wrote voluminously. Not including his numerous letters, labor reports, college notes, hymns and poems, reprinted articles, or answers to Scriptural questions, Littlejohn wrote more than 125 major articles, produced at least 18 tracts, and published 3 books. Littlejohn's articles were usually lengthy—often taking up more than one page in the periodical. Many of these articles were too long to be published in a single issue of a paper, and the enticing phrase "to be continued," is commonly found at the end of each section. If each published section of Littlejohn's articles were to be counted separately, the total would increase by almost three times, making the number over 300 known published articles.⁹

These statistics are even more impressive considering the fact that Littlejohn was blind. Since the mid-1850's Littlejohn was required to read and write through the eyes and hands of someone else. Hence whenever he gave a sermon or public address, it had to be delivered from memory. Throughout his life he employed numerous amanuenses and assistants. At least on one occasion the General

⁵"Shawsheen Grove," *Lowell (MA) Daily Citizen*, August 27, 1878, 2, online: <http://www.genealogybank.com> (accessed September 24, 2014), hereafter cited as Genealogy Bank.

⁶James White, "Obituary Notices: [John White]," *Review and Herald*, July 18, 1871, 39; W. H. Littlejohn, "Obituary Notices: [Joseph Bates]," *Review and Herald*, April 16, 1872, 143.

⁷Ellen G. White to James White, August 27, 1871, Letter 12, 1871, CAR.

⁸I. D. Van Horn, "Illinois Camp-Meeting," *Signs of the Times*, September 11, 1884, 554.

⁹These statistics, though not exhaustive, were tabulated from all available articles in Adventist publications. Furthermore, Littlejohn published numerous articles elsewhere that are not referenced here, and these numbers, though inexact can be considered an underestimate.

Conference even hired an amanuensis for Littlejohn.¹⁰ Many of these individuals are known only by their initials,¹¹ but a few of them have been identified by name.¹²

¹⁰James White and Uriah Smith, "Business Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Session of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists," *Review and Herald*, January 2, 1872, 21.

¹¹[1] M. E. G. (Wolcott H. Littlejohn to James S. White, July 7, 1870, White Estate Received Correspondence File, Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, hereafter cited as EGWE-GC). [2] J. E. L. (Wolcott H. Littlejohn to Ellen G. White, October 2, 1872, White Estate Received Correspondence File, EGWE-GC; Wolcott H. Littlejohn to Ellen G. White, January 14, 1873, White Estate Received Correspondence File, EGWE-GC). [3] E. G. R. (Wolcott H. Littlejohn to Ellen G. White, December 17, 1877, White Estate Received Correspondence File, EGWE-GC; Wolcott H. Littlejohn to Ellen G. White, July 15, 1878, White Estate Received Correspondence File, EGWE-GC). [4] B. (Wolcott H. Littlejohn to Ellen G. White, January 22, 1878, White Estate Received Correspondence File, EGWE-GC). [5] V. I. B. (Wolcott H. Littlejohn to James and Ellen White, January 23, 1887, White Estate Received Correspondence File, EGWE-GC).

¹²[1] C. C. Lewis (William Covert, "Early Observations—No. 11: Our First Camp Meeting," *Lake Union Herald*, February 10, 1915, 1; Wolcott H. Littlejohn to Ellen G. White, May 15, 1878, White Estate Received Correspondence File, EGWE-GC). [2] M. M. Ruiter (W. H. Littlejohn, "Michigan: Douglas, Allegan Co.," *Review and Herald*, January 30, 1883, 76; c.f. "The Journey's End: Ruiter," *Review and Herald*, May 18, 1944, 23). [3] Eugene Leland (Wolcott H. Littlejohn to Ellen G. White, April 22, 1883, White Estate Received Correspondence File, EGWE-GC; c.f. W. H. Sherrig, "Obituaries: Elder Eugene Leland," *Review and Herald*, July 13, 1922, 22). [4] It is probable that Donald Warren, a man disfellowshipped with Littlejohn in January 1876, was the assistant that helped Wolcott in the mid-1870's and signed the letters "D. W." (Wolcott H. Littlejohn to Ellen G. White, October 26, 1874, White Estate Received Correspondence File, EGWE-GC. Wolcott H. Littlejohn to James White, July 31, 1876, White Estate Received Correspondence File, EGWE-GC). [5] Littlejohn's wife, Addie Littlejohn, wrote for her husband on numerous occasions (Wolcott H. Littlejohn to Ellen G. White, February 7, 1884, White Estate Received Correspondence File, EGWE-GC; Wolcott H. Littlejohn to Ellen G. White, June 19, 1885, White Estate Received Correspondence File, EGWE-GC; Wolcott H. Littlejohn to Ellen G. White, August 16, 1886, White Estate Received Correspondence File, EGWE-GC; Wolcott H. Littlejohn to Ellen G. White, June 10, 1894, White Estate Received Correspondence File, EGWE-GC). [6] William C. White also aided Littlejohn some in his early years (W. C. White, "Trip to California," *Youth's Instructor*, October 1872, 73). [7] Beginning in 1901 several of Littlejohn's letters were signed "per F.," which was probably his adopted son, Fred Harvey (Wolcott H. Littlejohn to William C. White, December 28, 1901, White Estate Received Correspondence File, EGWE-GC; Wolcott H. Littlejohn to William C. White, July 5, 1902, White Estate Received Correspondence File, EGWE-GC; Wolcott H. Littlejohn to William C. White, December 5, 1903, White Estate Received Correspondence File, EGWE-GC; Wolcott H. Littlejohn to William C. White, May 2, 1908, White Estate Received Correspondence File, EGWE-GC).

Early Life and Aspirations (1834-1865)

Wolcott Hackley Littlejohn was born on May 27, 1834, in Little Falls, New York, to Flavius and Harriet Littlejohn. When Wolcott was about two years old, many of his relatives (including his father) moved from New York to Allegan, Michigan, to start a new life on the frontier.¹³ In 1838 Flavius Littlejohn returned to New York to bring his wife and children to their new home in Michigan.¹⁴ As a result, Wolcott grew up in a pioneer community and became close with all of his family living there.

Wolcott was especially close to his father and developed a love for jurisprudence through his influence. Flavius Josephus Littlejohn was admitted to the bar when he was about 26 and began his practice as an attorney a short time later.¹⁵ Throughout his career, Littlejohn served as a member of the House of Representatives of Michigan between 1842 and 1844 and filled that position again in 1848, 1855, and 1856. Flavius was elected Michigan State Senator, serving two years (1845-1846) and later acted as Circuit Court Commissioner during 1855-1856.¹⁶ When the Ninth Judicial Circuit was organized in April 1858, F. J. Littlejohn was elected Circuit Court Judge and held that position until his resignation in 1869.¹⁷ After his “retirement,” Littlejohn held the office of President of Allegan village for several years (1870-1871, 1873-1874).¹⁸ As Flavius was a politician, lawyer, scholar, logician, author, and powerful orator, Lloyd W. Perrin correctly states, “Young Wolcott was nurtured in an intellectually active home where the language of the courtroom was common parlance.”¹⁹ Like his father, Littlejohn possessed all of these traits in varying degrees.

¹³First Presbyterian Church of Allegan, MI, “Session Minutes, 1837-April 1896; Church Register including Baptisms, 1836-1894,” 1, 4, Presbyterian Historical Society, Louisville, KY; [Crisfield Johnson], *History of Allegan and Barry Counties, Michigan ...* (Philadelphia, PA: D. W. Ensing, 1880), 68, 69; “Michigan in Brief,” *Jackson (MI) Daily Citizen*, March 22, 1877, 2, Genealogy Bank.

¹⁴Russell, “Life Sketch of Elder W. H. Littlejohn,” 16. Flavius and Harriet Littlejohn had a total of three children: Cornelia E. Littlejohn (1833-1902), Wolcott H. Littlejohn (1834-1916), and Eugene C. Littlejohn (1843-1860).

¹⁵[Untitled Article],” *New-York Morning Herald*, May 18, 1830, 2, Genealogy Bank; “Obituary,” *Otsego (MI) Weekly Union*, May 21, 1880, 1, online: <http://www.archiveol.com/otsego/search> (accessed September 24, 2014), hereafter cited as Otsego Library Archive.

¹⁶[Johnson], *History of Allegan and Barry Counties*, 62, 63, 151.

¹⁷“The New Circuits,” *Marshall (MI) Democratic Expounder*, April 22, 1858, 2, online: <http://www.newspaperarchive.com> (accessed September 24, 2014), hereafter cited as Newspaper Archive. [Johnson], *History of Allegan and Barry Counties*, 54, 62.

¹⁸*Ibid.*, 155.

¹⁹Perrin, “Wolcott Hackley Littlejohn: Preserver of the Faith,” 4.

As a young boy, Littlejohn developed chronic rheumatism, which caused severe pain in his joints and muscles. Unfortunately, this pain continued into adulthood, but was somewhat lessened after Littlejohn embraced the Adventist health message around 1868.²⁰ While a rheumatic condition may not sound that severe, it was actually quite debilitating for Littlejohn and later developed into iridocyclitis (inflammation of the iris).²¹ With time this caused Wolcott to completely lose his sight.

Wolcott initially followed in his father's footsteps and began to study law. He commenced his studies at Kalamazoo College and later enrolled in the Classics program at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.²² However, Littlejohn never finished his degree.²³ In 1856, at the end of his second year in university, Wolcott's eyes became infected with rheumatism and he was forced to return to his home in Allegan.²⁴ Although he couldn't read or write anymore,²⁵ he still had limited vision for 17 more years until he became totally blind between 1874 and early 1875.²⁶

In 1861 Littlejohn formed a partnership with his future brother-in-law, Augustus S. Butler, and the two opened a "book and stationary" shop in

²⁰W. H. Littlejohn, "Benefits Received," *The Health Reformer*, March 1871, 187.

²¹According to medical doctor and researcher A. C. Hilding, "All ophthalmologists of experience have seen rheumatoid arthritis associated with destructive iridocyclitis and perhaps blindness. These patients ordinarily show severe ankylosis in many joints, and frequently they are more or less helpless because they are frozen in one position." See A. C. Hilding, "Syndrome of Joint and Cartilaginous Pathologic Changes with Destructive Iridocyclitis: Comparison with Described Concurrent Eye and Joint Diseases," *A.M.A. Archives of Internal Medicine* 89, no. 3 (1952): 445.

²²University of Michigan, *Catalogue of the Officers and Students of the University of Michigan: 1855-1856* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, 1856), 12.

²³In spite of this, Littlejohn was an exceptional student and was inducted into the Peninsular Chapter of Alpha Delta Phi in 1858. See Executive Council of the Alpha Delta Phi Fraternity, *Catalogue of the Alpha Delta Phi* (Boston: Rockwell and Churchill, 1899), 397.

²⁴1880 U. S. Census, Allegan Co., Michigan, "Defective, Dependent, and Delinquent Classes," Blind Inhabitants, Allegan, enumeration district (ED) 15, 13094-B [sic], Wolcott [sic] Littlejohn; online: <http://www.ancestry.com> (accessed October 29, 2013); c.f. Russell, "Life Sketch of Elder W. H. Littlejohn," 16; Joseph Bates, "District Labor in Mich.," *Review and Herald*, March 26, 1867, 183.

²⁵On March 2, 1867, W. H. Littlejohn told Joseph Bates "that he had not read a page in any book for the last ten years." See Bates, "District Labor in Mich.," 183.

²⁶Ellen G. White to James E. and Emma White, August 5, 1874, Letter 46a, 1874, CAR; c.f. 1880 U. S. Census, Allegan Co., Michigan, Wolcott [sic] Littlejohn; Russell, "Life Sketch of Elder W. H. Littlejohn," 16.

Allegan.²⁷ After about a year, Butler moved on to other ventures and the shop was left solely in the hands of Littlejohn. Apparently his limited vision did not seem to curtail his ability to manage the store.²⁸

Conversion and Early Career (1866-1873)

W. H. Littlejohn first became aware of the Seventh-day Sabbath in the early-mid 1850s, probably while he was in college. John Norton Loughborough and Merritt E. Cornell teamed up often during the early 1850s and Littlejohn attended some of their lectures in Michigan. Ever since that encounter, Wolcott could no longer simply accept a Sunday-Sabbath as he had always done—it must be tested and proved.²⁹ In the summer of 1855 Littlejohn began to receive the *Review* and research the claims of the Sabbatarian Adventists.³⁰ While Littlejohn had some interest in studying about the Sabbath in the early-mid 1850s, partial blindness likely slowed down this process considerably. When the Civil War broke out, Littlejohn's distraction apparently continued. By the spring of 1866 Wolcott renewed his subscription to the *Review*³¹ and began to keep the seventh-day Sabbath in June 1866.³²

²⁷This was the first shop of its kind within Allegan. See [Johnson], *History of Allegan and Barry Counties*, 170; "Death of Former Allegan Resident," 7.

²⁸C.f. James White, "Report from Bro. White," *Review and Herald*, April 30, 1867, 244.

²⁹Russell, "Life Sketch of Elder W. H. Littlejohn," 16.

³⁰"Receipts," *Review and Herald*, July 10, 1855, 8. It is unclear if Littlejohn began to receive any Adventist publications prior to this time.

³¹"Receipts: For Review and Herald," *Review and Herald*, April 17, 1866, 160.

³²There are two sources that confirm this date. First, W. H. Littlejohn wrote a reply letter to his uncle Elihu G. Hackley on July 16, 1866. Apparently, Littlejohn's uncle was concerned about his nephew accepting the Sabbath and leaving the Presbyterian Church. The letter itself indicates that Littlejohn received his uncle's letter "at a time when, led on by [a] solemn sense of duty, [he] had *first taken a step* which had brought [him] under the condemnation of many who had previously been [his] friends" (emphasis supplied). After making that comment Wolcott apologized for his delayed response. See W. H. Littlejohn, "Mementos, 1866-1891," 3, VT 000219, CAR. Secondly, an article in the *Review* states that between June 3 and July 7 (the first Sabbath in July), "one has embraced the Sabbath in this place [i.e. Allegan], since our last gathering [on June 2-3, 1866]." See P. Strong, "Meetings in Allegan," *Review and Herald*, July 31, 1866, 72; c.f. Joseph Bates, "The Allegan Monthly Meeting," *Review and Herald*, June 19, 1866, 24. Presumably this "one person" is Wolcott H. Littlejohn. Since the monthly meeting in Allegan occurred on the first Sabbath in July, Littlejohn would have had to keep his first seventh-day Sabbath in June.

Throughout the rest of 1866, Littlejohn continued to pour through Adventist literature³³ and soon became active within the Allegan Seventh-day Adventist Church.³⁴ Joseph Bates later introduced Wolcott to all Adventists through the *Review* on March 3, 1867.³⁵ About one year after his conversion, Littlejohn published his first article in the *Review*, which was a defense of the Sabbath that ran for eleven consecutive issues.³⁶ At this time Littlejohn was not even an official member of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Regardless, he had been actively writing and participating in the Adventist Church for almost a year before he was voted into membership on August 10, 1867.³⁷

On May 19, 1869, Wolcott was granted his first preaching license³⁸ and began to hold speaking engagements throughout the United States with numerous Adventist leaders, including Uriah Smith, Joseph Harvey Waggoner, James and Ellen White, John Nevins Andrews, Dudley Marvin Canright, and George Ide Butler.³⁹ On February 7, 1871, W. H. Littlejohn was elected to the General

³³“Books Sent By Mail,” *Review and Herald*, August 7, 1866, 80; “Books Sent By Mail,” *Review and Herald*, August 21, 1866, 96; “Books Sent By Express,” *Review and Herald*, December 11, 1866, 12.

³⁴W. H. Littlejohn appears within the Allegan SDA Church Record Book for the first time on January 5, 1867. See Seventh-day Adventist Church of Allegan, MI, “Record Book, 1861-1879,” 16, VT 000213, CAR.

³⁵Bates, “District Labor in Mich.,” 183.

³⁶[First issue of 11-part series] W. H. Littlejohn, “The Law of God and the Sabbath Which It Ordains,” *Review and Herald*, July 2, 1867, 36, 37.

³⁷Seventh-day Adventist Church of Allegan, MI, “Record Book, 1861-1879,” 25, 63.

³⁸Uriah Smith and William C. Gage, “Michigan State Conference: Ninth Annual Session,” *Review and Herald*, May 25, 1869, 173.

³⁹In relation to Uriah Smith, see James White, “Tent Meetings,” *Review and Herald*, June 8, 1869, 192; Michigan Conference Committee, “Appointment for July 4,” *Review and Herald*, June 22, 1869, 207; Uriah Smith, “Meeting in Orange, Mich.,” *Review and Herald*, June 22, 1869, 207. In relation to J. H. Waggoner, see J. H. Waggoner, “Dedication at Potterville, Eaton, Co.,” *Review and Herald*, January 18, 1870, 30; J. H. Waggoner, “Dedication,” *Review and Herald*, February 1, 1870, 48. In relation to James and Ellen White, see James White, “Western Tour,” *Review and Herald*, June 21, 1870, 5; James White, “Eastern Tour,” *Review and Herald*, October 4, 1870, 125. In relation to J. N. Andrews, see J. N. Andrews and W. H. Littlejohn, “Note from the N. Y. Tent,” *Review and Herald*, September 6, 1870, 96; J. N. Andrews and W. H. Littlejohn, “Meetings in Oneida, N. Y.,” *Review and Herald*, October 11, 1870, 132–133. In relation to D. M. Canright, see D. M. Canright, “Tuscola, Michigan,” *Review and Herald*, March 7, 1871, 94; D. M. Canright, “Peru, Iowa,” *Review and Herald*, March 21, 1871, 110. In relation to G. I. Butler, see George I. Butler, “The Iowa Camp-Meeting,” *Review and Herald*, June 25, 1872, 14; George I. Butler and L. McCoy, “Iowa and Nebraska Conference,” *Review and Herald*, June 25, 1872, 14.

Conference Executive Committee with James White and J. N. Andrews.⁴⁰ He was ordained three days later⁴¹ and continued to travel and preach while he filled that office.

A couple of years later, during the summer of 1873, Littlejohn published his first book. The 336-page manuscript, titled, *The Constitutional Amendment*, was essentially a compilation of articles that Littlejohn had written in response to the editor of the *Christian Statesman*.⁴² In a review of his book, Henry Ward Beecher's *Christian Union*, positively remarked that Littlejohn "argued with uncommon ability, and with great candor and good feeling, against the proposed religious amendment to the Constitution."⁴³ While the recommended amendment advocated for the names of God and Christ to appear in the Constitution, the Bible to be publicly regarded "as the fountain of national law," and suggested that the Bible be read in public schools, the political party most supportive of these changes also sought to establish "by law the observance of Sunday, as the Christian Sabbath."⁴⁴ Therefore, the primary purpose of Littlejohn's book was to defend religious liberty and the right of private judgment. Years later, this work was revised, expanded, and retitled as *The Coming Conflict* and published in the summer of 1883 with 400 pages.⁴⁵

Controversy and Conflict (1874-1877)

On November 17, 1873, the Seventh-day Adventist Church officially adopted a unique policy on leadership.⁴⁶ This policy was written by G. I. Butler and placed utmost ecclesiastical authority within the hands of one leader of the church.⁴⁷ Littlejohn was one of the first to object to this new policy and zealously fought against the newly endorsed Adventist position. He expressed his views of

⁴⁰James White and Uriah Smith, "Business Proceedings of the Ninth Annual Session of the General Conference of S. D. Adventists," *Review and Herald*, February 14, 1871, 68.

⁴¹Uriah Smith and I. D. Van Horn, "Michigan Conference of S. D. Adventists: Eleventh Annual Meeting," *Review and Herald*, February 14, 1871, 69.

⁴²"The Statesman Articles in Tract," *Review and Herald*, July 8, 1873, 32.

⁴³"[Note]," *Review and Herald*, October 14, 1873, 144.

⁴⁴W. H. Littlejohn, *The Constitutional Amendment: or, The Sunday, The Sabbath, The Change, and The Restitution: Discussion Between W. H. Littlejohn and the Editor of the Christian Statesman* (Battle Creek, MI: Steam Press, 1873), iii.

⁴⁵"The Coming Conflict," *Review and Herald*, August 14, 1883, 528; W. H. Littlejohn, *The Coming Conflict: Or the United States to Become a Persecuting Power. A Series of Papers on the Present Sunday Agitation* (Battle Creek, MI: Review and Herald, 1883).

⁴⁶George W. Amadon, Diary, entry November 17, 1873, Byington-Amadon Diaries (Collection 12), CAR.

⁴⁷George I. Butler, *Leadership* ([Battle Creek, MI: Review and Herald], 1873).

opposition to Ellen White on July 30, 1874, in a courteous manner.⁴⁸ However, by October his politeness ceased and he quickly grew rather caustic by spreading false reports about James White⁴⁹ and twisting statements made by Ellen White.⁵⁰

In November 1874, one year after Butler's position on leadership was adopted, Ellen White traveled to Allegan with Butler and his wife Lentha to discuss the subject with Littlejohn. The meeting took place on either the 21st or 22nd in the Allegan meetinghouse and did not go well.⁵¹ Littlejohn was unyielding in his views and accused Ellen White of trying to give her husband Moses-like authority.⁵²

Littlejohn received a testimony from Ellen White as a result of her January 3, 1875, vision, warning him against "one man" leadership. She stated, "The word of God will not justify this extreme independence. This is one man power indeed which would claim that everything must bend to this one mind, this one will."⁵³ Both Littlejohn and Butler were actually advocating "one man" leadership, but from two opposite extremes. While Butler essentially advocated that every man's judgment should be submitted to the one leader, Littlejohn proclaimed that the one leader should submit to the judgment of every man.⁵⁴

On June 19, 1875, Littlejohn stopped attending the Adventist Church⁵⁵ and blamed Ellen White for his decision.⁵⁶ Throughout the year of 1875, Adventist church leaders tried fervently to resolve the issue. As a result, a council (also called a trial, or investigation⁵⁷) was held in Battle Creek from August 4-11, 1875.⁵⁸ Interestingly, George W. Amadon gave these meetings the most grandiose name by referring to it as the "Celebrated Littlejohn Trial."⁵⁹ Eventually, as the trial

⁴⁸Ellen G. White to James E. and Emma White, Letter 46a, 1874. C.f. Littlejohn to Ellen G. White, October 26, 1874, 2.

⁴⁹Littlejohn to Ellen G. White, October 26, 1874, 2; Dudley M. Canright to James White, February 21, 1876, White Estate Received Correspondence File, EGWE-GC.

⁵⁰Ellen G. White to Brethren and Sisters in Allegan and Monterey, December 24, 1874, Letter 64, 1874, CAR.

⁵¹Ellen G. White to Lucinda Hall, November 23, 1874, Letter 76, 1874, CAR. C.f. Ellen G. White to Sister Steward, November 16, 1874, Letter 63a, 1874, CAR.

⁵²Ellen G. White to Brethren and Sisters in Allegan and Monterey, Letter 64, 1874.

⁵³Ellen G. White, "Testimony Concerning Brother Littlejohn," Battle Creek, MI, January 15, 1875, Manuscript 3, 1875, CAR.

⁵⁴C.f. Butler, *Leadership*; Littlejohn to Ellen G. White, October 26, 1874, 2.

⁵⁵Seventh-day Adventist Church of Allegan, MI, "Record Book, 1861-1879," 76, 86, 87.

⁵⁶Ellen G. White to William C. White, August 8, 1875, Letter 29, 1875, CAR.

⁵⁷Ellen G. White to William C. White, Letter 29, 1875.

⁵⁸C.f. Amadon, Diary, entry July 14, 1875.

⁵⁹Amadon, Diary, entry August 5, 1875.

ended, a vote was taken and all but Brothers “Littlejohn, [Donald] Warren and Charlie Russel [sic]” stood with the Whites.⁶⁰

By January 1876 things were reaching their breaking point in Allegan. On January 2, the Allegan congregation voted to remove Littlejohn’s bell from the meetinghouse, a decision that was upsetting to some of the members.⁶¹ To complicate the matter, Wolcott Littlejohn and Horatio Lay had been holding “rival meetings” in Allegan, causing much disturbance among the Adventist congregation.⁶² These events led to a breaking point and W. H. Littlejohn, Horatio S. Lay, and Donald Warren (along with some others) were disfellowshipped on January 27, 1876.⁶³ The next day, this schism within the Adventist church was broadcast as “State News” in the *Otsego Weekly Union*.⁶⁴

By May 1876, things started to change, as the Whites visited Littlejohn several times in Allegan.⁶⁵ This resulted in Littlejohn’s gradual change of heart, and favorable response toward the Adventist movement. As early as May 7, 1876, “it [was] surmised that Littlejohn would come back.”⁶⁶

Renewal and Restoration (1877-1882)

On September 28, 1877, the General Conference finally voted to rescind all aspects of Butler’s *Leadership* that referred to one man. Following the decision, James White made the motion to have W. H. Littlejohn restored to the church. Littlejohn, having experienced a turnaround, willingly agreed and the motion passed.⁶⁷ At the end of the conference Littlejohn told Ellen White that he was returning to Allegan to “work among those he [had] helped in darkness.”⁶⁸

⁶⁰Ellen G. White to William C. White, Letter 29, 1875.

⁶¹Seventh-day Adventist Church of Allegan, MI, “Record Book, 1861-1879,” 82.

⁶²Seventh-day Adventist Church of Allegan, MI, “Record Book, 1861-1879,” 76, 86, 87, 94; James White to William C. White, May 7, 1876, James S. White Correspondence, 2, CAR.

⁶³Seventh-day Adventist Church of Allegan, MI, “Record Book, 1861-1879,” 76, 86, 87, 94.

⁶⁴“State News,” *Otsego (MI) Weekly Union*, January 28, 1876, 4, Otsego Library Archive.

⁶⁵Ellen G. White to William C. White, July 20, 1875, Letter 25, 1875, CAR; Ellen G. White to James White, May 6, 1876, Letter 22, 1876, CAR; Amadon, Diary, entry July 14, 1876; James White to William C. White, July 15, 1876, James S. White Correspondence, 2, CAR.

⁶⁶James White to William C. White, May 7, 1876, James S. White Correspondence, 2, CAR.

⁶⁷James White and A. B. Oyen, “Sixteenth Annual Session of the General Conference of S. D. Adventists,” *Review and Herald*, October 4, 1877, 106.

⁶⁸Ellen G. White to James E. and Emma White, September 28, 1877, Letter 19, 1877, CAR.

The next Sabbath, on October 6, Littlejohn was restored to the church of Allegan. A week later, Littlejohn was again preaching in Allegan, trying to amend the damages he had caused. Throughout the next year, Littlejohn proved true to his word. Almost every Sabbath, from October 1877 to October 1878, Littlejohn preached and ministered somewhere in Michigan, particularly in Allegan County.⁶⁹ Confidence in Littlejohn was restored, and he was reordained on October 12, 1878.⁷⁰ For the next four years, until the end of 1882, Littlejohn continued to live in Allegan, Michigan, and devoted much of his time to writing, traveling, speaking, and working on the Tract and Missionary Society.

Family and Fulfillment (1883-1885)

On January 17, 1883, Littlejohn moved from Allegan, Michigan, to Battle Creek.⁷¹ On August 4, 1883, he married Adaline (Addie) Peck Harvey, nee Chamberlain. The service took place on a Sabbath because the couple wanted it to symbolically remind others of the two institutions God had given at creation—the Sabbath and marriage.⁷² In addition to becoming a husband, Littlejohn also became a father on August 4. While he never had biological children of his own, his bride had adopted a boy and a girl.⁷³ The girl, Lillian (Nellie) A. Joint, later became the wife

⁶⁹H. M. Kenyon, “Michigan,” *Review and Herald*, October 25, 1877, 134; M. S. Burnham, “Allegan County,” *Review and Herald*, November 29, 1877, 174; W. H. Littlejohn and M. S. Burnham, “Michigan: Labor Among the Churches,” *Review and Herald*, December 6, 1877, 182; W. H. Littlejohn, “Michigan,” *Review and Herald*, January 3, 1878, 6; “Michigan: Allegan County,” *Signs of the Times*, January 10, 1878, 13; Seventh-day Adventist Church of Monterey, MI, “Record Book, 1860-1880,” 131ff., CAR; Littlejohn to Ellen G. White, December 17, 1877; W. H. Littlejohn and M. S. Burnham, “Michigan: Labor Among the Churches,” *Review and Herald*, January 24, 1878, 30; W. H. Littlejohn and M. S. Burnham, “Michigan: Labor Among the Churches,” *Review and Herald*, January 31, 1878, 38; Littlejohn to Ellen G. White, January 22, 1878; W. H. Littlejohn and M. S. Burnham, “Michigan,” *Review and Herald*, February 21, 1878, 62; W. H. Littlejohn and M. S. Burnham, “Michigan: Labor Among the Churches,” *Review and Herald*, March 7, 1878, 78; W. H. Littlejohn and M. S. Burnham, “Michigan: Labor Among the Churches,” *Review and Herald*, May 16, 1878, 158; “Michigan: Labor Among the Churches,” *Signs of the Times*, May 23, 1878, 157; W. H. Littlejohn, “Dedication at Lakeview, Mich.,” *Review and Herald*, May 30, 1878, 173; W. H. Littlejohn, “Michigan: Allegan and Douglas,” *Review and Herald*, August 15, 1878, 62; “Michigan: Allegan and Douglas,” *Signs of the Times*, August 22, 1878, 253.

⁷⁰“The Conference,” *Review and Herald*, October 17, 1878, 124.

⁷¹W. H. Littlejohn, “Michigan: Douglas, Allegan Co.,” *Review and Herald*, January 30, 1883, 76; “Publishers’ Department: [Change of Address],” *Review and Herald*, January 30, 1883, 80.

⁷²“[Wedding Announcement],” *Review and Herald*, August 7, 1883, 512.

⁷³1880 U. S. Census, Calhoun County, Michigan, Town of Battle Creek, 60 [penned], A. P. Harvey; online: <http://www.ancestry.com> (accessed June 11, 2014).

of Ellery Channing Waggoner. Since Nellie was about 21 years old at the time of the wedding, she probably never considered Littlejohn to be a father figure. The boy (Frederick H. Harvey⁷⁴) however was only three-and-a-half years old in August 1883 and W. H. Littlejohn was the only father he ever knew. Frederick remained unmarried until his death in April 1963.

Littlejohn moved to Battle Creek to fill the roles of pastor and editor and later, much to his surprise, president. He had previously been a minister in District No. 4 and operated from his home in Allegan, Michigan, but in mid-January 1883 the General Conference Committee agreed to transfer him to District No. 3 to fill the place made vacant by J. O. Corliss. Since Battle Creek held the largest congregation in the district (497 members in early 1883⁷⁵) it was expected that Littlejohn fill the role of pastor by having “special oversight of that church.”⁷⁶

Upon his arrival in Battle Creek, Littlejohn also joined the editorial staff of the *Review and Herald* and signed his editorials “W. H. L.”⁷⁷ In addition to writing editorials, Littlejohn had “the entire charge of the Commentary Department”⁷⁸ and answered some 274 theological questions in the *Review* from February 20, 1883, to May 26, 1885.⁷⁹ Littlejohn also helped to establish and manage the “Ministers’ Department” in the *Review*⁸⁰ and regularly contributed articles to this section of the paper. In addition to his editorial work for the *Review*, Littlejohn served on the Central Committee for the *Bible-Reading Gazette* in 1884⁸¹ and was on the Editorial Committee for the *Gospel Sickle* between February 1886 and February 1887.⁸²

It is during this period that Littlejohn wrote his longest article, which is probably the longest single article ever printed in an Adventist periodical. It was

⁷⁴The identity of Fred Harvey’s parents is currently unknown. Adaline Chamberlain married James Harvey on April 18, 1876. However, Harvey died less than one year later on March 5, 1877. See S. H. Lane, “Obituary Notices: [Harvey],” *Review and Herald*, March 15, 1877, 87. Since Fred Harvey was born on February 5, 1880, James Harvey could not have been his biological father. It is possible that he took the name Harvey when he was adopted since Adaline retained the Harvey surname after her first husband’s death.

⁷⁵W. H. L., “The Battle Creek Church and Advisory Committee,” *Review and Herald*, April 17, 1883, 249.

⁷⁶J. Fargo and E. H. Root, “Change of Laborers in Michigan,” *Review and Herald*, January 30, 1883, 80.

⁷⁷“[Note],” *Review and Herald*, February 13, 1883, 112.

⁷⁸“Honor to Whom Honor,” *Review and Herald*, December 18, 1883, 798.

⁷⁹C.f. “To the Reader,” *Review and Herald*, January 19, 1886, 43.

⁸⁰W. H. L. “Ministers’ Department,” *Review and Herald*, April 10, 1883, 235. This new section first appeared in the *Review* on May 8, 1883.

⁸¹See the masthead of this monthly paper from January 1884 to December 1884.

⁸²See the masthead of this biweekly paper.

titled, "The Temple in Heaven," and ran for an entire year in the *Review*, from July 1884 to July 1885.⁸³ This article is written in conversation style, analogous with John Bunyan's *Life and Death of Mr. Badman*, and highlights the wisdom of Mr. Biblicist as he communicates with his interlocutor, Mr. Thoughtful. Surprisingly this immense article was never published in book form, or if it was, no copy is known to exist today.

A second notable article appeared during these years. D. M. Canright wrote the first church manual for the Seventh-day Adventist Church. However, this project was later revised by Littlejohn so much that it was published as a new work under his name.⁸⁴ The first printed "Church Manual" appeared in 18-parts of the *Review*⁸⁵ and was later rejected by Adventists because a church manual seemed to be too creedal.⁸⁶

Shortly after moving to Battle Creek, Littlejohn began working with the Battle Creek College Board of Trustees.⁸⁷ The college had closed down in the fall of 1882 and Littlejohn firmly believed that the school needed to reopen,⁸⁸ but did not expect to serve as president. Due to his strong convictions, Littlejohn reluctantly gave "his consent to the Board of Trustees to take a position of responsibility in the management of the College" in the summer of 1883.⁸⁹ In mid-August it was announced that Battle Creek College would reopen on September 5, 1883, and W. H. Littlejohn would serve as its third president.⁹⁰ Littlejohn held that position for two years until he tendered his resignation in the summer 1885.⁹¹

⁸³[First issue of 46-part series] W. H. Littlejohn, "The Temple in Heaven: An Imaginary Conversation on a Very Important Theme," *Review and Herald*, July 22, 1884, 466, 467.

⁸⁴W. H. Littlejohn, "Explanation," *Review and Herald*, June 5, 1883, 368.

⁸⁵First issue: [W. H. Littlejohn], "The S. D. A. Church Manual," *Review and Herald*, June 5, 1883, 361, 362.

⁸⁶G. I. Butler and A. B. Oyen, "General Conference Proceedings: Twenty-second Annual Session," *Review and Herald*, November 20, 1883, 732, 733; G. I. Butler, "No Church Manual," *Review and Herald*, November 27, 1883, 745, 746.

⁸⁷For more information, see Vande Vere, *The Wisdom Seekers*, 48-52.

⁸⁸Littlejohn to Ellen G. White, April 22, 1883.

⁸⁹George I. Butler, "A Point of Interest to the Friends of the College," *Review and Herald*, July 31, 1883, 496.

⁹⁰"[Note]," *Review and Herald*, August 21, 1883, 544.

⁹¹G. I. Butler, "The Battle Creek College," *Review and Herald*, July 28, 1885, 472. C.f. Littlejohn to Ellen G. White, June 19, 1885.

Discouraged and Withdrawn (1886-1890)

For reasons that are not clear, Littlejohn essentially left the work entirely in the summer of 1885. While he did serve on the Editorial Committee for the *Gospel Sickle* in 1886, he did not hold many speaking engagements until 1891 and he also ceased writing for a while. Only one known article was written between mid-July 1885 and mid-October 1891.⁹² In late 1885 or early 1886, the Littlejohns moved from the city of Battle Creek and purchased “a little place near B. C. and built a house thereon.” By living 1.25 miles away from the *Review* Office, Littlejohn was able to maintain a more private life, which he enjoyed much.⁹³ During the fall of 1889 Littlejohn again sold his home⁹⁴ and moved his family in early 1890 “to a farm in the vicinity of Battle Creek.” This placed Littlejohn even further away from the Office and within a new community that was intelligent, but not very religious. Throughout much of 1890, Littlejohn spent most of his time “building a house and fitting up a quiet home.”⁹⁵

By the late 1880’s, Ellen White was attempting to bring Littlejohn back into the work. She wrote, “We very much desire the help of Elder Littlejohn. God has not released him from the work.”⁹⁶ By the early 1890’s, White increased her efforts, by appealing to Seventh-day Adventists at the 1891 General Conference session to rally around Littlejohn and help bring him back into the work of God. Her comments may shed light on reasons why Littlejohn had left the work in the summer of 1885. Ellen White mentioned that Littlejohn’s “talent of intellect is of value” and that Adventists could “help him by showing that they appreciate his ability.” She continued, “If you show that you place little value on his time and labor, you cut him away from the work and discourage him from engaging in active service. This will be a loss to him and to the cause of God.”⁹⁷

⁹²W. H. Littlejohn, “A Sinner in the City,” *Review and Herald*, August 16, 1887, 522.

⁹³Littlejohn to Ellen G. White, August 16, 1886.

⁹⁴See Ellen White, Diary, entry for November 3, 1889, Manuscript 23, 1889, CAR; c.f. “Business Notices,” *Review and Herald*, July 16, 1889, 463; “Business Notices,” *Review and Herald*, July 22, 1889, 463.

⁹⁵W. H. Littlejohn, “Michigan,” *Review and Herald*, May 26, 1891, 331.

⁹⁶Ellen G. White, “Religious Liberty,” n.p., n.d., Manuscript 18, 1888, CAR.

⁹⁷Ellen G. White, An Article Read at the General Conference, Battle Creek, MI, March 1890, Manuscript 30, 1890, CAR. Though this manuscript bears the date 1890, it should be noted that there was no General Conference Session held in 1890. That this manuscript was read at the 1891 General Conference in Battle Creek is suggested based upon the following points. First, it is believed that Ellen White wrote the message, “An Article Read at the General Conference, Battle Creek, MI, 1890” on the manuscript (c.f. Tim Poirier, e-mail message to author, November 17, 2014). Since this statement was evidently added at a later date, it seems most likely that Ellen remembered the event, but not the year.

In addition to feeling discouraged and underappreciated, some in Battle Creek had also accused him of being “sharp in money matters.” Some apparently felt that Littlejohn was paid too much for his labors⁹⁸ even though he was actually “running behind about ten dollars per week.”⁹⁹ This led them to be “sharp” with Littlejohn and place “stumbling blocks in his way” because they “thought that he was demanding too much.” Ellen White did not approve of this manner of treatment and stated, “Those who have criticised so freely must remember that Eld. Littlejohn is a blind man.”¹⁰⁰

Reappearance and Contention (1891-1906)

Ellen White’s discourse at the 1891 General Conference gave Littlejohn the encouragement he needed to get back into the work. In May 1891, about two months after White’s address at the General Conference, Littlejohn placed a brief note in the *Review* that offered a very short explanation as to where he had been and what he had been doing recently. In this note, Littlejohn stated that in his new irreligious community there was a schoolhouse adjoining his farm and that he had preached the word “occasionally of late.”¹⁰¹ Shortly after this, more speaking appointments began appearing in the *Review*.¹⁰²

Littlejohn returned to his writing with vigor but two of his publications written between 1891 and 1906 caused some contention. The first was a two-part article published in the *Review* in April 1894, titled, “Danger in Adopting Extreme Views.” In this article Littlejohn gave examples of several people throughout history that had adopted “extreme views” in connection with God’s work. He started with some of the Apostles, then mentioned the extremes of Martin Luther (particularly in his debate with Zwingli), and also gave several cases within early

Second, the document refers to the General Conference held in Minneapolis in 1888. Ellen White stated that this event took place “some years” ago. If Ellen wished to refer to the 1888 meetings at the 1889 General Conference, she would have likely said, “last year” or “one year since,” instead of “some years” since. Since Ellen White left for Australia in 1891, it is probable that she gave this address in March 1891 at the General Conference in Battle Creek before her journey. This suggestion is further supported by the fact that Littlejohn did become more involved in the work after this appeal was made.

⁹⁸Ellen G. White, Manuscript 30, 1890.

⁹⁹Littlejohn to Ellen G. White, August 16, 1886.

¹⁰⁰Ellen G. White, Manuscript 30, 1890.

¹⁰¹Littlejohn, “Michigan,” May 26, 1891, 331.

¹⁰²“Appointments,” *Review and Herald*, July 7, 1891, 431; “Appointments,” *Review and Herald*, August 4, 1891, 495.

Adventism.¹⁰³ Ellen White learned about these articles in the early summer and was quite displeased.¹⁰⁴ She wrote a long letter to Littlejohn on June 3 explaining, “You have undertaken to point out the defects of Reformers and pioneers in the cause of God. No one should trace the lines which you have done. You have made public the errors and defects of the people of God, and in so doing have dishonored God and Jesus Christ.”¹⁰⁵

A second problem arose shortly after Littlejohn self-published his third book, *Life Only in Christ*, in February 1894.¹⁰⁶ While this monograph was well received by non-Adventists, including distinguished scholars such as William W. McLane,¹⁰⁷ it did provoke controversy in the Adventist Church in a surprising way. According to Littlejohn, Archibald R. Henry had influenced the General Conference Association to issue a statement that required all self-published works to be approved by a committee before they could be advertised in any Adventist periodical. In Littlejohn’s estimation, his book had prompted Henry to get such a resolution passed and he was personally offended. In a letter to Ellen White, Littlejohn compared such actions to the Catholic Church and the Pope’s *Imprimatur* on sanctioned writings.¹⁰⁸

Ellen White responded, with much kindness, on August 3, 1894. While Ellen White did not necessarily approve of the recent action of the General Conference Association, she also offered a more balanced view of the current situation. There were other Adventists who believed that they were called to write and were publishing all kinds of material that diverted “the minds of men away from present truth.” As a result, it was necessary that certain protocols be in place to

¹⁰³W. H. Littlejohn, “Danger in Adopting Extreme Views,” *Review and Herald*, April 3, 1894, 210, 211; W. H. Littlejohn, “Danger in Adopting Extreme Views,” *Review and Herald*, April 10, 1894, 227, 228.

¹⁰⁴Ellen G. White to Dear Brethren in the Seventh-day Adventist Faith, Granville, NSW, Australia, June 7, 1894, Manuscript 27, 1894, CAR.

¹⁰⁵Ellen G. White to Wolcott H. Littlejohn, June 3, 1894, Letter 48, 1894, CAR.

¹⁰⁶This series began on October 17, 1893 (W. H. Littlejohn, “Immortality Not a Birthright, but a Gift from God,” *Review and Herald*, October 17, 1893, 647) and ended on January 9, 1894. This series was only stopped because of its length and the readers of the *Review* were referred to the book (*Life Only in Christ*) if they wished to continue reading. See W. H. Littlejohn, “Explanation,” *Review and Herald*, January 9, 1894, 32; W. H. Littlejohn, “Life Only in Christ,” *Review and Herald*, January 23, 1894, 62; “Literary Notice: Life Only in Christ,” *Review and Herald*, February 20, 1894, 128.

¹⁰⁷“Business Notices,” *Review and Herald*, March 13, 1894, 175; “Conditional Immortality,” *Review and Herald*, December 19, 1893, 794; “Conditional Immortality,” *Review and Herald*, April 3, 1894, 224; “[Note],” *Review and Herald*, May 1, 1894, 288. C.f. “Trade Books,” *Review and Herald*, May 6, 1902, 2; Littlejohn to Ellen G. White, June 10, 1894.

¹⁰⁸Littlejohn to Ellen G. White, June 10, 1894.

guard against extreme ideas. White appealed to Littlejohn to wait patiently and put his trust in God. Furthermore she admitted, “It is right that I should speak to them [i.e. the General Conference Association]” about this matter.¹⁰⁹

Retirement and Cessation (1907-1916)

Littlejohn continued to write numerous articles, tracts, and books until 1906.¹¹⁰ In 1907, Wolcott Littlejohn, at the age of 73, was ready for retirement. During his “declining years” Littlejohn was relatively inactive and was cared for by his wife and adopted son, who did “everything that warm hearts and loving hands could do to lighten the burden of advancing years.” On November 4, 1916, Wolcott Hackley Littlejohn passed away at his home in Level Park near Battle Creek at the age of 82 years, 5 months, and 8 days.¹¹¹ According to the Battle Creek newspapers, Littlejohn died suddenly from an “attack of heart failure” at 5pm.¹¹² However, the attending physician, Theodore Kolwood, stated that Littlejohn passed away from Chronic Bright’s Disease (known today as chronic nephritis, or kidney disease) at 4pm.¹¹³

Two funeral services were held for W. H. Littlejohn. The first service was held in Level Park on the morning of November 7 at the Littlejohn home. This “notable funeral service” was conducted by Elders Russell A. Hart and Lycurgus McCoy. Once this service was concluded, the body was taken to the Oakwood

¹⁰⁹Ellen G. White to Wolcott H. Littlejohn, August 3, 1894, Letter 49, 1894, CAR. Ellen White apparently did bring this issue before the General Conference Association. In a letter to O. A. Olsen (the current GC President) she stated, “The case of Eld. Littlejohn has been strangely mismanaged. He has appealed to me to set things right, but I have done nothing about it; it was not the time. Your counsel in the treatment of him was all wrong. It bears the signature of the adversary of souls.” See Ellen G. White to O. A. Olsen, June 10, 1895, Letter 65, 1895, CAR.

¹¹⁰I have not been able to locate any publications after 1906, with the possible exception of one undated tract. See W. H. Littlejohn, *Departing and Being with Christ: Or the Apostle Paul’s Desire to Be Translated* ([Battle Creek, MI]: W. H. Littlejohn, ca. 1906). After this tract was published, it also appeared as an article in the *Signs of the Times* in 1912. [First issue of 3-part series] See W. H. Littlejohn, “Departing and Being with Christ, Or Apostle Paul’s Desire to Be Translated,” *Signs of the Times*, October 1, 1912, 600, 601.

¹¹¹Russell, “Life Sketch of Elder W. H. Littlejohn,” 16.

¹¹²“Elder W. H. Littlejohn Dies Suddenly, Age 82: Former President of Old Battle Creek College and Active Adventist Succumbs to Attack of Heart Failure,” *Battle Creek (MI) Enquirer*, November 5, 1916, 1, Willard Library Newspaper Collection, Battle Creek, MI; “Elder Wilcott [sic] H. Littlejohn,” *Battle Creek (MI) Evening News*, November 6, 1916, 14, Willard Library Newspaper Collection, Battle Creek, MI.

¹¹³Calhoun County, Michigan, “Certificate of Death,” online: <http://seekingmichigan.org> (accessed June 15, 2014), courtesy of the Library of Michigan.

Cemetery in Allegan that afternoon for burial and Clifford A. Russell conducted another short service.¹¹⁴

Conclusion

Littlejohn, typically an active leader within the Adventist Church, was particularly influential through his writing. Nevertheless, there were two major writing-gaps in his life. He wrote steadily from July 1867 to June 1873. The summer of 1873 marked Littlejohn's deteriorating eyesight and his involvement in the leadership controversy. These events pronounced the first gap, which lasted from July 1873 to November 1877. Littlejohn again wrote steadily from November 1877 to July 1885. The second writing-gap began in August 1885 and continued until October 1891, with only one known new article published in 1887.¹¹⁵ Beginning again in October 1891 Littlejohn published material fairly regularly until the end of 1906, yet began slowing down in 1896. From 1907 to his death in 1916, only one article has been located, but this article had been previously published as a tract, probably in 1906.¹¹⁶

Of his 18 known published tracts, five must be briefly mentioned. The first three are important because they were later added to the *Bible Student's Library*, which was a series of Adventist tracts intended for distribution among the general public. First, *The Seventh Part of Time*;¹¹⁷ second, *The Rich Man and Lazarus*;¹¹⁸ and, third, *The Sabbath in Prophecy: Seven Inspired Predictions of a Sabbath Reform Movement to Take Place in Our Day*.¹¹⁹ While most of these tracts can be accessed at the Center

¹¹⁴Russell, "Life Sketch of Elder W. H. Littlejohn," 16; "Death of Former Allegan Resident," 7.

¹¹⁵Littlejohn, "A Sinner in the City," 522.

¹¹⁶See fn. 110.

¹¹⁷Originally a sermon given on June 18, 1869, and published as a tract in December 1869. See "Book and Tract Department," *Review and Herald*, December 14, 1869, 197; W. H. Littlejohn, *The Seventh Part of Time: A Sermon on the Sabbath Question, Delivered at Orange, Mich., June 18, 1869* ([Battle Creek, MI: Review and Herald, 1869]); W. H. Littlejohn, *The Seventh Part of Time*, Bible Student's Library, no. 21 (Oakland, CA: Pacific Press, May 21, 1889).

¹¹⁸Originally published as a 3-part series in the *Review*. See [first issue] W. H. Littlejohn, "The Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus," *Review and Herald*, November 1, 1877, 137, 138. First published as a tract in the *Bible Student's Library* in January or February 1897. International Tract Society, "The Rich Man and Lazarus," *Review and Herald*, February 16, 1897, 110.

¹¹⁹Originally published as a 6-part series in the *Review* and later published as a tract. See [first issue] Wolcott H. Littlejohn, "The Sabbath in Prophecy, or a Sabbath Movement to Take Place in the Last Days," *Review and Herald*, October 25, 1892, 659, 660; Wolcott H. Littlejohn, *The Sabbath in Prophecy: Seven Inspired Predictions of a Sabbath Reform Movement to*

for Adventist Research, two of Littlejohn's pamphlets are currently missing. The title of one is *Jonah and the Sea Monster*¹²⁰ and the title of the other is *Who Changed the Sabbath?*¹²¹

Most of Littlejohn's writings can be classified within the following categories: Apologetic,¹²² Sabbath/Sunday,¹²³ Prophecy/Apocalyptic,¹²⁴ Religious Liberty,¹²⁵ Ecclesiological/Church Order,¹²⁶ Biblical/Theological,¹²⁷ and Health/Health

Take Place in Our Day, Bible Student's Library, no. 148 (Oakland, CA: Pacific Press, January 1897), 31pp.

¹²⁰"Book Notices: Jonah and the Sea Monster," *Signs of the Times*, January 10, 1906, 31.

¹²¹See "Timely Publications" in Littlejohn, *Departing and Being with Christ*, [18].

¹²²See, e.g., W. H. Littlejohn, "The Pocasset Outrage," *Review and Herald*, June 5, 1879, 180, 181; [first issue of 5-part series] W. H. L., "A Sceptic's Queries," *Review and Herald*, March 20, 1883, 185, 186; W. H. L., "An Objection to the Testimonies Answered," *Review and Herald*, 264, 266.

¹²³See, e.g., W. H. Littlejohn, "The Seventh-Part-of-Time Theory," *Review and Herald*, August 25, 1868, 145–146; [first issue of 3-part series] W. H. Littlejohn, "The Two Hemispheres and the Sabbath—No. 1," *Review and Herald*, October 31, 1878, 138; [first issue of 3-part series] W. H. Littlejohn, "The Rich Man and the Beggar That Was Laid at His Gate," *Review and Herald*, April 19, 1892, 243, 244.

¹²⁴See, e.g., [first issue of 3-part series] W. H. Littlejohn, "The Prophetic Scar," *Review and Herald*, December 1, 1891, 738, 739; [first issue of 4-part series] W. H. Littlejohn, "The Temporal Millennium," *Review and Herald*, December 18, 1894, 787; [first issue of 11-part series] W. H. Littlejohn, "The Age-to-Come: Or, the Eleventh Chapter of Romans and the Bearing of the Same upon That Theory," *Review and Herald*, February 12, 1895, 98.

¹²⁵See, e.g., [first issue of 11-part series] W. H. Littlejohn, "The Statesman Articles," *Review and Herald*, March 18, 1873, 105, 106; [first issue of 5-part series] W. H. Littlejohn, "Whither is Our Nation Drifting?: Christians in the Chain-gang for Conscience' Sake," *Review and Herald*, June 6, 355, 356; W. H. Littlejohn, "A Defect in the Constitution: Religious Liberty not Secure in this County," *Review and Herald*, April 17, 1894, 242, 243.

¹²⁶See, e.g., [first issue of 3-part series] W. H. Littlejohn, "The Rejected Ordinance," *Review and Herald*, June 13, 1878, 185, 186; [first issue of a 2-part series] W. H. Littlejohn, "The Order to Be Pursued in the Administration of the Ordinances," *Review and Herald*, January 9, 1879, 9, 10; [first issue of 2-part series] W. H. Littlejohn, "Seventh-day Adventists and Seventh-Day Baptists: A Reply," *Review and Herald*, November 4, 1880, 296-298.

¹²⁷See, e.g., [first issue of 3-part series] W. H. Littlejohn, "The Two Covenants," *Review and Herald*, January 3, 1882, 4, 5; [first issue of 4-part series] W. H. Littlejohn, "When Did Christ Rise from the Dead ; On Saturday or Sunday?," *Review and Herald*, February 13, 1883, 98-101; [first issue of 5-part issue] Wolcott H. Littlejohn, "Justification By Faith, or Infidel Objections to God's Plan for Saving Men, Considered," *Review and Herald*, July 5, 1892, 419, 420.

Reform.¹²⁸ Nearly all of Littlejohn's works are apologetic in nature, as a defense either for the Adventist Church, the Seventh-day Sabbath, Religious Liberty, or a particular doctrine. Throughout these articles, Littlejohn presented his topic in a "pleasing style" with careful and well-crafted argumentation.¹²⁹ As a result, Adventists enjoyed reading his essays and were often eagerly awaiting more from his pen.

Through his writing, preaching, and leadership, Wolcott Hackley Littlejohn impacted the church in a powerful way and considered himself to be a defender of the faith. As he aged he grew increasingly anxious, especially after being blind for 60 years, to finally see the face of God. His last known work may have been inspired by his own eager desire for the Second Coming of Jesus. This tract, titled, "Departing and Being with Christ, or Apostle Paul's Desire to Be Translated,"¹³⁰ was about a man who was also once blind and longed to see his Savior coming in the clouds of glory. Like Paul, Littlejohn did not live to see that Day, yet he never gave up hope. Now, as his good friend Clifford A. Russell lovingly wrote, "he sleeps, awaiting the call of the Life-giver."¹³¹

¹²⁸See, e.g., Littlejohn, "Benefits Received," *Health Reformer*, March 1871, 186, 187; W. H. Littlejohn, "What We Hazard in Eating Flesh-meats," *Health Reformer*, May 1871, 249, 250; W. H. Littlejohn, "The Reform Dress," *Health Reformer*, February 1872, 54-56.

¹²⁹"[Note]," *Review and Herald*, July 2, 1867, 44.

¹³⁰See fn. 110.

¹³¹Russell, "Life Sketch of Elder W. H. Littlejohn," 16.

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY SEMINARY STUDENT JOURNAL

The Journal of the Doctoral Student Club
of the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary of Andrews University
4145 East Campus Circle Drive, Berrien Springs, Michigan 49104-1550, U.S.A.

Editor: Adriani M. Rodrigues
Associate Editor: Denis Kaiser
Managing Editor: Jerome Skinner
Associate Managing Editor: Arlyn S. Drew

Executive Board: Jiri Moskala, Dean of the Seminary; Christon Arthur, Dean of the School of Graduate Studies & Research; Tom Shepherd, Director of the PhD in Religion and ThD Programs; Denis Kaiser, President of the Doctoral Student Club; Adriani M. Rodrigues, Editor of AUSSJ; John Reeve, Editor of AUSS; Jo Ann Davidson; Roy Gane; Wagner Kuhn; Terry Robertson.

Communications: E-Mail: adriani@andrews.edu
Web: <http://www.andrews.edu/openjournal>

The *Andrews University Seminary Student Journal (AUSSJ)*, established in 2014, is an online, open access, multi-disciplinary, peer-reviewed journal that is led, edited, and reviewed by a team of doctoral students and faculty members of the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary at Andrews University. The purpose of the journal is to disseminate scholarly contributions of graduate students. Submissions may be made in the area of Systematic Theology, Philosophy, Ethics, Hebrew Bible, Jewish Studies, New Testament, Archaeology and Ancient Near Eastern Studies, Church History, Applied Theology, Mission, and Religious Education.

The opinions expressed in articles, book reviews, etc., are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the editors or of the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary.

GUIDELINES FOR AUTHORS AND REVIEWERS

AUSSJ publishes research articles and brief notes on the following topics: Systematic Theology, Philosophy, Ethics, Hebrew Bible, Jewish Studies, New Testament, Archaeology and Ancient Near Eastern Studies, Church History, Applied Theology, Mission, and Religious Education.

The focus of the journal, as that of the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, where *AUSSJ* is based, is biblical. A high regard for Scripture, along with elevated standards of research, characterizes the choice of articles. *AUSSJ* accepts articles written by authors of different faith persuasions, as long as this focus is taken into account.

AUSSJ is a refereed journal. Thus each article is read by two scholars who are competent in the area treated in the article. *AUSSJ* editors refer helpful referee comments to the author to facilitate the process of any necessary rewriting. After revising the manuscript, the author may resubmit the article. Revised manuscripts should be accompanied by a cover letter detailing the changes requested and the action taken (or the author's argument for retaining the original text). To maintain objectivity, the author's name is deleted from the manuscript copies sent to the referee, and the referees' names are deleted from any comments furnished to the author. A final decision on whether or not the article will be published in *AUSSJ* is made by the editors.

AUSSJ accepts articles written in English. Articles submitted to *AUSSJ* must conform to acceptable English language standards. American spelling and punctuation will be used in editing. Authors are asked to use inclusive gender language, such as "humanity" rather than "mankind," "person" or "human being" rather than "man."

For general style matters, *AUSSJ* uses Kate L. Turabian, *A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses, and Dissertations*, 7th ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), and subsequent editions. Scholarly abbreviations and biblical issues not covered in Turabian follow *The SBL Handbook of Style for Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies* (Patrick H. Alexander et al [Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999]). For spelling, authors may refer to *Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language Unabridged* (Springfield, MA: G. and C. Merriam, 1986).

AUSSJ prefers articles of 10-25 pages, including footnotes. The main text is to be double-spaced (single space for footnotes and indented quotations). Longer articles may occasionally be accepted, if they are particularly significant and space is available in the journal (it is recommended that authors query the editor for such articles). When the editors deem that an article needs to be substantially shortened, they will return the manuscript to the author with instructions regarding the areas needing attention.

AUSSJ reserves the right to make necessary modifications to articles that have been submitted in order to comply with the journal's content and style. Authors of articles edited for publication will receive a set of first page proofs. Authors will carefully review the article, compare it to the original draft, note any corrections on the manuscript, and provide a cover letter detailing the changes and corrections made. *AUSSJ* asks that articles be reviewed in a prompt and timely manner.

Articles may be submitted through the *AUSSJ* website or alternatively by email (see the editor's email). *AUSSJ* will accept articles prepared in Microsoft Word.

Manuscripts should be double-spaced (single space for footnotes and indented quotations), have one-inch margins, and be left-justified. Excessive formatting should be avoided, with only block quotations, tables, figures, headings, and subheadings included. Tabs, rather than single spacing or first-line indentation should be used. Tables should be formed using standardized table templates provided in the author's word-processing software. The motto for formatting is, Keep it simple!

Quotations longer than five lines are to be indented and double-spaced. Spelling, capitalization, punctuation, and abbreviations must be reproduced exactly as in the original and care should be taken to preserve the original author's intent.

All biblical, classical, and patristic literature, Dead Sea Scrolls and related texts, Targumic material, Mishnaic and Rabbinic literature, Nag Hammadi Tractates, and journals, periodicals, and major reference works should follow the *SBL Handbook of Style* 8.2–8.4. For biblical references, no period is used following the abbreviations; a colon is used between chapter and verse. Biblical references should be placed in parentheses in the text of the article, rather than in footnotes (see *SBL Handbook of Style*). Citations of classical and patristic literature should follow the *SBL Handbook of Style*. The following abbreviations should be used in parenthetical or footnote references. The terms should be spelled out when they occur in the text.

Abbreviation

chap(s).	chapter(s)
col(s).	column(s)
frg(s).	fragment(s)
n(n).	note(s)
pl(s).	plate(s)
v(v).	verse(s)

See *SBL Handbook of Style* 7.1–7.4. Page numbers included in footnotes should be all-inclusive, e.g., 110-111, 234-239 rather than 110-11 or 234-39. When a note of comment includes a bibliographic reference, this reference should be set in parentheses at the end of the comment. For instance: “But C. C. Torrey thinks that the name Cyrus has been interpolated in Isa 45:1” (“The Messiah Son of Ephraim,” *JBL* [1947]: 253).

Greek and Hebrew fonts are generally preferred rather than transliteration. Transliteration should be used primarily for ancient nonbiblical languages. Due to the problem of font compatibility, *AUSSJ* accepts only BibleWorks or SBL fonts. SBL provides free downloadable fonts at its website: <http://www.sbl-site.org/e-resources.html>. BibleWorks may be purchased from <http://www.bibleworks.com>. Before submitting Greek and Hebrew in other fonts or transliteration, please query the editor for directions.