

Adventist Colleges Under Siege
Kenneth Wood on the State of the Church
A Lawyer's Perspective on Adventism

SPECTRUM

A Quarterly Journal of the Association of Adventist Forums

Volume 13, No. 2

WAYS TO READ THE BIBLE

Trajectories of Adventist Old Testament Studies
The Bible as Visionary Power
Four New Testament Versions of One Parable
An Historical Critical Look at Genesis One

SPECTRUM

Editor

Roy Branson

Associate Editor

Charles Scriven

Senior Editor

Tom Dybdahl

News Editor

Bonnie Dwyer

Manuscript Editor

Gene Daffern

Book Review Editors

Peggy Corbett

Rennie Schoepflin

Editorial Board

Roy Branson
Ethics, Kennedy Institute
Georgetown University

Molleurus Couperus
Physician
Angwin, California

Gene Daffern
Physician
Washington, D.C.

Bonnie Dwyer
Journalism
Loma Linda, California

Tom Dybdahl
Editor
Allentown, Pennsylvania

Alvin L. Kwiram
Chemistry
University of Washington

Gary Land
History
Andrews University

Rennie Schoepflin
History
University of Wisconsin

Charles Scriven
Theology
Walla Walla College

Otilie Stafford
English
Atlantic Union College

Consulting Editors

Earl W. Amundson
President
Atlantic Union Conference

Eric Anderson
History
Pacific Union College

Roy Benton
Mathematics
Columbia Union College

Geri Fuller
Public Relations
Washington, D.C.

Raymond Cottrell
Theology
Loma Linda, California

Lawrence Geraty
Old Testament
SDA Theological Seminary

Fritz Guy
Theology
SDA Theological Seminary

F.E.J. Harder
Educational Administration
College Place, Washington

Jorgen Henriksen
Artist
Boston, Massachusetts

Edward Lugenbeal
Anthropology
Berrien Springs, Michigan

Margaret McFarland
Attorney
Washington, D.C.

LaVonne Neff
Publishing
Downers Grove, Illinois

Ronald Numbers
History of Medicine
University of Wisconsin

Gary Patterson
President
Georgia-Cumberland Conference

Edward E. Robinson
Attorney
Chicago, Illinois

Gerhard Svrcek-Seiler
Psychiatrist
Vienna, Austria

Carolyn Stevens
English
Walla Walla College

Helen Ward Thompson
Administration
Walla Walla College

L. E. Trüder
Education
Marienhohe Gymnasium
West Germany

Louis Venden
Pastor
Loma Linda University Church

Association of Adventist Forums

Executive Committee

President
Glenn E. Coe
State's Attorney
West Hartford, Connecticut

Vice President
Lyndrey A. Niles
Communications
Howard University, Washington, D.C.

Executive Secretary
Claire Hosten
Attorney
Washington, D.C.

Treasurer
Richard C. Osborn
Principal
Takoma Academy
Takoma Park, Maryland

Directors

Of International Relations
Molleurus Couperus
Physician
Angwin, California

Of Membership
Ronald D. Cople
Business
Silver Spring, Maryland

Staff

Secretary
Vinette Anderson
Takoma Park, Maryland

Legal Consultant
Bradley Litchfield
Attorney
Washington, D.C.

Systems Manager
Don McNeil
Computer Programmer
Spencerville, Maryland

Regional Representatives

Atlantic
Richard B. Lewis, Jr.
Advertising
Boston, Massachusetts

Central
Darrell J. Huenergardt
Attorney
Kimball, Nebraska

Central Pacific
Guy D. Cochran
Dental Surgeon
Palo Alto, California

Columbia
E. Theodore Agard
Radiation Physicist
Kettering Medical Center
Kettering, Ohio

Northern Pacific
John Brunt
Theology
Walla Walla College
College Place, Washington

Southern
T. Grace Emori
Nursing
Atlanta, Georgia

Southern Pacific
Mike Scofield
Business
Monterey Park, California

SPECTRUM is a journal established to encourage Seventh-day Adventist participation in the discussion of contemporary issues from a Christian viewpoint, to look without prejudice at all sides of a subject, to evaluate the merits of diverse views, and to foster Christian intellectual and cultural growth. Although effort is made to ensure accurate scholarship and discriminating judgment, the statements of fact are the responsibility of contributors, and the views individual authors express are not necessarily those of the editorial staff as a whole or as individuals.

The Association of Adventist Forums is a nonsubsidized, nonprofit organization for which gifts are deductible in the report of income for purposes of taxation. The publishing of SPECTRUM depends on subscriptions, gifts from individuals and the voluntary efforts of the contributors and the staff.

Editorial Correspondence: SPECTRUM is published quarterly by the Association of Adventist Forums. Direct all editorial correspondence to SPECTRUM, Box 5330, Takoma Park, Maryland 20912. Manuscripts should be typewritten, double spaced and in matters of style and documentation, conform to *A Manual of Style* (University of Chicago Press). Submit the original and two copies, along with a self-addressed, stamped envelope. Responses from readers may be shortened before publication.

Subscription Information: In order to receive SPECTRUM, send a membership fee (\$15 per 4 issues, except \$18 in Canada and in other foreign countries; \$2 less for students) to Association of Adventist Forums, Box 5330, Takoma Park, Maryland 20912. Single copies may be purchased for \$4. Pay by check made out to the Association of Adventist Forums. For address changes, send old address label along with the new address.

Editorial

A Time for Healing	Roy Branson	2
---------------------------	-------------	---

Articles

Adventist Colleges Under Siege		
1. Report on Pacific Union College	Kent Seltman	4
2. Report on Southern College	Joan Marie Cook & Marie Jennings	12
Kenneth Wood on the State of the Church	Ron Graybill	19
The Future of Adventism: A Lawyer's Perspective	Glenn E. Coe	25

Special Section: Ways to Read the Bible

The Bible as Visionary Power	Ottolie Stafford	30
A Parable of Jesus as a Clue to Biblical Interpretation	John C. Brunt	35
Beyond Fundamentalism: A Short History of Adventist Old Testament Scholarship	Lawrence T. Geraty	44
Genesis One in Historical-Critical Perspective	Larry G. Herr	51

Reviews 63

Responses 66

Update 69

Autumn Council Creates 7th-Largest Health System; Theological Consultation in North Pacific Union; Adventist Media Center Makes More Cuts; Worthington Foods Back in SDA Hands; New SDA Hymnal by 1985 General Conference.

About This Issue

The outgoing president of the Association of Adventist Forums, Glenn Coe, makes a plea in this issue for greater understanding within the church through honest examination of all relevant evidence. The reports on Adventist colleges preceding his comments suggest that groups within Adventism might differ in their reactions to his views.

The special cluster of articles following his statement demonstrates how such investigation applied to the context within which the Bible was written enhances our understanding of Scripture. The authors of these essays have attempted to do more than take readers into the core of the crucial discussions at Theological Consultations I and II;

they have tried to introduce readers to the sometimes bewildering, but also enriching world of biblical scholarship.

Glenn Coe's remarks are drawn from his speech concluding the 1982 national conference of the AAF. It was his valedictory at the end of seven years of a presidency that has seen a remarkable growth in membership. The editors appreciate his unwavering commitment to the importance of an independent, responsible press within Adventism. Happily, Glenn Coe, a prosecuting attorney with a judicial temperament, remains on the board of AAF.

We are happy to welcome to our pages another person retiring from a post within the Adventist community: in this case, Kenneth Wood, stepping down from the very important responsibility of the editorship of the *Adventist Review*.

—The Editors

A Time for Healing

by Roy Branson

Just before a Sabbath School class met during the middle of November, I asked Don, the son of a good friend of mine, what he was majoring in during his junior year at Walla Walla College. Don has always been one of the leaders of youth activities in our local church, and had performed so well academically during his academy years that he had been invited into an advanced program at Johns Hopkins University. Now Don had decided on his own that he wanted to transfer to an Adventist college.

Well, he said, getting to my question, he loved to study and discuss theology, and wanted to help people. So, he had decided to become a pastor, perhaps some day a theology teacher. But he had been talking with some of his older friends at college who had also been planning to become ministers. With all the resignations and firings going on in the church, they had switched to pre-law and business.

“I love to argue,” Don went on, “and I don’t mind politics—it’s necessary to get some things done. But I don’t want to go into the ministry and end up spending all my life in denominational fights. I’ve decided to find some other place where I can still help people and as a layman give my spare time to the church.

Right now, the greatest threat to the Adventist church in North America is not doctrinal error, but fatigue. We are so exhausted from fighting each other we have little energy to undertake bold, new tasks—

or ignite the enthusiasm of the next generation. Even some who have tried to bring together contending voices find that they too become principals in new controversies that absorb their time and emotional resources. A time for healing and renewal is imperative if the church in North America is to fulfill its mission.

Certainly the church will survive. It is not without resources. Its health-care system is the seventh largest in the United States, and it has one of the most extensive parochial school networks in the country. Financially, it may well be that the denomination’s remarkable strength will remain unshaken by the Davenport affair, if the commission recently established by the General Conference acts fairly and decisively.

But Adventist administrators, faculties, pastors and lay persons continue to be distracted by months of accusations and rebuttals, charges and countercharges; not simply about the theological positions others hold, but their basic loyalty to the church. Some otherwise dedicated and talented members (on different sides of denominational debates) are becoming so demoralized that they brush past discussions of issues to ask whether opponents are truly Adventists, and suggest disputes might have to be settled with lawsuits. Too many of those resigning from the ministry and those administrators firing pastors and teachers do not merely disagree with others in the church, they regard them as enemies. In the face of continuing rancor in the church, a chilling

number of members are quietly abandoning further participation in Adventism.

That is not to say that renewal can come through cessation of spirited discussion. Quite the contrary. Respecting each other enough to continue conversation on truly significant topics is one important route to renewal. Charles Bradford, vice-president of the General Conference for North America, refers to our colleges and universities as “reservoirs of renewal.” He knows that our schools not only forge friendships and associations that are the unifying core of the denomination’s life, but that Adventist faculties are dedicated to exploring and debating how the church can best embody Christianity in the midst of twentieth-century society. Members need to let their faculties and church administrators know that they appreciate their schools pursuing that exploration.

If there is to be reconciliation through sustained study and conversation, Adventist leadership and laity must appreciate the necessity of not just tolerating, but insisting that the search for truth continue—in our universities, our colleges, our publications, our pulpits, and our Sabbath School classes.

Without that commitment the credentials of persons to call themselves Adventists will continue to be challenged and revoked; and increasing numbers of persons will grow weary and excuse themselves from the lively conversation that has been Adventism. An entire generation of Adventists will no longer dream dreams—will cease to see visions. And without a renewed vision this people will perish.

If the church is to be reinvigorated it will remember that our forefathers made a special commitment to the belief that God’s revelation is not static, but progressive. If the Adventist church today is loyal to that daring belief, it will reject the view that truth is neatly defined, easily packaged, and conveniently passed on to the next generation, like a pill guaranteed to be effective. Rather, Adventists will share the conviction that truth is like a diamond; the more one examines it the more facets one sees, and the greater the wonder and fascination.

If Don and his friends were confident that the church knew that it depended on them to continue the exploration of truth, they would be clamoring to participate. Whether the Adventist denomination fulfills its promise depends on convincing our children that we are committed to making our forefathers’ search for truth a permanent quest.

Adventist Colleges Under Siege

1. Report on Pacific Union College

by Kent Seltman

Seventh-day Adventist higher education is under attack. Under criticism, the presidents of both Pacific Union College and Southern College have been granted leaves of absence at the end of the present (1982–83) school year. While two of the schools under siege have had the reputation of being the most conservative Seventh-day Adventist campuses in North America, the issues being raised about these two colleges touch the core of all Adventist higher education.

Pacific Union College has been at the center of controversy since Desmond Ford, then a professor in the religion department, gave a public lecture on the investigative judgment during October 1979.¹ Following the uproar that ensued, the faculty, administration, and board spent months investigating various criticisms without resolving the controversy. Indecision paralyzed the campus. Finally, at a special meeting of the college board on September 22, 1982, two dramatic actions occurred: President John W. Cassell, Jr., announced his resignation, and the board voted to terminate the employment of religion professor Erwin Gane.

Cassell announced his resignation—a unilateral decision, effective July 1, 1983—in his administrative report to the board before it began deliberating on other issues. His resignation was accompanied by a request

for a 15-month sabbatical, to begin post-doctoral studies in psychology and education as preparation for a return to the classroom after 27 years in educational administration on three Adventist college campuses. In announcing this to the faculty later that same day, Cassell emphasized, “There was no pressure applied. This is a purely voluntary action on my part.”

The Pacific Union College trustees fired Gane, according to Cassell, because of the “persistent criticism which Gane leveled against certain of his colleagues in the religion department in the past few years and because of his stated inability to work with the college administration.” At this same board meeting, members of the religion department with whom Gane had differed were promoted. W. Larry Richards was appointed to a four-year term as chairman of the religion department and Larry Mitchel and Wayne Judd were promoted to the rank of associate professor of religion.

These board actions are the antithesis of the demands made by several critics of the college who have been speaking and writing in recent months. These critics include a few students, some members of the faculty and staff, and at least two members of the college Board of Trustees, as well as some parents, alumni, and community members. The anonymous publications of this faction have played an important role in raising questions about the Pacific Union College faculty and administration. The material—often simply single-page documents, easily

Kent Seltman is chairman of the English Department at Pacific Union College.

copied and passed on to others—list charges against specific faculty members, then tells readers to call the General Conference, union, and conference presidents, members of the conference committee, and the college board to express concern. Rumors based upon these publications were rampant.

An early example is the anonymous broadside, “Is it Right?” which appeared in the fall of 1981. Clumsily displayed on a single typewritten page, this paper asked rhetorically if a number of alleged practices were “right.” It attacked Adventist scholars and ministers rather generally, but specifically the Adventist Forum, SPECTRUM, and *Forum*, Desmond Ford, and Pacific Union College. No assertions were made, but the intent was to damn those named by questions and innuendo. The broadside urged readers to act by applying pressure upon church officials—and praying.

The fundamental charge made by these voices was that Pacific Union College had become a hotbed of heresy. Because Ford had proposed a major revision in Adventism’s sanctuary doctrine, these tracts questioned just what was going on at the college on the mountain. Broad-brush attacks on “devious” academics and a longing for the “shaking,” fired by Californian Lewis Walton and his book *Omega*, only added to the climate of suspicion.

Although many students and their parents praised Pacific Union College teachers for dealing constructively with the “hard questions” facing Adventism, others were uneasy with diversity of opinion, disturbed by the discovery that Adventist teachers could disagree with the theology of *Adventist Review* Editor Kenneth Wood, repudiate Walton’s view of Seventh-day Adventist history, or question the interpretations of the White Estate.

Major controversies ballooned from small allegations: Wayne Judd was an open friend and admirer of “Adventist heretic” Ronald Numbers; Larry Mitchel had introduced “modern scholarship” into his Old Testa-

ment classes; history teachers were “soft” on the age of the earth, or “too candid” about controversies in denominational history; Sabbath School classes were “negative” and “unduly open.”

The chorus of dissent eventually focused on three major charges: the religion department did not support “historic Adventism”; the administration was keeping Gane out of the classroom; and some faculty members were engaged in a smear campaign against the church.

After Ford left the religion department, Gane became the new center of controversy. Gane states that there were major doctrinal differences which the administration treated as personality conflicts. Whatever the base of the problem, Terrence Roberts, director of mental health and social services at the St. Helena Hospital and Health Center, was hired to conduct group counseling with the members of the religion department. When that did not solve the problems, Gane was placed on a two-year leave of absence to prepare publications for the White Estate, jointly funded by the college and the General Conference.

The charge of a smear campaign grew out of a curious event now known simply as “the singing incident.” Depressed by the mood of the church just before Consultation II, several teachers relieved their gloom by composing and privately singing hymn parodies. The songs complained that teachers must “Rust and Obey” to keep their jobs and suggested that Seventh-day Adventists might soon be singing new words to the old song, “Never Part Again”: “What, never *think* again? No-o, never think again. And soon we shall be scholarless, and never, never *think* again.” A colleague overheard these satires, and deeply shocked, took the matter to Cassell. In a process that even the originators of the parodies do not understand, garbled copies of the songs were soon circulating around

the country. In the minds of some, the songs themselves became elevated from private relaxation to a deliberate strategy of "attack poetry."

When Cassell did not respond to the demands for major changes in faculty and policy at the college, the attacks broadened to include the administration, especially the president, who was criticized for protecting and retaining faculty members "disloyal" to the beliefs and traditions of the church. Besieged by these attackers, the administration seemed unable to establish a base of power from which to act. College board members were hearing the defense of faculty members only from an administration whose integrity, they were being told by the critics, was not to be trusted.

At the request of the administration, the board, in November 1981, established a Fact-finding Committee. The committee consisted of five administrators and four board members. The board representatives on the committee were Charles Cook, president of the Central California Conference; Jerry Jolly, CPA; Janice von Pohle, attorney; and Marion Williams, businesswoman.

But by the February 1982 board meeting, this process was itself being called a white-wash by some board members. They felt that college administrators dominated the committee. So the membership was expanded to include two more members, including at least one of the critical voices, Wilmonte Penner, a dentist from Sacramento. (A second highly critical board member, Caleb Davidian, had previously refused to serve.)

Over the months, much pressure came from individuals connected with the Carmichael Church in the East Sacramento area. For instance, according to Art Milward, advisor to the 1981-82 *Campus Chronicle*, Saleem Farag, an official in the California State government (and for a few months in 1980 was director of the General Conference department of Health and Temperance), made a number of "harassing"

telephone calls to Milward because the student newspaper had published a book review critical of Lewis Walton's *Omega*. Milward explained, "Farak argued that, since the book had been approved by the Review and Herald editorial board and published by a church-owned press, it was not appropriate to publish critical reviews." Finally, in a phone conversation, Farag threatened the newspaper with a lawsuit. He also threatened Eric Anderson, Pacific Union College history professor, with a suit, because of a letter to the editor which Anderson had written during the debate over the college.

In March, the senior pastor of the Carmichael Church, Reinhold Tilstra, acting as spokesman for a group of about 20 individuals, read to the Fact-finding Committee a corporate, but unsigned statement of "concerns" about the college. Members of this group included Farag, Walton, and Davidian. A petition calling for signatures in support of "A Statement of Concern About Pacific Union College" used the mailing address of Lawrence Winn, a member of the Carmichael congregation.

This petition consists of a general statement in support of traditional, conservative Seventh-day Adventist teachings and lifestyle (as construed by its authors); then it asserts that some people at Pacific Union College violate "the historic . . . position in the areas of theology, attitude toward leadership, . . . lifestyle, and support of the Spirit of Prophecy"; and finally pledges a withdrawal of support until the board acts to "see that the true Seventh-day Adventist principles are followed at Pacific Union College." The almost 600 individuals who signed the statement reflected a broad concern that had developed.

"Unfortunately, however, those who signed were informed largely by rumors, rather than accurate first-hand information," says Cassell. "Furthermore, these rumors were being fomented by those circulating the petition. The Fact-finding Committee established the facts to the best

of its ability, and the subsequent actions of the board are consistent with the findings.”

Perhaps the most interesting of all the materials produced in this process is the 18-page statement presented by Gane to the Fact-finding Committee on May 12. In it, Gane defines his perceptions of the problems at Pacific Union College: “. . . We have represented on the staff at least two major philosophies of Christian education. One says that the purpose of Christian education is to engender a relationship with Christ and dedication to set of revealed truths, as well as to provide secular training . . . The other philosophy of Christian education at

Pacific Union College is that of the President and his supporters.” Throughout, the report clearly makes the point that the board must choose between the ideas of Professor Gane and those of President Cassell.

In the statement, Gane also explains his behavior toward his colleagues: “The ‘intolerance’ of the so-called ‘conservative’ stems from his strict loyalty to a line of truth which does not allow for co-existence with contradictory emphases. It is not that the ‘conservative’ cannot tolerate views contradictory to his own in matters other than those fundamental to the faith of Adventists. Yet, the conservative’s attitudes are inevitable, given his unwillingness to accept within an Adventist Bible department pluralistic or variegated theological em-

Adventist Colleges Face Crisis

At a meeting of the General Conference Board of Higher Education on October 26, Dr. Robert Reynolds, its executive secretary, warned the 45 members in attendance that recent attacks of “so-called conservative loyalists” on Adventist colleges, particularly Pacific Union College and Southern College, are attacks on the integrity of the Adventist higher education. College administrators are consumed with defending their schools against these attacks, teachers are confused, and enrollments of SDA colleges in North America are suffering—a 4% decline in September 1982 from September 1981.

He thought it was not too much to say that Adventist higher education, particularly because of these attacks, was approaching a state of crisis. And since the schools are an integral part of the church, these attacks are, in fact, attacks on the church itself. What disturbed him as much as anything was the claim of those criticizing Adventist colleges to have support

from some influential leaders within the church.

These attacks came at a time when Adventist higher education is vulnerable because of population trends and economic conditions. The September 1982 enrollment in North American Adventist colleges dropped more than four times as rapidly as enrollment in private colleges and universities generally in the United States: 4.0% to 0.8%. No relief is in sight. The Board of Higher Education estimates that even if economic conditions are ignored, in the autumn of 1983 Adventist colleges will be drawing on 500 fewer graduates from Adventist academies in the United States than they did this year. (One union conference alone expects 150 fewer academy graduates next year than in 1982.) The Board expects academy graduates in the United States to continue to decline in numbers each year for several years. In fact, demographic patterns indicate a 20% decline in graduates of all secondary schools in the United States for the next decade.

phases, including both concepts which are germane to Adventism and those which are not.”

Though a central figure in the controversy, Gane resisted for several weeks the request to appear. After his appearance, he wrote in a May 25 letter to the Fact-finding Committee and others, “. . . I was subjected to extreme pressure to testify . . . I resisted this pressure from the President and others because I did not wish to be drawn into the current discussions, and because I had serious questions about the make-up of the committee.” None of those Gane had

“The Fact-finding Committee recommended against the termination called for by the critics.”

criticized earlier or had mentioned in his own report resisted their summons from the committee.

Gane was requested to appear before the committee, but the decision to present a written statement was his own. After copies of the report appeared in the hands of Gane supporters in Takoma Park, Maryland, four faculty members, who previously had been voted as spokesmen by department and committee chairmen, secured a copy. These professors—Milo Anderson, physics; William Hemmerlin, chemistry; James Kempster, music; and Gilbert Muth, biology—repudiated Gane’s statement in a letter addressed to the board. They argued that “It is the grossest corruption of language for a small group of willful critics who seek revolutionary changes and faculty purges in this and all Seventh-day Adventist schools to call themselves ‘conservative.’ Quite simply, Dr. Gane proposes a program of revolutionary upheaval—not conservative preservation . . . We solemnly deny Dr. Gane’s claim that Pacific Union College is divided between those with a secular, relativistic vision of this school’s mission and

the handful like Dr. Gane who ‘have not bowed the knee to Baal’ and still believe in the historic values of our educational philosophy.”

Larry Richards also replied directly to Gane in an eight-page personal letter. Gane supporters subsequently circulated this letter in an apparent effort to block the appointment of Richards as chairman of the religion department. Richards wrote, “I now see you as one who believes that Erwin Gane is the true spokesman for Adventism; that Erwin is the judge of another man’s orthodoxy; that Erwin knows better than the accused person himself whether he is an Adventist, or whether he is telling the truth about his claims; and that Erwin sees himself as more qualified to resolve church problems than many of the church leaders.” In his letter, Richards went on to identify numerous factual and argumentative problems in the Gane statement, including many items in the religion department, some pertaining to Richards himself, about which Richards had first-hand knowledge. Richards insisted Gane was wrong when he asserted that “genuine Adventism” would reject the possibility of “various points of view” being “able to co-exist” within a religion department. “In taking on Pacific Union College as you have, you have essentially taken on all of our colleges in North America,” Richards declared.

In 60 hours of meetings the Fact-finding Committee interviewed over 20 persons, and approximately 30 more as members of delegations. Motivated by the intense desire for healing, students and faculty leaders sent separate messages to the board and its Fact-finding Committee, appealing for resolution of the problems. The faculty letter, signed by all but one academic department and major academic committee chairman, urged “that the board and its Fact-finding Committee declare that the cycle in which charges followed by investigation and further charges followed by further investigation should proceed to rapid conclusion.” After considering all the evidence accum-

ulated in the six months of its investigations, the Fact-finding Committee recommended against the terminations called for by the critics.

The critics promptly acted to generate increased pressure. A significant portion of this new pressure came from the Illinois press of Vance Ferrell (1955 Pacific Union College graduate), whose *Pilgrim's Waymarks* had already contained some criticisms of Pacific Union College and Southern College. Beginning in June 1982 through the summer, Ferrell printed eight issues of his magazine. Included in it were circulars, petitions, and other documents related to the controversy, along with generous portions of commentary. After compiling 32 pages of printed material Ferrell apologized for publishing some of the information.

"However," he wrote, "a number of detailed reports were submitted to the PUC Board's 'Fact-finding Committee' over a period of five complete months with the intention that this information would reach the complete Board, be carefully discussed by this body, and then suitably acted upon be [sic] in harmony with Bible-Spirit-of-Prophecy principles. But this was not done. Therefore there is no alternative but to give the details of the whole matter to the faithful, so that enough laymen will be aroused to demand that the 'new theology' be ousted, not only from PUC, but everywhere else it may be found in North America."

Cassell characterized the content of Ferrell's publication as "gross distortions of truth, slanted reporting, and obvious misrepresentation of the facts . . ." For instance, stories and quotes from one to 15 years old are current events, Cassell says. Also, in his commentaries, Ferrell uses the labels "Fordite" and "new theology" as general pejoratives without reference to what specific individuals (even, perhaps, Desmond Ford himself) believes.

Currently 2,000 people are on Ferrell's mailing list for the tracts which he writes and prints. He said the documents on Pacific Union College came to him through "friends." He has a policy of not naming names, except for people he considers enemies. As to determining the reliability of reports, he said, "With current news it is difficult to filter fact from error."

"The administration knew that we couldn't begin a school year with these matters unresolved," says Gordon Madgwick, vice-president for academic affairs. So a special meeting of the full board was called for September 22, just before the beginning of school. Prior to this meeting of the board, Walter Blehm, president of the Pacific Union and chairman of the Pacific Union College board, and Sylvester Bietz, treasurer of the Pacific Union and vice-chairman of the board, surveyed all faculty members. Their written questionnaire covered a broad range of issues: the perception of faculty loyal to the church and the college, the ethical conduct of the board, and the effectiveness of the president and the vice-president for academic affairs. The chairman and vice-chairman also conducted one-hour discussions with the members of each academic department.

Following the two days of departmental interviews, Blehm and Bietz met with department chairmen. Blehm observed to them that the faculty is "a fine group of Seventh-day Adventist leaders with whom we are proud to be associated. People ought to get information first-hand." Blehm also noted that those who attack the college "feel that the church is in jeopardy. But they are misguided and guilty of a blanket condemnation that is not justified." Blehm and Bietz reported to all constituents in the October 18, 1982, *Pacific Union Recorder*: "After spending two full days visiting with department personnel . . . we came away thrilled and inspired with the commitment these educators have to the church, to the message of the church, and to the traditions that have made Pacific Union College a

place respected within our denominational circles.”²

Though Cassell was not voted out of office, his resignation still comes in the context of one of the most serious crises of confidence in the 100-year history of the college. Cassell stated to the faculty his opinion that “a new president may turn the college around more quickly. Every new administrator has a ‘honeymoon’ period.”

For Board Chairman Blehm, one of the great frustrations of this crisis has been the disruptive tactics adopted by a small number of the board members, who have refused to accept board decisions as final, including one action that they voted for themselves. Consequently, a tyranny of the minority developed, making it almost impossible to resolve an issue of concern to these members. “It is the ethical responsibility of board members to express their opinions in the board meetings and then to accept the majority opinion,” said Cassell, “but it seems that where a couple of members are unhappy about a vote, they and their friends have conducted extensive lobbying efforts to reverse the action.”

This pattern of action, of course, raises the question of whether the issue is now settled. Although Ferrell said he is tired of the Pacific Union College subject, he plans to publish material showing how Gane was “pestered and pestered” into writing his report and then how that was used against him.

Instead of objecting to the board’s actions as a rejection of his theology, Gane now states that the board illegally terminated his contract. However, he is unsure what his next move will be. As a matter of principle, he says he does not believe in suing, but he has objected to the board action with a letter, and he hopes the board will discuss the matter again. He suggests that the board’s vote against him bodes ill for other faculty members, too, because no teacher can be confident of continuous tenure if the

board can simply cancel a contract before it expires.

However, the college points out that although the board action will terminate his employment in June 1983, 12 months before the end of a three-year contract, the school never awarded him ‘continuous’ tenure. The college also contends that Gane was dismissed “with just cause,” which means the school is not obligated to pay beyond the terminal date of the signed contract.

Another open letter now circulates: “A Host of Friends of PUC” demands of Cassell and Madgwick: (1) that recognition be given that Gane’s contract does not terminate until June 30, 1984, (2) that Cassell resign December 31, 1982, instead of at the end of June 1983, (3) that Madgwick also resign December 31, 1982, and (4) that these actions be implemented at the November board meeting. A request for additional General Conference representation is also included.

During the fall of 1982, the largest direct anti-public relations campaign yet was directed against the college. In late October, Ferrell mailed his *PUC Papers* directly to the homes of approximately 1,900 Pacific Union College students. In a phone conversation, Ferrell acknowledges that some may have been mailed by his staff in Illinois. Dorothy Pappas, an Angwin resident and 1972 Pacific Union College graduate, singlehandedly prepared all the labels and sent them to Ferrell; his organization applied the labels to envelopes for the mailing of the materials, under Ferrell’s non-profit organization, bulk-mailing permit.

“Observing the events of the past several months,” Cassell said, “a war of attrition has been waged by a vocal group of individuals who seem bent on imposing their will on the internal affairs of the institution . . . It is hard to understand how those who call themselves Christians could participate in a campaign of personal and professional vilification that has had the obvious effect of producing a crisis of confidence among our constituency. . . .

By so doing, they have played on the fears and anxieties of church members already feeling troubled and insecure over social trends within the church, attacks on the spirit of prophecy, and alleged financial mismanagement by church personnel.”

Administrative techniques and the role of governing boards in Seventh-day Adventist institutions are, perhaps, partially to blame for the long duration of the problem at Pacific Union College. The Board of Trustees does not, for instance, have a specific code of ethics for its members. Also, the final decision of the board was delayed for months while waiting for a consensus. In the meantime, the administration and board invoked extraordinary measures by directly investigating faculty members. In the end, the original intentions of the administration were affirmed, but the months of delay have cost the institution dearly.

A difficult problem of these times has been the reluctance of church leaders to speak and write in support of higher education generally, not to mention specific support of Pacific Union College or Southern College. In fact, the opposite has even been the case. Many educators see the *Adventist Review* editorial, “Colleges in Trouble,” by Kenneth Wood, as the signal for attacks that have come in the past couple of years.³ That a critical attitude persists, is revealed in subtle, and perhaps not even deliberate ways, such as the undermining of scholarly endeavors by a sarcastic tone in James Coffin’s recent *Adventist Review* editorial, “One Thing I Know”: “We live in an

age of education. We worship at the feet of the degreed gurus whose research and study have provided wisdom so profound that the uneducated masses can only marvel. How could these modern-day wise men be wrong? After all, are they not men of science?”⁴

The similarities that exist between all Seventh-day Adventist colleges and universities make each campus vulnerable to the kind of campaign that two campuses have experienced. Thus, at issue is something bigger than problems on a campus or two—it is a church problem. In the long term, the fate of a viable, accredited system of Seventh-day Adventist higher education is at stake. If vicious rumor is not balanced by credible clerical voices speaking in support of higher education, income from both tuition and gifts will be further reduced, jeopardizing the financial viability of the institutions.

An uncertain financial base may be a threat to continued accreditation of the college. But the greatest danger to accreditation comes from infringements on academic freedom which lies at the heart of higher education. And unaccredited colleges cannot satisfy the higher education needs of Adventist youth seeking careers in the medical and paramedical professions, education, engineering, or law—or almost any other profession that requires certification by a graduate or professional school. Consequently, the church faces the possibility that most of its youth will not go to Adventist colleges and will either be educated in the public system of higher education or not receive a college education at all.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. For a full report on this matter see Walter Utt, “Desmond Ford Raises the Sanctuary Question,” *SPECTRUM*, Vol. 10, No. 4, pp. 3–8.

2. W. D. Blehm and S. D. Bietz, “Board Officers Visit With PUC Faculty,” *Pacific Union Recorder*, Oct.

18, 1982, p. 8.

3. *Waymarks* No. 60, Sept. 15, 1982, p. 2.

4. James N. Coffin, “One Thing I Know,” *Adventist Review*, Oct. 21, 1982, p. 12.

2. Report on Southern College

by Joan Marie Cook and Marie Jennings

On September 15, 1982, the Southern College Board of Trustees granted Frank Knittel, president of the school for the past 12 years, a 15-month sabbatical which will begin in June 1983. The request came after Knittel had come under pressure from the chairman of the board, and no one expects Knittel to return as president. Although A. C. McClure, president of the Southern Union and chairman of the board of Southern College, has said that the board has no plans to dismiss any other faculty members, he acknowledges that the board at its meeting in February 1983, will certainly take a look at the rehiring of faculty members and staff. Teachers, especially in the religion department, are apprehensive about their futures. Some of the faculty at Southern College feel they must explore other employment possibilities in case they are forced to leave.

Critics of Knittel claim that administrative competence is the issue. Some say his circle of advisors should have been wider, others that firmer action should have been taken to prevent a drop of enrollment in 1981 of 232 students and another drop of 51 this year.

Supporters of the president point out that the two-year drop is by no means the worst in the Adventist college system and that financially, through prudent management, Southern College showed an operating gain of more than \$250,000 in the year that ended

June 30, 1982. In fact, as of September 30, 1982, the school was \$100,000 ahead of last year's balance at that time. They think that the issue is not administrative competence, but academic freedom—the right of teachers to answer urgent questions from students determined to search for truth and to be able to answer those questions in the atmosphere of trust and support. They believe that some of the drop in enrollment was the result of a campaign to discredit the school by a determined group of critics.¹

In the spring of 1980, controversy erupted—at what had always been considered one of the most traditional Adventist schools—over the unlikely subject of masturbation. For prayer meeting one evening, the Collegedale Church showed one of the popular James Dobson films on family life. During the discussion period afterward, some church members became agitated when a teacher from the floor, said he was aware of no scientific proof that masturbation caused some of the more extreme effects suggested by Ellen White in her book, *A Solemn Appeal*.

One community resident, Florence Woolcock, became particularly incensed. In the next few days she wrote a very long letter to Knittel on the subject. When she came to interview him soon afterwards, Knittel stated that in general he agreed with the behavioral science teacher. Woolcock assumed, therefore, that he did not believe Ellen White was inspired, and she decided to do something about it.

After her talk with Knittel, Woolcock scheduled individual interviews with all the

Joan Marie Cook is an individual counselor and marriage counselor, and Marie Jennings is a businesswoman. Both are Adventists living in the Nashville, Tennessee area.

teachers in the Division of Religion. To her dismay, she learned that most of them concurred with the teacher's observation. Woolcock took this as proof of apostasy, because—to her—it meant that none of these men believed in Ellen White's inspiration.

However, it was not until after September 1980, when members of the theology faculty reported on Theological Consultation to a large audience in the Collegedale Church that Woolcock and others started their activities in earnest. By the start of the school in 1980, Desmond Ford had been dismissed from the faculty of Pacific Union College and the issues involving the sanctuary and Ellen White were being discussed in denominational publications. Later in the Fall, Walter Rae was dismissed. Some of the young and most popular of the theology faculty seemed to be drawn into the controversies raging through the church.

Without their knowing it, Woolcock—in the spring of 1981—began attending classes of the theology faculty. She made a practice for a time of hiding behind a heavy folding door in the room where one religion class was held. Despite the difficulties of hearing from that location, this secret scribe managed to make notes. Three to four students helped her glean information from religion classes that they considered to be heretical. (Not all the claims proved to be valid; at least one student later admitted making untrue statements.)

That semester Woolcock occasionally mimeographed materials which she sometimes attempted to hand out on campus. Finally, Knittel threatened legal action to bar her from such activity on campus, and at least one of the students helping her was not re-admitted the next school year.

In April, *Evangelica* (Vol. 2 No. 2) carried two articles by two members of the Division of Religion, Jerry Gladsen and Ed Zackrisson. The journal had been started in 1980 by students at the SDA Theological Seminary. From its first issue, *Evangelica* stressed the

importance of righteousness by faith. The two faculty members had agreed to write for the journal before it began to take what they later came to regard as an increasingly radical direction. Although no one has found fault with the content of their articles, the fact that they published articles in the magazine eventually was used against them.

Soon after the *Evangelica* articles appeared, the theology faculty gained still greater visibility. After the resignation of Smuts van Rooyen, (a former professor at Southern College) from the Andrews University theology department, Lorenzo Grant, on June 12 and 13, organized a gathering of 17 teachers from most of the Adventist colleges in North America, including Andrews University and Loma Linda University. Jerry Gladsen, Norman Gulley, and Ed Zackrisson from Southern College also attended. So did Frank Knittel, on the first day.

At the end of their session, the group delivered to the General Conference what they called "The Atlanta Affirmation," because, they said in their preamble, "of our shared commitment to the building up of the church and to the preservation of its unity." Clearly written against the background of the earlier firing of Ford and resignation of Smuts van Rooyen, the statement called attention to the "dismissal or withdrawal under pressure of certain teachers and pastors from denominational employ," and to their concern that "the credibility, and therefore effectiveness, of seminary and certain other religion faculties—made up of the very persons prepared to serve the church theologically—are now being eroded." It also said frankly that "the treatment of recent theological controversy in the *Adventist Review* and *Ministry* has not always reflected the variety of viewpoints that exist in the church and that this one-sidedness has fostered an attitude of suspicion and a sense of impotence among a substantial number of our members."

The affirmation concluded with three recommendations: "that teachers, pastors, administrators, and other church members attempt now to stop the polarizing process that threatens our unity and future as a movement by cooling rhetoric, easing tensions, and enhancing mutual trust within our community; 2) that they take frequent opportunity to express confidence in the truthfulness of the Adventist message; 3) that they continue, in light of the present situation and in faithfulness to our Lord, to learn about, examine, and renew the heritage God has given to us all."

Later, it emerged that those who had donated the funds for the conference had for tax purposes sent the money through Good News Unlimited Foundation, a procedure that Grant later conceded might not have been the wisest.

Less than ten days after the Atlanta meeting, a letter was written to all members of the Southern College Board of Trustees. It came from a source that attracted attention, Sharon McKee, wife of Ellsworth McKee. He is president of the McKee Baking Company, which distributes as far West as Phoenix, Arizona, its well-known Little Debbie snack cakes. The company's main plant is situated on the edge of the Southern College campus in Collegedale, and 200 of its some 2,500 employees are students at the college. The founder and chairman of the company, O.D. McKee, Ellsworth's father, was a founding member of Southern College's Committee of One Hundred, a group of substantial donors to Southern College, and he is reported to give 50 percent of his income to the church. As recently as the previous summer, he had pledged \$1 million to the Project '80 building fund at Southern College.

The members of the board quickly learned that the wife of the president of the McKee Bakery Company was demanding that the president of Southern College declare himself plainly on the issues confronting the denomination:

"I do not know where you stand on the Ford-Rea issues; nor do many other people. Shouldn't everyone know where you stand? It seems to me the middle-of-the road is confusing in the crisis we are now facing."

Her concern was the religion faculty. She stated that Knittel should see to it that teachers "running down" the church or its doctrine should stop being paid.

"I find it difficult to understand why certain personnel at SMC accept the position and pay for work that is contrary to the teaching of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. . . . Those who are running down our church and doctrine should not be paid by our school or church organization . . .

"Your position demands that you take a stand. But if you do not take a stand and some of these religion teachers are maintained in their positions, the only alternative would be to drop religion courses from the requirements and allow the students to take religion courses only by their choice. It would be better to have admitted Catholics teaching than to have wolves in sheep's clothing."

Within a month, members of the theology faculty had taken another action that the chairman of the board felt, under the circumstances, was unwise and provocative.

In July Lorenzo Grant and Ed Zackrison drove from Tennessee to Atlanta to hear Smuts van Rooyen give a presentation at the local chapter of the Association of Adventist Forums. They had heard a lot of rumors about their former colleague who, after leaving the religion faculty at Andrews University, had joined Desmond Ford at the Good News Unlimited Foundation in California. They decided to take the opportunity to quiz him themselves.

The following week the two teachers, along with Knittel, were summoned to an

impromptu committee of Southern Union Conference officials gathered at the Atlanta airport. The teachers were questioned for about three hours. McClure, the union president and chairman of the college board, was very displeased. He stated that he understood that the teachers had been advised not to attend the meeting; the teachers recall that he therefore considered them uncontrollable and insubordinate. Still the teachers felt that, on the whole, the meeting had finally ended with good understanding on both sides.

But they were soon chilled to learn that McClure refused to allow an expression of support he had already written for the theology department to be printed in the *Southern Tidings*. When the introduction to the statement signed by all the religion faculty affirming their commitment to the Adventist church and its beliefs appeared in the *Southern Tidings*, it was introduced by Knittel. McClure's action was particularly upsetting to the faculty because they had followed the advice of union conference officials to refrain from responding to criticisms until the union president and faculty made their joint statements.

With the approach of the 1981-82 school year, the tempo of criticism increased. Broad­sides rained down on the Col­legedale campus. Vance Ferrell's *Pilgrim Waymarks* printed a garbled version of minutes taken at the Atlanta Affirmation meetings, inter­rupted throughout with Ferrell's bracketed comments. In other issues of his publication, Ferrell described theological error at South­ern College, citing, among other things, a speech by Knittel to the Association of SDA Secondary School Administrators on Ellen White and education. At the association's request, the speech was later printed in the *Journal of Education*, edited by the General Conference Department of Education.

The previously mentioned material gath-

ered by Woolcock and her student com­patriots later appeared in an eight-page newspaper called *Collegedale Tidings*. It attacked several of the theology faculty, including the chairman, Douglas Bennett, who was accused of being a "Fordite" because he said it was the little horn, not the sins of the saints, that pollutes the heavenly sanctuary. Among many charges, Ed Zack­rison was reported to have said that anyone who experienced the indwelling of the Holy Spirit was a pantheist, a version of what he said that he finds totally inaccurate. The *Collegedale Tidings* also reproduced the Vance Ferrell version of the Atlanta Affirmation minutes. Later, Ferrell, in turn, reprinted the Woolcock material in his *Pilgrim's Way­marks*.

“Those who are running down our church and doctrine should not be paid by our school . . . It would be better to have admitted Catholics teaching than to have wolves in sheep's clothing.”

—Sharon McKee

John Felts, who printed (but not edited) *Collegedale Tidings*, a one-time effort, prints and edits *SDA Press Release*, on newspaper-sized newsprint. Devoted initially (and still primarily) to disseminating news of the Davenport affair, Felts included in the fifth issue of his *Press Release* a call for Knittel to resign.

In the Spring of 1982, Robert Francis, who had been a popular theology teacher at Southern College before he retired in the Col­legedale community, produced a 17-page document, "Some Observations on the Present Theology Crisis," that viewed with alarm what he considered to be a one-sided emphasis by some teachers in the Division of Religion on righteousness by faith.

At the Spring 1982 meeting of the Board of Trustees, a committee was established to attempt to deal fairly with complaints and criticism about faculty members. Many written communications were coming to the president of the college. Much of the time the letters were not signed and contained unsubstantiated charges. They revolved around three main areas: teaching concerning righteousness by faith versus perfection; the inspiration of Ellen White; and the concept of the heavenly sanctuary. The letters were vague and, in Knittel's view, contained not one line that documented the teaching of heresy. According to Knittel, McClure told him he also considered that no evidences of heresy had been presented.

Still on July 29, 1982, McClure called Knittel and said that he and J. Hinson Whitehead, treasurer of the Southern Union and secretary to the Southern College board, were coming to the campus and wanted to schedule meetings with several department chairmen and administrative officers. When the two men arrived, Knittel says that they asked him to work out a transfer of Edwin Zackrison to another Adventist school. Knittel reminded the men that Zackrison's education debt came to over \$60,000. McClure reportedly said the debt could be forgiven and Zackrison given one year's salary if another school were willing to take him. Then the chairman and secretary of the board left for their interviews with college personnel.

That same night at 11:30, Knittel was awakened to find a crowd of people at his front door. Incredulous, he heard the agitated faculty and staff members explain how McClure had questioned them about "the unrest on campus," and "Dr. Knittel's ability to 'pull things together.'" They asked Knittel what was happening. He didn't know.

On August 3, 1982, McClure summoned Knittel to the union office in Decatur, Georgia, about 150 miles from Southern College. There, McClure asked Knittel to take a job with Adventist Health Systems/Sunbelt. Knittel asked for an explanation for this request since he previously had not been confronted over any administrative problems. (In fact, in 1981 when Knittel had received inquiries about the possibility of becoming dean of the Kettering College of Medical Arts, McClure urged him not to pursue the opportunity.) Knittel says that McClure also indicated that Gladsen, Grant, and Zackrison had to go and that he told McClure he knew that the real problem with him as president was the fact that he refused to clean out the religion department. McClure, however, insists that the issue was one of administration.

Although Knittel told no one of McClure's request, when he called his wife back at Collegedale at 3 p.m., she had already heard from several sources that he had been asked to resign. By the time he arrived home at 5:30 p.m., he had phone calls to return from people all over the United States asking about the matter.

After thinking things over for a few days, Knittel wrote to McClure saying that, if there were further insistence on his resignation or dismissal just before the start of the 1982-83 school year, action would have to be taken by the full Board of Trustees in an official meeting. In response, McClure scheduled a board meeting for August 16.

However, McClure subsequently cancelled the meeting, reportedly because there was such an outcry from board members. On August 19, McClure came to a faculty meeting at Southern College. The opening of school was approaching and he appeared to want to reassure everyone. In his remarks he said, "I have no evidence of heresy being taught at Southern College." At another point he astonished the faculty by stating that "Dr. Knittel has not been asked to resign."

Less than a month later, at the September 15 board meeting, Knittel informed the board that he planned to ask for a sabbatical at the February 1983 board meeting. Knittel emphasized that board action would be improper before that 1983 meeting, since a formal plan of activity for such a proposal is required by the faculty working policy before a sabbatical request may be accepted.

Knittel also took advantage of the opportunity to deliver a forceful address on the problem as he saw it. He said in part:

“. . . some of the loudest voices have come from people who by their own admission are very hazy about theological issues. They simply have a vague and visceral feeling that somewhere along the line the traditional historic doctrines of the church have been perverted and/or lost in academia . . .

“I truly wonder whether our church is really ready for the type of critical thinking and independent study demanded by higher education.”

“Tom Zwemer resigned from the board in protest of what he saw as a purge mentality.”

He further expressed a plea for simple Christian ethics in dealing with fellow believers in times of controversy.

He called for a strong stand from church leaders against the “wretched invective appearing under the guise of purifying the church” from the underground press. While everyone claims to deplore these papers, Knittel pointed out that “church members and leaders continue to ask rather accusatory questions framed by statements that are word for word from the latest issue of *SDA Press Release*, et al.” Knittel cautioned against using wealth and influence to twist the arms and minds of church leaders.

Following his address, an executive session of the board of directors was declared, and those who were not part of that group, including Knittel, had to leave the room. Without much further discussion, McClure called for and received a vote accepting the president’s “request” with no strings attached.

After the September board meeting, board member Tom Zwemer, assistant dean of the School of Dentistry, Medical College of Georgia, submitted his resignation. He had served on the board about seven years and resigned in protest of what he saw as a “purge mentality” in operation.

In his letter, Zwemer summarized his perception of the events at Southern College as follows:

“The current crisis began in the open when Dr. Ford gave his paper on the Investigative Judgment at a Forum Meeting at PUC. College presidents were caught in the squeeze between scholars and church administrators.

“The rejection of the scholar’s version of the Statement of Fundamental beliefs at Dallas was the second principal issue. These two events lead to Glacier View and its consequence for all scholars.

“The series of editorials on ‘Colleges in Trouble,’ etc. in the *Adventist Review* closely followed. Walter Rea and Lewis Walton escalated the basic issues. The underground press then picked up the hue and cry. The Davenport problem became a critical issue and placed church administrators in the position of having to recapture their credibility as men of principle and action.

“Finally, the scholars’ retreat into obscurantism became the *prima facie* evidence which proved their heterodoxy to the conservative traditional constituency of the Seventh-day Adventist denomination.

“This series of events coupled with a remnant mentality dooms any college president who takes a stand for academic

freedom for his faculty within a sectarian institution. The better president the greater the risk.”

Not everyone was distressed by Knittel’s planned departure, however. When McClure had interviewed several administrative officers and faculty members in late July 1982, he reports that he found that the majority of those he talked to felt it was time for a change. Several expressed the view that Knittel had not tried to control the situation in the religion department, and through his neglect a small problem had grown into a large one. About the only thing that is certain at this time is that Knittel will take a sabbatical next year.

Individuals on both sides in the controversy over Southern College seem sincerely committed to the church and gravely con-

cerned about its future. Church leaders want desperately to recapture the image of Southern College as a loyal, traditional Adventist school. Teachers in the religion department consider continuous searching for truth a basic Christian responsibility. Events at Southern College over the coming months will answer the question of whether it is possible for people who think differently, but share the same ultimate goals, to accept each other as brothers and sisters.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. *We approached an equal number of persons from each viewpoint. Critics of Knittel and the school were willing to speak, but not for attribution. One critic refused to be interviewed at all.*

Interview

Kenneth Wood on the State of the Church

by Ron Graybill

We are pleased that Kenneth H. Wood agreed to an interview for SPECTRUM, conducted by Ron Graybill, an associate secretary of the Ellen G. White Estate. As editor of the Adventist Review for the last 16½ years, Wood joins a select group of five men whose extended tenures as editors-in-chief insured that they were major forces shaping the substance and tone of discourse within the church: James White, 16 years (1850–1881, with intermittent absences); Uriah Smith, 38 years (1855–1903, with nine or ten intermittent years of absences); F. M. Wilcox, 33 years (1911–1944); Francis D. Nichol, 21 years (1945–1966); Kenneth H. Wood, 16½ years (1966–1982).

Born in Shanghai to missionary parents, Wood brought to the editorship extensive pastoral and departmental experience, including five years as

director of lay activities, Sabbath school and public relations in the Columbia Union. For ten years he served as assistant, then associate editor of the Adventist Review.

In addition to the internationalization of the Review, to which Wood refers in this interview, he will be remembered for inaugurating the letters to the editor and “speaking out” sections. Like his predecessors, he has seen to it that the Review was engaged in most of the theological debates taking place in the church during his editorship.

Wood’s voice and influence will continue to be strong. Although William G. Johnsson’s name, for the first time, appears as editor on the December 2 issue of the Review, Wood retains the key post of chairman of the board of the White Estate.

—The Editors

Graybill: I was attending my first General Conference session in 1966 when you became editor of the *Adventist Review*. In what ways has the *Review* changed, if any, since those days?

Wood: I had been one of the editors of the *Review* for nearly 11 years before I became editor. The major difference is that before I became editor we published merely a weekly magazine. Now we have added not only a monthly magazine in English that is the Inter-American Division church paper, but a French edition in Haiti, a Portuguese edition in Sao Paulo, and Spanish editions printed in Buenos Aires and Mountain View. We have tried during this period to internationalize the church paper so that it could become a greater force for unifying

our believers. When I became editor, the church had only about a 1.5 million members. Now it is 3.8 million strong. So the problem of unity becomes ever greater.

Graybill: What is the circulation of the *Review* in North America?

Wood: North American circulation has run as high as 110,000. That included subscriptions the Columbia Union purchased for all its members. Now that the Columbia Union no longer provides those subscriptions, the circulation stands at 75,000, of which 10-12,000 are still being bought by the Southwestern Union to send to its members.

Graybill: Roughly, what would the circulation of the *Review* now be in all editions, in all languages?

Wood: I presume that it would be somewhere between two and three hundred thousand. Our surveys have always shown that about four people, on an average, read any given copy, which means to me that we could reach a million to 1.5 million Adventists on a regular basis.

Graybill: Do the foreign language editions print the same articles that appear in our weekly *Review* here, or do some articles appear in the foreign language editions that we never see in English?

Wood: Some things appear in all of the magazines, such as the monthly message from the General Conference president. Beyond that the foreign language editions lift out four pages of our regular monthly edition, provide their own localized news, and mix in some general articles from their local authors.

Graybill: To what extent is the *Review* the official voice of the church?

Wood: Well, this depends upon whom you are talking to. In spite of all of our disclaimers about its being an official organ, throughout its history the *Review* has been the “unofficial” official voice of the church. My predecessor used to speak of it as the “Authentic Voice of the Advent Movement.” I would say this, that while the editors have complete freedom to publish whatever they feel is in the best interest of the church, they try as nearly as possible to reflect the theological positions of the church and to be constructive. So, while there was a short period of about six years when the phrase “Official Organ of the Seventh-day Adventist Church,” appeared on the cover of the *Review*, I took the initiative in removing it and returning the expression “General Church Paper of Seventh-day Adventists.” Recently, by request, we changed to “General Organ of the Seventh-day Adventist Church.” In a political climate like we live in today, church leaders need to be able to disassociate themselves from positions in the magazine that they do not agree with, or that have not been officially voted.

Graybill: Are you under pressure to

print whatever General Conference officers submit?

Wood: We’ve never felt that kind of pressure. We have felt that we had a special responsibility to General Conference leadership, because the total church had elected these people to their positions. When they have sent beneficial articles, we have tried to put them in the best form possible and publish them. On occasion we have returned material to the leading brethren and usually, after some dialogue, they recognized that what they had said could have been thought out more carefully, or might create embarrassment some place.

Graybill: There has been a feeling that you have grave fears for our colleges. Where do you think our colleges are headed, and how might their service to the church be improved?

Wood: Well, it’s interesting that a single editorial can establish an editor as being on one side or another of an issue. The only editorial that I ever wrote that expressed any concerns about our educational system, at least so far as I can recall, was one entitled “Colleges in Trouble.” In that editorial, I was simply pointing out that our colleges do not exist in a vacuum and that the things that trouble other church-related colleges tend to bother us too. The further we get away from the pioneers, the more we need to constantly review where we’re going and what we’re teaching. I suppose what I was really saying was that young people who have not really sorted things out, as they may in later years, shouldn’t be exposed to ideas that they are not ready to handle. It merely shakes their faith and confuses them. So our schools, if they do what they should do, ought not also just to throw a potpourri of ideas at young people, but rather help them sort these out in line with Adventist beliefs.

The point that was lost sight of, apparently, was that I have always been one of the most loyal supporters of our schools, from the elementary grades right on up through our graduate programs. I have sent our children and our grandchildren to Ad-

ventist schools, and I myself never had one day in a public school. So I believe very much in our educational program. But I don't think that we ever ought to get to the place where we feel threatened when somebody says, "Are we doing everything in the best way possible?" That's really all that I was saying.

Graybill: If you were living in Chattanooga today and your children were college age, would you still send them to Southern College of Seventh-day Adventists?

Wood: Yes, I would. In fact, I have recently been contemplating encouraging a young person to attend that very school. I believe that the environment of our schools is the best environment for our young people, even if there may be some theological controversy. So, I wouldn't hesitate at all to send a young person to any of our schools.

Graybill: I know that General Conference and *Review* people get letters from all sorts of people. One person who has written to me and to you and others, feels that many of the teachers in our Bible departments ought not to be teaching there. She apparently got a letter from you which some are interpreting as endorsing her efforts to remove these teachers. How do you feel about people who are trying to get specific teachers dismissed?

Wood: Well, I've never been one who tried to zero in on any particular person, whether faculty member or administrator. I do feel that, in general, our church has always been very gentle and kind to what we might call "liberals," but has been very hard on conservatives. And I use the term "conservative" to describe people who feel that there should be a work of revival and reformation going on in the church. There's a tendency to dismiss these people as fanatics, or crackpots, or extremists, or something of this kind. Now, in my correspondence, I have tried to encourage the faith of people who have concerns about what's happening in the church, and to help them see that they're not alone in this

feeling, but that the Lord, above it all, has never turned over to the undershepherds the full responsibility for the church. He is still the Chief Shepherd of the sheep. I have tried to encourage them to be patient and not despair, for truth has a way of succeeding ultimately. And so, I think that my correspondence probably could be interpreted as supporting those who at times are critical of the church, but it isn't that I'm supporting their criticisms so much as I'm trying to keep them from losing faith in the fact that this is God's church and that He's still leading it.

Graybill: So you don't necessarily endorse the tactics that some of them use?

Wood: No, indeed.

“Our church has always been very gentle and kind to what we might call ‘liberals,’ but has been very hard on conservatives.”

Graybill: I was distressed at the little paper *Pilgrims' Waymarks* for printing all of these parodies and poems. Do you think it is helpful to publish that sort of thing?

Wood: Well, as an editor of the *Review* for a long time, my feeling has been that a lot of judgment needs to be applied to what you publish. Whatever we publish should be responsible and should be constructive. Obviously, some things should not be given wide exposure because to do so only strengthens whatever is being expressed. I certainly am as concerned as anybody about parodies, whether they are verbal or artistic, but I think it's irresponsible to publish them simply because they exist. Now, I don't know a great deal about *Pilgrims' Waymarks*, but I think that Vance Ferrell's theological positions, in general, have been fairly sound—in line with historic Adventism. But I would feel it is a mistake for him to publish some material, such as on the search for the ark of the covenant. This is the sort of topic on which many people do not have the information with which to make a proper evaluation. And once it's published,

of course, it merely takes on added momentum. And I feel that's true with some of these parodies, too.

Graybill: When I read Walton's *Omega*, I felt that it was unbalanced in its tendencies toward perfectionism—that it stressed the importance of works and sanctification to the almost total exclusion of grace and justification. Looking back on *Omega* now, what do you feel were its strengths, and did it have any weaknesses?

Wood: So far as perfectionism is concerned, this is probably a very misunderstood word. There are people who try to attach the label of perfectionism to anything that gives any emphasis at all to what Christ is able to do through the life of a person, by way of victory. I believe that both the Bible and the spirit of prophecy teach that, at the end of time, it is possible for individuals to be so fully committed to God that they will be willing to give their lives, rather than to yield to the religious political forces. Certainly, they will have come to the place where they consistently say, "Yes," to God, whatever He asks, and "No," to the devil. Now, I don't think that that's an extreme position, and I don't think that Walton is extreme in that. Some people read what he says through their own frame of reference. If they are thinking very, very strongly of grace, then naturally they're going to feel that he has stressed works too much. On the other hand, there are people in the church who are so legalistic that they would feel that his book was far too easy on sinners and didn't demand enough of Christians.

Graybill: I haven't met any of those.

Wood: You haven't? Well, there are those, believe me.

Graybill: That specifically criticized Walton's book?

Wood: That type of book. They feel that even the *Review* is far too liberal. As for Walton's interpretation of history, here again, I think that people shouldn't have become nearly so stirred up. They should simply recognize that this is the way he looked at it. They could write their own book with a different view.

Graybill: But they wouldn't have the funds to send it out to all of the . . .

Wood: Well, that was only a minor portion of the circulation, maybe 2,000 copies out of the 70,000 or so, that were sold. You know, I feel about the critics the way one writer said. He said, "Where were they when the page was blank?" You know, they've got their own blank pages, why don't they write their own book? In spite of the criticism of the book, I think the book has done a lot of good to alert people to get to thinking for themselves. And, of course, that is one of the ultimate objectives of good writing.

"I have no objection to a magazine publishing anything it wants to, but I do think that, when it purports to be Seventh-day Adventist, it ought to be faith-building and constructive."

Graybill: Is there a place for a magazine like SPECTRUM in the church?

Wood: I happen to believe that a thing ought to be either fish or fowl. The criticisms that have come to me through the years about SPECTRUM are based on the fact that the magazine contains many respected Adventist names on the masthead and the term "Adventist" is part of the name of Forums; consequently many of our members wonder whether this is an official magazine on the same basis as the *Adventist Review* and *Ministry*. I have no objection to a magazine publishing anything it wants to, but I do think that, when it purports to be Seventh-day Adventist, it ought to be faith-building and constructive. I think that that's always possible with any kind of information that we discover. But when material is published that tends to sound cynical, or sounds as if it's undermining faith, or taking issue with basic Adventist beliefs, then I think it ought not to be identified as "Adventist."

Graybill: I have felt that SPECTRUM is almost the only place where one could appropriately print in-depth reports on such topics as the Davenport matter and the law suit against the Pacific Press. I found a lot of information there that I didn't find in any other Adventist journal. Was SPECTRUM out of line to publish this? Could some other Adventist journal have published that sort of coverage?

Wood: I think the real question is, What other journal would have considered it beneficial to its readers? The *Adventist Review* could publish every line of a story of that kind, but we have found through the years that only about one percent of SDA's are interested in the kind of nuts-and-bolt story that documents the church's deficiencies. What they are interested in is the progress of the church. They know that in a world like ours, there are going to be some mistakes, some lack of perfect judgment, but to dwell on those mistakes at length, they probably don't think is all that profitable. You're right that SPECTRUM is probably the only magazine that would have published it, but only because other magazines would have felt that ultimately it wouldn't contribute that much to the welfare of the people. It's for the curiosity seekers, the voyeurs, you might say.

Graybill: Yet when people around the General Conference building gather together and compare notes, they like to know some of those kinds of detail, they like to understand what really went on.

Wood: Right, but don't you think that the officers of the General Conference are willing to explain all of that and rehearse it, as they often have at the close of the General Conference Committee? What we're talking about is whether this kind of information should be primarily for those who are involved, or whether it should be scattered through the membership.

Graybill: I think it builds confidence for leadership to be able to discuss those things openly with the membership.

Wood: True, but I think that magazines have a certain market. I'm not questioning

at all the right of disseminating information. I just don't think that the *Review* would maintain its circulation very long if it dwelt on that sort of thing. That is a specialized market.

Graybill: And you feel that the market for the kinds of things that SPECTRUM publishes is probably one percent?

Wood: Definitely, because look, the present subscription list of SPECTRUM is, what, 7,000? Well, with 3.8 million church members, I was generous when I said one percent.

Graybill: Shifting gears now, what is your feeling about a separate division for North America?

Wood: I haven't heard all of the discussions on the question so I can't say that I'm as knowledgeable on the issues as many people are. I will say that from the information I have, I have ambivalent feelings. I believe that the Lord raised up the Advent Message here in North America for a certain reason. It's provided a wonderful base for our world work. I have problems when I look around these days and see more and more people considering their own needs rather than the world-wide needs. You remember how Mrs. White got after the people in Battle Creek because they seemed to think that was the hub of the world there, and she tried scatter them to get out. I'm concerned when I see us spending enormous amounts of money for conference offices, let's say. This increases the overhead of a field, but may not improve performance. The same is true of our educational institutions, our medical work, our publishing work, or whatever. I think the Lord is interested in the whole world, and the only anxiety I have about a North American division as a separate entity is that I feel it might tend more and more to a kind of empire building.

North America provides the major share of the support financially for our world work. Money is a factor in leadership and in authority, and I think the happy combination of the General Conference and North America here has given greater

strength to General Conference leadership. In other words, separation might work to the advantage of North America, but it might work to the disadvantage of the total world church.

My fear is that if we push this separation to the ultimate, the General Conference might be in a kind of weak, advisory capacity, and North America might be so strong that, if it lost its vision, the world work would be weakened everywhere.

Graybill: Speaking as specifically as possible, what do you enjoy most about being a Seventh-day Adventist?

Wood: I can't narrow this down to just one item. Many people in the world feel that life has little meaning. They question whether what they believe is true and whether their work has any value. As a Seventh-day Adventist, I have absolutely no doubts about the truth of our message nor the worthwhileness of what I am doing. Every Seventh-day Adventist can be excited by knowing that he is a link in the chain let

down from heaven to save a lost world. What could be more challenging than this?

Second, Ellen White points out that our first responsibility is self-development. In my way of thinking, the Advent message enables a person to reach his full potential spiritually, intellectually, socially, and physically. Adventism puts no ceiling on a person's opportunities to grow up to one's full stature in Christ Jesus as a son or daughter of God.

Third, as a part of all this, I enjoy most the immediacy of a personal relationship that Adventism offers. I never feel alone, because I sense the presence of Christ with me by his Holy Spirit. I never feel uncertain about my salvation, for I have committed my life to the victorious Christ who represents me before the Father. With the pioneers of the past, I enjoy looking to the future, contemplating the day when Jesus shall return, a day that I believe is not far away.

The Future Of Adventism: A Lawyer's Perspective

by Glenn E. Coe

The Seventh-day Adventist church as a truth-seeking religious community can learn from our Anglo-American system of justice which, imperfect though it be, has developed over many centuries time-tested principles of law which seek to ensure that truth will emerge through our judicial process. Some of those principles are, in several respects, applicable to the search for religious truth. They suggest, furthermore, the need for significant changes in the responsibility of church members and of church leaders.

With this in mind, let us take a brief look at three principles of law which are basic to our system of justice.

The first principle is that out of conflict truth will emerge. Obviously, when everyone agrees, trials are not necessary. But when there is disagreement our system of justice assumes that truth will emerge if each side is represented by able and vigorous advocates whose duty it is to present all relevant evidence. In civil cases, the plaintiff attorney might rejoice if his opponent is incompetent, but in criminal cases, the government fears an incompetent defense counsel, not because the government fears losing the trial, which is unlikely, but because a victory over incompetency is no victory at all, but simply grounds for reversal and a new trial with competent counsel. The judicial system recognizes that justice

and truth will most likely emerge if both sides are ably represented.

A second principle is that persons accused of criminal conduct are presumed innocent until proven guilty, and that the party seeking to overcome the presumption of innocence has a heavy burden of proof to carry—proof beyond a reasonable doubt. The government accepts this heavy burden readily, for what it seeks is justice, the acquittal of the innocent as well as the conviction of the guilty.

The third principle is that it is the jury and the jury alone that decides whether the standard of proof has been met. The jury listens to the testimony, examines the relevant documents and evidence, evaluates the opinions of the experts, listens to the arguments of the advocates, and then decides if it has been persuaded beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant, in accordance with the law, is guilty as charged.

Now, how might these principles apply to the search for religious truth? First, controversy. I would not advocate controversy for the sake of controversy. I do not believe, in fact, that a religious community can thrive if it is consumed by controversy; we gain much by dwelling on those aspects of faith which are accepted and commonly believed.

Still we would be deluding ourselves if we thought it possible to have a religious community without controversy. Alvin Kwiram, first president of the Association of Adventist Forums, has said that the person who searches for truth "is not satisfied with glib or simplistic answers. Instead, he searches tirelessly for flaws in the arguments proposed—for weaknesses and inadequacies in the accepted formulations. He tends to focus on the inconsistent elements in a situation, since to him they illustrate that

Glenn Coe, who served as president of AAF from March 1975 to September 1982 is Chief Trial Attorney, Office of the Chief State's Attorney, State of Connecticut.

This article has been adapted from a valedictory presidential address concluding the national conference of the Association of Adventist Forums, September 2-5, 1982.

understanding is incomplete.”¹ This leads to challenge, conflict, controversy; they are necessary in the development of understanding. Controversy, in fact, is a sign of vitality within the community and, as such, is a positive factor.

Again, this is not to suggest that what is commonly believed by the community is void of meaning. In fact, I would like to suggest that what has been traditionally believed by the church ought to enjoy a presumption of validity akin to the presumption of innocence which all citizens enjoy. A presumption in this context recognizes that what has been established and accepted to the satisfaction of many is deserving of some weight. It places the burden of proof upon those who would challenge orthodoxy.

Just as a prosecutor ought to pause before challenging someone whose innocence is presumed, so a person challenging an accepted tenet of a religious community should recognize the presumption of validity the tenet enjoys. Just as a prosecutor carefully sizes up the credibility of his evidence before filing charges, so too, should the challenger of a religious belief weigh carefully the credibility of the theological evidence for and against the belief before challenging it. Just as the presumption of innocence lends stability to society and its members, so the presumption of validity lends stability to a religious community and its members.

When controversy does occur, we must place a high premium on ensuring that truth will emerge in the end. That is why effective advocacy lies at the very core of our judicial system. By analogy with this, the church must acknowledge the need for articulate advocates who can speak freely concerning doctrinal controversy, and it must give them access to all relevant and pertinent documents and sources.

My plea is not for the vicious, slashing, intimidating style often associated with trial lawyers, but rather for the principle of close, probing examination. The role of

advocate is so honored by our courts that lawyers enjoy immunity concerning what they say in the courtroom, so that fears of civil retaliation will in no way restrain their advocacy. So, too, those who fulfill the role of the responsible advocate in a church community should not be subject to reprisals. What they do is a necessary service for the church; it is indispensable to a serious search for truth.

What about the principle of law imposing a standard or burden of proof? How might that principle be applied to the search for religious truth? It must first be recognized that there are several standards of proof. Proof beyond a reasonable doubt is the highest, the most demanding to meet, and is used in criminal cases where a person's life or liberty is at stake. This standard of proof recognizes that there are different kinds of doubt. Some are reasonable and some are not. The term “reasonable doubt” means what it says—a doubt for which you can assign and give a reason. It is not doubt based on speculation, surmise, or conjecture, but one that arises from the evidence or the lack of evidence. The government is not required to prove guilt beyond all doubt or to a mathematical certitude, for that is rarely if ever attainable in life. The law requires only that the proof be beyond all reasonable doubt.

The least demanding standard—used in most civil cases—is proof by a preponderance of the evidence. It does not refer to volume of evidence, but to that quality of evidence necessary to lead a jury to determine that the existence of the contested fact is more probable than its non-existence. As one court put it:

The term “probability” denotes an element of doubt or uncertainty and recognizes that where there are two choices, it is not necessary that the jury be absolutely certain or doubtless, but that it is sufficient if the choice selected is more probable than the choice rejected.²

Lawyers frequently illustrate this abstract principle by referring to the scales of justice. The side that is the least bit weightier is the side that prevails under this standard of proof even though there may be reasonable doubt on both sides of the case.

There is also an intermediate standard of proof—proof by clear, strong, and convincing evidence. This standard is used in civil cases where there is thought to be special danger of deception: suits to establish the terms of a lost will; suits to set aside, reform, or modify a written contract on grounds of fraud, mistake, or incompleteness; and suits in paternity actions. The proof in such cases cannot be one of mere probability; the evidence must show high probability for the proof to be clear, strong, and convincing.

As I reflect on my personal religious beliefs, I find myself applying different standards of proof to different beliefs. Belief in the existence of God, for instance, I find satisfied by a preponderance of the evidence. That minimal standard strikes me as allowing the proper mix of reason and faith, since the exercise of faith is itself an exercise of reason.

Having been persuaded of the probability of God's existence, I find myself employing a higher standard of proof for less fundamental religious affirmations. It seems to me that is what Paul does in Romans 14 where he describes two brothers in the church who have diametrically opposed convictions about the sinfulness of eating certain foods. The strong brother believes he can eat anything; the brother who is "weak in faith"³ believes he can eat only certain foods.

Paul in verse 14, makes it very clear that he identifies with the strong brother. "I know and am persuaded in the Lord Jesus that nothing is unclean in itself; but," he says, "it is unclean for any one who thinks it unclean." Later on, in verse 23, Paul says: "he who has doubts is condemned, if he

eats." Why? "because he does not act from faith." In other words, if you are not convinced beyond all reasonable doubt that it is all right to eat certain foods, then don't eat them, because to do so is to violate your belief, or your faith, and that is sin, says Paul, "for whatever does not proceed from faith is sin." On the other hand, if you are personally persuaded beyond all reasonable doubt that the food is clean, then by all means eat and enjoy, for you can do so with a clear conscience, provided you do not become a stumbling block to your weaker brother. I happen to believe that much of what makes up the particulars of one's faith ought to satisfy such a standard of proof.

Now what about that intermediate standard of proof—proof by clear, strong, and convincing evidence which is applied in cases where there is a special danger of deception. As one who accepts Scripture, canonical Scripture, as embodying the terms of my covenant with God, I would require anyone who claims unique or special inspiration to interpret Scripture to satisfy this standard of proof. Their claims must be supported by evidence that is clear, strong, and convincing. I would further think that anyone who respected the primacy of Scripture would want to be measured by such an exacting standard.

I would add that even if a person satisfies such a standard of proof, everything said by the prophet or messenger is not automatically binding on the believer. Authority in matters of spiritual truth flows more from the innate persuasiveness of the message presented than from claims to inspiration based only on extraordinary physical manifestations. The words of a prophet, I suggest, carry a presumption of validity, but it is a presumption which is rebuttable.

It is not my purpose to argue what standard of proof ought to be applied by everyone to particular beliefs. Rather, I would urge that, as a lawyer always considers what standard of proof is applicable in a given case, so too should the searcher for religious truth ask at the outset what stan-

dard of proof he will apply to a given issue.

This brings me to the last, and perhaps the most important, analogy to be drawn. This concerns who it is that decides and resolves conflicting claims. In our judicial system, it is the jury; in our church, we say, it is the members. If this is so, it implies several things that need to be openly acknowledged.

In our judicial system practically everything revolves around the recognition that a jury will ultimately render a verdict. This means, among other things, that in a trial all relevant and material evidence and documents are brought before the jury to enable it to perform its task of deciding the truth.

Similarly, a church that truly recognizes its membership as the ultimate deciders of truth, must allow all relevant and material information to be brought before the membership for them to weigh, and this is particularly true when there is a bona-fide controversy. In a criminal case, evidence is not ruled inadmissible merely because it conflicts with the presumption of innocence, for if that were so there would never be convictions. Likewise in a religious community, evidence should not be kept from the membership merely because it is inconsistent with what church leadership believes to be the commonly held tenets of the church. Suffice it to say that a trial judge would be severely criticised by an appellate court if the judge stated in advance what he thought the verdict should be and then admitted only that evidence which was consistent with his pre-stated views.

In a trial experts in a field requiring specialized knowledge may give opinion testimony. But it remains for the jury to determine what weight and credence their testimony has. The same should be true in the church. Special training does not give one the right to arrogate to oneself the proper function and role of the members of the church. My experience with juries has, for the most part, reaffirmed my confidence

in the good judgement of the common man and woman. The vast majority of jurors are able to assimilate complex testimony and documents.

I am only a little less sanguine about the good judgement of the members in the pew, and that is less their fault than the fault of others. For too long, church members have been conditioned to accept the judgement of others. Our members need to be re-educated as to their proper responsibilities and duties. When that is accomplished, I am confident that they will be able to evaluate arguments and conflicting opinions, including the conflicting opinions of experts.

I recognize that it is proper for leadership to defend what the church has historically believed and preached; however, church leaders must come to recognize that their defense is an effort of persuasion, not of dictation. The persuasion must flow from the force of evidence, not from their administrative power to enforce conformity. Church leaders must also recognize and accept that members may decide to reject the views of leadership. This should not be viewed necessarily as a defeat, but very possibly as God's special leading at that particular time.

Those who in fact make the decision should have the attributes of a jury. That is to say, a jury composed of employees or close associates of the defendant or the prosecutor is hardly a fair, impartial, or objective jury. It is a stacked jury, and verdicts given by such a jury are meaningless and at variance with a system of justice. If the church in General Conference assembled is to be the jury that decides the formal, publicly-stated beliefs of the church, then let it be so composed as to give integrity to, and confidence in, its decisions. Leadership should actively promote this, if they genuinely believe that the church is its members and its members the church. To do otherwise reflects a lack of faith in the members of the church. The integrity of the process is what gives legitimacy to our system of justice, and the same should be true of our church.

In another sense, church leadership must recognize that the individual member is his own jury with ultimate responsibility to define his own personal faith. The apostle Paul recognized that. As previously noted, Paul, in Romans 14:14, speaking about food offered to idols,⁴ says: "I know and am persuaded in the Lord Jesus that nothing is unclean in itself." This statement of personal belief is all the more remarkable when you realize that Paul was openly disagreeing with a doctrinal position adopted by the church at the Council of Jerusalem a few years before. You can read the account of the deliberations and decision of the Jerusalem Council in Acts 15. In effect, Paul is saying to church leaders: "You have not persuaded me. You have not carried your burden of proof that it is sinful to eat food offered to idols so far as I, Paul, am concerned; on the contrary, 'I know and am persuaded in the Lord Jesus that nothing is unclean in itself.' This is my verdict—my personal conviction."

The awareness of the responsibility of each individual to settle matters of faith must not be grudgingly recognized, but must be preached, promoted, encouraged, and respected by church leaders. It should be recognized as basic to a meaningful religious faith.

I believe that the Adventist church that I envision will find itself filling up with members excited by the beliefs they have

discovered for themselves. I have seen this happen to people with whom I have studied the Bible. I begin every Bible study with Romans 14, for it reminds me to respect the individual's responsibility to determine for himself what truths will make up his faith. To see people decide to join our church because they have been personally persuaded from Scripture is, indeed, a great joy. A searching faith can at the same time be a sharing faith.

I also believe that a prime reason for the large exodus of so many from our church is that they have never caught the excitement of personal discovery. Everything was pre-packaged and their only decision was to accept or reject the package. This can change if we become what we ought to be—as willing to subject our beliefs to the mind of man as God is willing to be discovered by human minds.

There has been too much hurt and trauma within our schools and congregations; there is a desperate need for healing within our church: healing that flows from a profound respect for one another, that recognizes that each is engaged in a genuine, sincere, and earnest search for truth. Healing takes place when it is recognized that that process is, in fact, desirable and does, in fact, contribute to the health and vibrancy of the church. This search for the truth is not a detriment; it is an asset. It is, we can all hope, the future of the Adventist church.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Alvin L. Kwiram. "On Intellectuals." (Unpublished manuscript prepared for the Committee on How to Reach the Educated of the Association of Adventist Forums and submitted to the General Conference Committee on How to Reach the Educated, 1977, p. 2.)

2. Norton V. Futrell, 149 Cal.App.2d 586, 308 P.2d 887, 891 (1957).

3. The SDA Bible Commentary Vol. 6, p. 634 describes the brother "weak in faith," as . . . one who has but a limited grasp of the principles of righteousness. He is eager to be saved and is willing to do whatever he believes is required of him. But in the immaturity of his Christian experience, and

probably also as the result of former education and belief, he attempts to make his salvation more certain by the observance of certain rules and regulations that are in reality not binding upon him. To him these regulations assume great importance. He regards them as absolutely binding upon him for salvation, and he is distressed and confused when he sees other Christians about him, especially those who seem to be more experienced, who do not share his scruples.

4. See SPECTRUM, Vol. 11, No. 3, where John Brunt suggests that Paul's stand extended to all foods and not just those offered to idols.

Special Section: Ways to Read the Bible

The Bible As Visionary Power

by Otilie Stafford

The Bible . . . is not a story-book or an epic poem; but it is much closer to being a work of literature than it is to being a work of history or doctrine, and the kind of mental response that we bring to poetry has to be in the forefront of our understanding of it.¹

—Northrop Frye

Northrop Frye's repeated statements relating the Bible to a reality of the imagination that is vast—stretching through time and space to include the whole history of the world and the prophetic soul dreaming on things to come—have influenced teachers of biblical literature, both directly and through other writers.² Ever since his early work on Blake, everything that Frye has written has pointed forward to a major work dealing with biblical literature. He has always written of the Bible as the central myth of the Western World, and “the supreme example of the way that myths can, under certain social pressures, stick together to make up a mythology.”³

Now that the first volume of his work dealing with the Bible, *The Great Code*,⁴ has appeared to enthusiastic critical applause, the importance of Frye's application of literary theory to biblical study cannot be

ignored. The title of his book echoes William Blake: “The Old and New Testaments are the Great Code of Art.” And Frye is very much concerned with the necessity of understanding the Bible in order to understand the arts of the Western World. But he is also insistent that the Bible is itself a unified work, narrative and poetic in its forms, given coherence by its patterns of imagery, structure, and rhetoric. This is an important change from the more common literary approach to the Bible, that sees it as a collection of separate works, an anthology of Near Eastern literature. Frye's approach makes possible not only a coherent reading of Scripture, but also a new approach to the ways in which biblical literature acts as a magnet drawing to itself the secular literature of our culture.

Frye's background qualifies him for such a study. After graduating from the Honours Course in Philosophy and English at the University of Toronto, he took three years of theology at Emmanuel College, and was ordained by the United Church of Canada in 1936. Although he decided that his true vocation lay in literary study and went on to do graduate work at Oxford, his theological training has affected his approach to literature, just as his critical theories have affected his reading of the Bible. *The Anatomy of Criticism* (1957) led to his recognition as “the most able systematizer of his time.” The *Anatomy's* structure of criticism initially was intended to organize ways of looking at literature, but eventually led to educational theory, and finally (in *The Critical Path* in

Otilie Stafford is chairman of the department of English and director of the adult degree program at Atlantic Union College.

1971) to approaches to social and political action.

This broadening of Frye's concerns is logical. He sees the purpose of all humanistic study, and ultimately of life itself, as an attempt to find vaster and more creative structures of the imagination in order to shape life by them. And he sees the Bible, sitting in the middle of all such structures, as the single most important object of humanistic study, particularly of literary study. So the Bible is central to the effort to grasp life through the imagination without abstracting it. Its visionary power is its secret, and its aim is to transform the society. The aim of myth is to make the seemingly impossible probable. The work of literature is to reshape experience.

The Bible's power to organize man's vision of his world rises out of its being an organized world of typology. It is the only form which incorporates all the structures of archetypes that can extend over time and space and over all orders of reality, visible and invisible. Everything in the Bible becomes mythically significant as it is seen within these structures. The universal is seen in every event recorded; "the truth is inside its structure, not outside."⁵

Inside the structure are symbols that unify all existent worlds: the divine world of God, the human world of the Son of Man, the animal world of the sheepfold, the vegetable world of vine and garden, the mineral world of the cornerstone. All are caught up in a movement with a quest as its theme: the search for an ideal world where injustice and suffering have passed away. The quest for such a possible but not present world is a theme found in all literatures. In the Bible it shapes the movement from Garden to Holy City, as well as individual expressions within it.

The *Pilgrim Psalter* (Psalms 120–134), for example, moves from isolation and violence to community and holiness. The Joseph epic

ends in reunited brotherhood after danger, violence, and distress. A similar structure is found in the book of Ruth and an ironic form in the book of Jonah.

Particularly in the book of Job—a kind of Bible in miniature—the reader moves from

“The Bible grasps life through the imagination . . . Its visionary power is its secret and its aim is to transform the society.”

despair at the separation of experience from meaning, the agonizing search for God and His answers, to the joyous vision of the whole creation filled with God's presence. These themes not only relate Job to the whole movement of the Bible, and to other works within that larger structure, but also relate it to Dante's *The Divine Comedy*, Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound*, Frost's *The Masque of Reason*, Milton's *Samson Agonistes*, Dillord's *Holy the Firm*, and any number of the widely-ranging footnotes to the book of Job in world literature. They are also related, of course, to personal tragedies in individual lives, and to society's distress recorded in the daily papers.

Frye sees the quest for lost identity, the search for the long-lost home, the desire for reconciliation and harmony as the theme of almost all literature and most of the experiences of life. It is found in Yeats' "Sailing to Byzantium" with its golden birds in golden trees singing of what is past and passing and to come, in Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*, with its movement from the pastoral world to the pearl gates and the jewels of the glowing streets, in Thoreau's vision of a brighter day to dawn, and in all the Utopias where the life of nature and reason are lived in communities.

Both in reading and understanding the Bible and in living a responsible life, it is the imagination that grasps and holds a vision of a possible world. It is the will that trans-

forms that vision into a goal for action. The relationship to belief and faith is obvious. For the Christian, who believes that revelation gives the key to the meaning of life and the individual must respond, Frye's Bible-centered organizations have a particular value.

What does such an approach do to the study of the Bible? First of all, it sees the Bible as a unity in a way doctrinal and historical approaches cannot. It is an epic with God as the hero. It is a romance, a quest for a lost society that moves from Genesis to Revelation. It is a progress from despair to joy, from chaos to order, from innocence to hard-won illumination, from isolation to community, from violence to holiness.

If one views the movement from creation to apocalypse as a movement from chaos to order, then the stories of Jesus are central to the typology of the Bible and hence of all of the experiences in life and in literature. He is the unifying symbol for all existence. His death and resurrection lead us through the deepest chaos into the most complete re-establishing of order. The quest for the lost identity has its central expression here, and the effort "to regain to know God aright" concentrates on the life of Christ. Here archetypal literary criticism and theology are in complete agreement.

Furthermore, the unity of the Bible is not a static one, according to such an approach. There is a continual shaping of the typological coherence as book after book is written. The Old Testament is found in the New in its images and in the echoing suggestion of repeated narrative. The visionary structure of any part of the Bible enlarges upon the visions of the past. Inspiration works in part through this process.

The second benefit of Frye's approach to the Bible is the typology it gives us to relate to other works of literature and to the arts and social sciences as well. This implies an

educational significance also. It would be possible to use Frye's structures, centered in the Bible, as a way of organizing the study of other subjects. He talks of a gigantic cycle from creation to apocalypse as containing three other cyclical movements: individual, from birth to salvation; sexual, from Adam and Eve to the apocalyptic wedding; social, from the giving of the law to the establishment of the renewed society. One could incorporate most areas of theology, psychology, history and political science, behavioral science, as well as the arts that express them, within these structures. This is hardly what Adventist educators think of when they talk of Bible-centered curriculums, but such an organization of study might be less contrived and more capacious than some of our efforts have been.

Frye recognizes the educational implications of his theories. He says the Bible's importance as the central myth means that it "should be taught so early and so thoroughly that it sinks straight to the bottom of the mind, where everything that comes along later can settle on it." Obviously, the manner of reading needed is not the memory-verse method. It is the power of the character and the story and the language that the imagination responds to. It is a *visionary* power.

The third advantage in approaching the Bible as a texture of myth relates it immediately to the concerns, anxieties, and hopes of life. Frye is trying to embrace the entire conceptual world and to use it to create personal vision. Literature is important as verbal power; but even more important, it is a way of getting at an understanding of life itself. Placing the Bible at the center of such an endeavor organizes an understanding of life around it, rather than demanding a withdrawal from life to study it. If the Christian's goal is to see life whole,

as well as the Bible whole, his ability to relate the vast movement of symbols in the Bible to the events of his life might make his vision more coherent. It might help to place order on the chaos of daily haphazardness. But to grasp a vision of holiness and to use it to transform the world demands an educated imagination—not usually one of the concerns of Adventist schools and colleges.

For it is only the imagination that can see in Revelation, for example, not only a unified and carefully constructed literary form, but a final expansive bringing together of the symbolic structures that run through the Bible. The historical critic sees Revelation's strange breasts as a part of an Old Testament mythology known throughout the Middle Eastern world. The doctrinal reading of Revelation dissects, graphs, defines. The archetypal reading of the grand apocalypse moves from the factual world of geographically located cities to a geography filled with unreal beasts, symbolic women, and polarized cities, where all humanity is wound on to two spools of good and evil.

In the perfect city is gathered the perfect society. As evil deepens in the earthly society portrayed in the Apocalypse, the contrast with goodness is heightened. Gradually the society governed by the beast becomes unnatural, ghastly, filled with groans and the sound of weeping. Everything is lurid. And like the nightmare world it has become, the natural world turns grotesque: insects fill the air, water is blood, the heavens speak of doom, leaders of the society think only of warfare. Horror grows until God's people are called to come out of the dreadful night and the violence of Babylon. Then the contrasting society is pictured. Groaning and weeping are replaced by song; messages of doom followed by shouts of praise; suffering and violence end and the splendid city is filled with order and love.

The symbol of this love is the apocalyptic

wedding. The first wedding of Adam and Eve is the background against which this final biblical wedding occurs. This redeemed love, however, unlike that of Adam and Eve, is a result of suffering—that of the Lamb and that of the martyrs. Evil and violence caused the suffering, but holiness and harmony result from it. The worship of the Lamb rises out of the memory of violence. The entire Bible and all of human experience emerge from the chaos they were tossed into after the first wedding in the innocence of Eden.

“The Christian’s chief responsibility is to become a visionary and revolutionary . . . the road to reformation runs through the language of the imagination.”

And Eden is deliberately recalled. The tree of life and the throne of God remind the redeemed society of where it began. But they now appear in a setting not of the familiar natural world where everything was begotten, born, and died, but in the enduring world of jewels and gold, lifted out of the temporal. Here there is not even a sun to mark the daily movement of time. With everything else that brought suffering and death, time itself has been wiped out.

Since the finishing of the creation, the number seven has symbolized completion. Here in the Apocalypse, with the fulfillment of the promises to the seven churches (all organized in packages of seven), the final completion is achieved. Even the phrases used in the early messages to the churches are repeated to signal the finish of both rewards and condemnations. Division is now also finished, and the wedding of the redeemed and the Lamb symbolizes the return of the world to oneness. Separation, individual isolation, conflict, contention, and the anxiety and hostility they caused,

which have been themes throughout the Bible, end with the destruction of evil.

Color imagery also organizes the movement of the book through the separation of good from evil and the final resolution of history. The first vision seen by John, with its gold candlesticks, God's white hair like wool and sun-like countenance, begins the patterns of white and gold identified with holiness. But the feet that burn and the eyes of flame begin patterns of fiery red that end with the destruction of wickedness. At the end of the book, when the images of darkness and night are entirely outside the Holy City, the flaming anger of God destroys evil for the final time, and what remains are the colors of perfection: white, gold, the rainbow, shining splendor.

As Gros Louis suggests,⁶ any attempt to portray unmodified evil or unstained good strains the limits of language and brings the imagination to a point beyond which it does not know how to go. But the vision of a society centered in holiness, unified by brotherhood, caught up in universal praise

of the Creator and Redeemer, works powerfully. Here is the homeland of the imagination. It is with the entire memory of biblical imagery and of human history filled with suffering and searching that the homesick wanderer reads John's words: "Even so, come, Lord Jesus."

Beyond the point where history as we know it ends, the archetypal structures of the Bible do not take us. Neither do they take us back to the universe that existed before the opening words of Genesis. But they do give us structures to organize personal and social history. And the unified vision of unspoiled goodness at the beginning of history and of splendid holiness at its end moves us, or should move us, toward a better world.

To be so moved is, for Frye, the purpose of all biblical and literary experience. It is to create a vision in the reader's mind, so that his will can freely choose to transform the world in every way he is able. The Christian's chief responsibility is to become a visionary and a revolutionary. To paraphrase Frye, the road to reformation runs through the language of the imagination.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Northrop Frye. *The Critical Path: An Essay on the Social Context of Literary Criticism* (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1971), p. 116.

2. See, for example, Leland Ryken's *The Literature of the Bible* (Wheaton, Illinois: Zondervan Publishing House, 1974), and Leonard Thompson's *Introducing Biblical Literature* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1978).

3. *The Secular Scripture: A Study of the Structure of*

Romance. (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press), p. 14.

4. New York and London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1982.

5. *The Great Code*, p. 46.

6. Kenneth R. R. Gros Louis, "Revelation," in *Literary Interpretations of Biblical Narratives* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1974), p. 345.

A Parable of Jesus as a Clue to Biblical Interpretation

by John C. Brunt

Why do we need a Matthew, a Mark, a Luke, and a John, a Paul, and all the writers who have borne testimony in regard to the life and ministry of the Saviour? Why could not one of the disciples have given us a connected account of Christ's earthly life? Why does one writer bring in points that another does not mention? Why, if these points are essential, did not all the writers mention them?—It is because the minds of men differ. Not all comprehend things in exactly the same way. Certain Scripture truths appeal much more strongly to the minds of some than others.¹

—Ellen G. White

One important way to appreciate the distinctiveness of each book in Scripture is to study the way the Bible was formed. Can this approach to the Bible—often called the “historical-critical method”—be used by Bible students who hold a conservative view of scriptural inspiration? One way to decide is to look at a test case, the parable of the wicked tenants, and see how that parable was treated differently in Mark, Matthew,

and Luke. Analysis of the distinctive editing by gospel writers (technically called redaction criticism) is one example of the historical-critical method.

Before studying how the editing of that parable differs from gospel to gospel, it is helpful to remember that analysis of editing builds upon the work of other analysts of Scripture who focused on the sources of the gospels (source criticism) and others who focused on the forms in which passages in Scripture were fashioned (form criticism).

Analysts of the sources of the gospels recognized that the synoptic gospels are interrelated in a way that suggests direct literary dependence of some kind.² Although various hypotheses to explain the data were advanced as long as 200 years ago, the fundamental work that led to the present near-consensus among New Testament scholars was carried out in the nineteenth century by Lachmann, Wilke, Weisse, and Holtzmann and was refined by Streeter in the early 1920's. The basic conclusions of source analysts is that Mark was the first gospel to be written. They think Matthew and Luke each made independent use of Mark and that Matthew and Luke also used another non-extant source made up primarily of sayings material (represented by the symbol “Q”), in addition to their own unique material. Thus Matthew and Luke

John C. Brunt, is professor of New Testament studies at Walla Walla College and author of *A Day for Healing: The Meaning of Jesus' Sabbath Miracles*.

are both made up of material from Mark and Q, in addition to their own unique material.

The early source analysts who reached these conclusions were liberal scholars who attached certain theological baggage to their source-critical views that is no longer accepted by anyone today. They believed that in Mark they had found the simple historical Jesus who taught the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God and that it was unadulterated with the theological aberrations found in the later, less trustworthy gospels. This liberal theological baggage, however, neither grew out of the basic data from which their conclusions about source were drawn, nor negated the value of those conclusions.

“The application of form-critical methodology is further evidence that the early Christians did not cease the observance of Sabbath, but observed it in a way that differed from that of their Jewish neighbors.”

Most of today’s analysts of editing in the Bible accept that the writers of later gospels depended on gospels written earlier and that Mark was written first.³ Indeed, these conclusions about sources are crucial to the work of those going on to studying editing. However, editorial analysts do not see the evangelists using courses in the wooden manner that was often described by earlier analysts of sources.

While source analysis spoke to the problem of synoptic relationships, it did nothing to address questions about the gospel material before the existence of the written sources. After World War I, form analysts—such as Schmidt, Dibelius, Bultmann, and Taylor, borrowing methods developed in the study of oral folk materials and already applied to the Old Testament—turned their attention to the period of oral transmission previous to the written gospels.

The basic assumptions and conclusions of form analysis as applied to the gospels were:⁴

1. The stories about and sayings of Jesus were transmitted orally before they were written down.

2. These stories and sayings were circulated separately in independent units.

3. During the stage of oral transmission the material assumed certain fixed forms.

4. These forms can be linked to and arose from particular life-situations within the church.

5. The material served the needs of the church, and the church played a very creative role in its formation and transmission—thus the material often tells us much about the church and little, if anything, about Jesus.

6. The relative age and historical value of traditional material can be determined by the application of certain criteria.

7. The gospel writers were primarily collectors who pieced together various oral traditions and already written materials. Again, as was the case in the analysis of sources, the “liberal” conclusions in the last part of this list are by no means necessitated by the insights of the first part. It is altogether possible to agree that the gospel material served the needs of the early church, and was transmitted orally in certain fixed forms that are now identifiable within the gospels, without concluding that the church either was careless with the tradition or simply created it.

For example, in a separate study⁵ I have found form analysis useful in showing that Jesus’ Sabbath healing miracles were preserved by the church and recounted by the gospel writers to meet a certain need—that of justifying the church’s different manner of observing Sabbath. Indeed, these stories contain common ingredients that almost qualify them as a distinctive sub-form. The issue behind the stories appears to be the manner of Sabbath observance. These

stories justify an approach to Sabbath observance among Christians that differs from that of Jews by appealing to the example of Jesus. Thus the result of the application of form-critical methodology is further evidence that the early Christians did not cease the observance of Sabbath, but observed it in a way that differed from that of their Jewish neighbors.

Editorial analysis (or redaction criticism) grew up in the 1950's and 1960's and is associated with the names Perrin,⁶ Bornkamm,⁷ Conzelmann,⁸ and Marxsen.⁹ It assumes the basic conclusions of form analysis, but reacts sharply against number seven above. It considers the gospel writers to have become creative theologians who arranged and modified their material from particular theological perspectives to address a new life-situation in their own community. Therefore, editorial analysts concentrate not on the sources or traditions that stand behind the gospels, but on the way that the gospel writer uses both traditional material and his own contributions to form a new literary creation.

The methodology of editorial analysis involves careful observation of the text to determine how the author has collected, arranged, and modified his material in order to understand what he was trying to communicate. This includes careful comparison of the author's work with his sources whenever they are extant (as is the case with Matthew and Luke who used Mark). But even when sources are not extant, the analyst of editing in the gospels, by careful observation of the author's style, emphases, and use of language, attempts to distinguish the already existing tradition from the editing contributed by the author of the gospel.

Once again, the major analysts of editing work within a liberal tradition, which sees a very creative role for both the church in its transmission of the oral tradition and for the evangelists. Thus Norman Perrin approves of R. H. Lightfoot's conclusion that the gospels yield "only a whisper of Jesus'

voice."¹⁰ Perrin goes on to say that "a Gospel does not portray the history of the ministry of Jesus from A.D. 27–30, or whatever the dates may actually have been, but the history of Christian experience in any and every age."¹¹

“Source analysts say that Mark was the first gospel to be written.”

But these liberal conclusions are not inherent in the approach itself. The essential element in this way of studying the Bible is merely the careful attention to the distinctiveness of each writer. This appreciation of each author's unique contribution is entirely in keeping with God's purpose in communicating His message to us through various individuals. Ellen White, in the opening quotation of this essay, applauded the inclusion of many gospels in the canon "because the minds of men differ."

The Parable of the Wicked Tenants
 Mark 12:1–12; Matthew 21:33–46;
 Luke 20:9–19

All three of the synoptic evangelists include this parable at the same point in Jesus' ministry.¹² It is near the beginning of the Passion Week, and Jesus' opponents are asking him a series of controversial questions designed to trick him. Not only is this basic ordering of events the same in the three gospels, but the wording is so much the same at many points that dependence of one gospel author on another seems to be the only satisfactory explanation. It is even easier to recognize dependence when we realize that Jesus probably told the parable in Aramaic and the gospels are written in Greek. It is not possible within the scope of this paper to present the evidence for writers of later gospels depending on gospels written earlier and the gospel of Mark

being written first. But on the basis of both order and language, it is best to assume that all three gospels are narrating the same event—that Mark’s account is first, and that Matthew and Luke both had Mark’s account in front of them when they wrote.

But even though it appears certain that all three evangelists are narrating the same event (it is hard to imagine Jesus telling it three different times in the same context), there are unmistakable differences in detail in the three accounts. In all three an absentee owner first sends servants and, finally, a son to the tenants to receive fruit. But the details, for example, of the sending of the servants differ, as the following outline shows.

country. The details of the vineyard (hedge, winepress, tower, etc.) clearly connect it with Isaiah 5:2, the song of the vineyard, and show that the vineyard is intended to represent Israel (see Isaiah 5:7).

If the vineyard is Israel, the owner must represent God and the servants could hardly be other than the prophets sent to Israel, as Mark 12:5b makes explicit. Thus the parable has undeniable allegorical elements. This becomes even more clear with the reference to the son in verse 6. The designation “beloved” clearly shows that the son is Jesus. After unsuccessful attempts through the prophets to call the tenants of the vineyard to accept their responsibility, God finally sends his own son, who is killed.¹³

<i>Matthew</i>	<i>Mark</i>	<i>Luke</i>
A group of servants sent. Some beaten, some killed, some stoned.	One servant sent who is beaten.	One servant sent who is beaten.
A larger group sent with the same results.	Another servant sent who is wounded in the head.	Another servant sent who is beaten.
Son sent who is killed.	Another servant sent who is killed.	Another servant sent who is wounded and cast out.
	Many others sent who are beaten and killed.	Son sent who is killed.
	Son sent who is killed.	

Do these differences have meaning? What follows is a brief and oversimplified analysis of editorial shaping of the parable that looks first at the Markan version, then examines, in turn, the Matthean and Lukan accounts.

The Markan Version

This parable appears to be addressed to the chief priests, scribes, and elders, since Jesus tells it immediately following His answer to a question about authority put to him by these three groups. The parable concerns a man who planted a vineyard, let it out to tenants, and went to another

Following the basic story, Jesus asks a rhetorical question (What will the owner of the vineyard do?), which he answers himself by declaring that the tenants will be destroyed and the vineyard given to others. Presumably, this suggests that the Christian church assumes the role once filled by Israel, but Mark does not make this explicit. Since the parable is addressed to the chief priests, scribes, and elders, Mark may only be thinking of the rejection of the Jewish leaders.

Jesus concludes with a reference to Psalm 118 and compares his ministry with the stone that the builders rejected, a motif that became very important in early Christianity (see Acts 4:11; I Peter 2:4–7). Mark con-

cludes by showing that the Jewish leaders got the point of the parable (they perceived that he told it against them) and would have arrested Jesus except for their fear of the crowd. The focus of attention in this Markan version is the conflict between Jesus and his opponents and the significance of this conflict for the history of salvation. The central elements are the Son, his rejection by the Jewish leaders, and their resulting loss of the vineyard. Also of special significance in the story is the surprising element of the owner's patience. Although the tenants eventually lose the vineyard, the owner's patience goes to lengths that would hardly have been expected from any first-century absentee landlord. Although these central elements remain clear in the other two accounts, different facets of the picture are emphasized.

The Matthean Account

A number of minor variations of arrangement and detail are apparent in Matthew.

1. Jesus' previous encounter is with the chief priests and elders, not the scribes. Carlston suggests that this is because scribes are more positive for Matthew,¹⁴ but there are too many exceptions for this to be convincing.

2. Matthew includes two additional parables along with this one. The parable of the two sons precedes it, and the parable of the wedding garment follows it. The former helps emphasize Israel's recalcitrance and ties it with Israel's rejection of John the Baptist, whose authority has been the subject of the previous encounter. Thus Israel is seen to have rejected first John the Baptist, then Jesus.

3. It is not simply a man, but a "householder" who plants the vineyard. This is a favorite term for Matthew (he uses it seven times while Mark uses it but once).

4. In verse 34 Matthew mentions that the

servants were sent when the "season of fruit" drew near. In Mark there is only one incidental reference to fruit in the story. It is parallel to this verse where it is said that the owner sent the servant to get some fruit. But for the Matthew the concept of "fruit" is crucial to the story. Here the servants go at the season of fruit to get some fruit. In verse 41 the vineyard is given to other tenants who will *give the owner fruits*, and in verse 43 the kingdom is taken away and given to a nation that will *bear fruit*. Thus the concept of bearing fruit, only incidental in Mark, is strongly emphasized in Matthew in a way that is characteristic for him (cf. 3:8–10; 7:15–19; 13:8, 23, 26). The term fruit appears 19 times in Matthew and only five times in Mark.

5. The grouping of the servants is different (see parallels and differences outlined above). Virtually all commentators point out that Matthew is probably thinking of the former and latter prophets with his two groups of servants. This makes the reference to Israel more explicit.

6. In verse 39 the order of events has been reversed. Instead of the son being killed and cast out, he is first cast out and then killed. This heightens the allegorical reference to Jesus, by pointing to His crucifixion outside the city (cf. Heb. 13:12).

7. In verses 40 and 41, the rhetorical question has become an actual question that is answered by Jesus' opponents, rather than by Jesus himself. This heightens the sense of controversy and has the opponents condemn themselves.

8. The saying of Jesus in verse 43 is added. This saying makes much more explicit the fact that the Christian church assumes the role once played by Israel and makes the role dependent on bearing fruit.

When all these variations are taken together, the parable does have a somewhat different thrust than it does in Mark. The specific conflict between Jesus and his opponents is made more direct and dramatic. There is also a more explicit corporate or ecclesiological emphasis. The Christian

church is the new Israel that now accepts responsibility for bearing fruit, and as Carlston¹⁵ has shown, this latter concept adds an emphasis not present in Mark. Now the church can only possess the kingdom if it bears fruit. The parable of the wedding garment that follows connects with this emphasis and shows that even the new recipients of the kingdom cannot presume on God's grace. Matthew is showing that the kingdom is only for fruit-bearers. As Carlston says of Matthew's account of our parable:

The parable could be understood to reflect a regular principle in the divine economy: just as God has turned from the Jews to the Gentiles, so he will always turn from those who do not produce "fruit" to those who do. This seems to be Matthew's meaning, unknown to Mark and probably unthinkable for most Christians ever since.¹⁶

The Lukan Account

Several of the specific changes in Luke's account reflect stylistic changes that are typical of Luke, but there is a somewhat different theological focus as well. Among the variations are the following:

1. Luke specifically mentions that the parable is addressed to the "people." In both Luke and Mark, the Jewish leaders are contrasted with the people. The leaders oppose Jesus while the people are receptive. But only Luke addresses the story to the people, perhaps beginning already to set the tone for a more individualistic emphasis where not only the Jewish leaders, but the hearers or the people are to see the significance of the story for them ("people" is a favorite term for Luke; he uses it 37 times).

2. Luke omits the extended mention of the details of Isaiah 5. For him the connec-

tion between the vineyard and Israel is far less important than for Matthew or Mark.

3. Luke adds the detail that the owner went to another country "for a long time." Many interpreters have seen this as a subtle reference to the delay of Christ's Second Coming, but Luke's two other uses of the identical expression (8:27 and 23:8) are not allegorical, and even if this one is, it is far too subtle to be proven.

4. The ordering of the servants is different. Luke demonstrates a greater sense of style. There is an ascending crescendo of ill treatment of the three servants, and the dramatic climax is reached with the son, who is the first to be killed.

5. In verse 13, the owner, instead of making the statement "they will respect my son" before sending him, adds "*it may be they will respect him.*" Carlston¹⁷ suggests that Luke's sensibility is offended by the owner's apparently mistaken conviction, since the owner represents God, who cannot be mistaken.

6. Again, as in Matthew, the son is cast out before being put to death. Luke's purpose is undoubtedly the same as Matthew's at this point (note that this is the only point where Matthew and Luke agree against Mark. They probably make the change independently for the same reason).

7. In verse 16 the people respond to the parable by saying, "God forbid." Thus the focus is on the people's relationship to the story.

8. Luke omits the last part of the quote from Psalm 118 and adds the saying of Jesus in verse 18: "Everyone who falls on that stone will be broken to pieces." This focuses the attention on the individual hearer's response to Jesus, the rejected stone.

When taken together these changes again reflect a somewhat different thrust for the parable. There is hardly any emphasis on Israel's fate, or on the corporate church. Instead Luke wants to show his readers, the "people," that they are each individually judged on the basis of their response to Jesus. Each individual is confronted with the

decision that determines his or her destiny, the decision to accept or reject Jesus.

Although the story has the same overall message in all three of the synoptics, there is clearly a difference in emphasis. Mark emphasizes the role of Jesus in the history of salvation *vis-a-vis* his opponents; Matthew, the necessity for the church to bear fruit if it is to possess the kingdom; and Luke, the response to Jesus as the basis for individual judgment.

The Pre-Markan Parable

Even though this aspect of the parable does not fall within the scope of this study, some brief observations should be made. If both Matthew and Luke, under the inspiration of the Spirit, make certain modifications in Mark's account, which serves as their basic source, it could be assumed that Mark may also have made some changes as well. Although this is probably the case, the separation of Mark's editorial material from his source (probably oral tradition) is tenuous indeed and should be attempted only with great caution. In some cases Markan editing is obvious (see Mark 7:19, for example), but ordinarily any conclusion must remain very tentative.

The history of New Testament scholarship is filled with continuous attempts to move far beyond the evidence into the realm of speculation. Thus, although some conclude that any story with such allegorical details as are found in this parable could not have come from Jesus,¹⁸ a near-consensus has emerged that Jesus did tell the parable, but that he originally told a simple, non-allegorical version of it.¹⁹ But even those who agree in holding to the latter view suggest a variety of original meanings. The original parable is seen as a vindication of Jesus' gospel to the poor,²⁰ an aesthetic demonstration of the tragic results of inauthentic existence,²¹ a deliberately shocking story of

a successful murder, showing that Jesus' followers must act resolutely,²² or an attack on the methods of first-century zealots, showing that their violent methods will reap violent results.²³

It seems much more in keeping with the evidence to assume that any Markan variations would be of the same minor variety as those found in Matthew and Luke and that the original meaning was consistent with what we find in the synoptics.

Editorial analyses of this parable suggest certain conclusions are justifiable. When the synoptic gospels are carefully compared, it is evident that the evangelists have modified material they received. Both the arrangement and the narration of the details differ from one account to another. This could only be denied by arguing that Jesus told the story three times on the same occasion, that each of the gospel writers selected a different telling, and that they each recounted it at the same point in their gospel. Such a conclusion seems not only ludicrous, but unnecessary to anyone who does not equate inspiration with verbal dictation or inerrancy.

But although modification has occurred, there is no evidence that the evangelists have engaged in *creatio ex nihilo*. Modifications are of a minor nature and do not do violence to the story.

“When the synoptic gospels are carefully compared, it is evident that the evangelist have modified material they received. Both the arrangement and the narration of the details differ.”

Second, this modification is purposeful. While in no way contradictory, the gospels do use the parable with different theological

emphases, and the modifications contribute to these emphases. Matthew's additional references to fruit are not accidental, for instance, but contribute to the message that Matthew, under the guidance of the Spirit, seeks to communicate. In other words, differences in detail are not merely a matter of faulty memory, but rather of conscious modification in order to communicate a message. (Perhaps this could be compared with the preacher who tells the same personal experience in two different sermons with slightly different emphasis and detail.)

“By analyzing the editing of this parable by each gospel writer, Bible students have three texts from which to learn, instead of one. The unique facets of each can be appreciated without finding it necessary to harmonize the three accounts.”

Third, analysis of Scripture that notes the editing (or redacting) done contributes to understanding the gospels and should be utilized by Adventist exegetes. Editorial analysis is useful both to learn the theo-

logical and homiletical points of the book and to communicate that to others, because this kind of approach to the Gospel helps make the distinctive contribution of each evangelist clear.

By analyzing the editing of this parable by each gospel writer, Bible students have three texts from which to learn, instead of one. The unique facets of each can be appreciated without finding it necessary to harmonize the three accounts into a *de facto* Diatessaron,²⁴ where the unique colors of each are run together into a blob of grey. Recognizing the unique contribution of each writer helps us appreciate God's purpose as described by Ellen White.

Finally, the fact that the methods and terminology just described and demonstrated—source criticism, form criticism and redaction criticism (collectively described as the historical-critical method)—are used by conservative scholars such as R. P. Martin²⁵ and George Ladd²⁶ shows that liberal conclusions are not necessary when one uses these methods of studying the Bible. Indeed, virtually all Adventist exegetes of Scripture do use historical-critical methodology, even if they are not willing to use the term. The historical-critical method deserves a place in the armamentarium of Adventists who are serious about understanding their Bibles.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. *Counsels to Teachers*, p. 432.

2. For a history of source criticism of the gospels, see W.G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 17th ed., trans. Howard C. Kee (Nashville: Abingdon, 1975), pp. 44–52, and *The New Testament: The History of the Investigation of its Problems*, trans. S. MacLean and Howard C. Kee (Nashville: Abingdon, 1972), pp. 148–155, 325–327.

3. Although there has been recognition on the part of most scholars that the source history of the gospels is more complex than the two-document theory indicates, and although there has been vociferous objection to the theory on the part of a few, the strong consensus still favors Markan priority.

For an outline of the reasons for Markan priority, see Kümmel, *Introduction*, pp. 52–80.

4. This list is drawn from several different sources including: Edgar V. McKnight, *What is Form Criticism?* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969), pp. 17–20; Norman Perrin, *What is Redaction Criticism?* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969), p. 14; and Ralph P. Martin, *New Testament Foundations: A Guide for Christian Students: Volume 1; The Four Gospels* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), pp. 132, 133.

5. The results of this study, but not the process itself, can be seen in my book *A Day for Healing: The Meaning of Jesus' Sabbath Miracles* (Washington D. C.: Review and Herald, 1981), pp. 50–51.

6. For a concise introduction to redaction criticism, see Perrin, *passim*.

7. C. Bornkamm, G. Barth, and H. J. Held, *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*, trans. Perry Scott (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963).

8. H. Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, trans. G. Buswell (New York: Harper and Row, 1960).

9. W. Marxsen, *Mark the Evangelist*, trans. James Boyce et. al. (Nashville: Abingdon, 1969).

10. Perrin, p. 69.

11. *Ibid.*, p. 75.

12. A fourth account is found in the Gospel of Thomas where there is no historical context.

13. Although interpreters have offered various suggestions to explain why the tenants could possibly have thought that killing the son would result in their receiving the inheritance, it is probably best to refrain from pressing this detail too far.

14. Charles E. Carlston, *The Parables of the Triple Tradition* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975), p. 40.

15. *Ibid.*, pp. 44–45, 189–190.

16. *Ibid.*, pp. 189–190.

17. *Ibid.*, p. 79.

18. *Ibid.*, p. 188.

19. See, for example, Joachim Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, 2nd rev. ed. (New York: Charles

Scribner's Sons, 1972), pp. 70–77; Daniel O. Via, Jr., *The Parables: Their Literary and Existential Dimension* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967), p. 134; and John Dominic Crossan, *In Parables: The Challenge of the Historical Jesus* (New York: Harper and Row, 1973), pp. 76–96. For a contrary view which argues that the Gospel of Thomas (which presents a simple version of the parable that the above consider to be closer to the original) is dependent on the synoptics see K. R. Snodgrass, "The Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen: Is the Gospel of Thomas Version the Original?" *New Testament Studies* 21 (Oct. 1974): 142–144; and Robert M. Grant, *The Secret Saying of Jesus* (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1960), p. 172.

20. Jeremias, p. 76.

21. Via, p. 137.

22. Crossan, pp. 96–97.

23. Jane E. and Raymond R. Newell, "The Parable of the Wicked Tenants" *Novum Testamentum* 14: 226–237.

24. The *Diatessaron* was a second century document in which the church father Tatian wove all four gospels together into an account of Jesus' ministry.

25. See Martin, pp. 119–176.

26. George E. Ladd, *The New Testament and Criticism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967), *passim*.

Beyond Fundamentalism: A Short History of Adventist Old Testament Scholarship

by Lawrence T. Geraty

“Why don’t Adventist Bible teachers meet regularly with the Evangelical Theological Society?” That question was raised recently during a meeting of the Andrews Society for Religious Studies, the professional organization for Seventh-day Adventist Bible teachers.¹ (Annually, Adventist religion scholars gather just prior to the annual joint meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature and the American Academy of Religion, the largest North American gathering of scholars in religion.)

The question was answered from the floor without a moment’s hesitation by veteran SDA archaeologist and biblical scholar, Siegfried Horn: “To join the Evangelical Theological Society, one must sign an un-Adventist creedal statement that declares, ‘The Bible alone and the Bible in its entirety is the Word of God written, and therefore inerrant in the autographs.’ Secondly, the scholarship exhibited at the Evangelical Theological Society’s meetings is often shallow. However, we don’t always agree with the presuppositions or methods of scholars presenting papers at the Society

of Biblical Literature and the American Academy of Religion meetings either.” One could tell from the reaction to Horn’s response that it met with general acceptance among the 100 or so Adventist Bible teachers present.

Horn could have mentioned also that at the Evangelical Theological Society meetings one meets only a small segment of the teachers in biblical studies and theology, while during the annual Society of Biblical Literature and the American Academy of Religion meetings one rubs shoulders with all kinds of scholars in those fields of interest, including many scholars of conservative persuasion. Thus Adventist scholars have a much greater visibility by attending the Society of Biblical Literature and the American Academy of Religion meetings than in confining themselves to the Evangelical Theological Society gatherings, where they are not really welcome anyway.

But the question remains a good one. Since Adventists are generally conservative, why don’t their teachers attend fundamentalist professional meetings in greater numbers? After all, the *purpose* of Evangelical Theological Society is “to foster conservative biblical scholarship by providing a medium for the oral exchange and written expression of thought and research in the general field of the theological disciplines as

Lawrence T. Geraty, is professor of Old Testament and Archaeology, SDA Theological Seminary, and director of the Siegfried H. Horn Archaeological Museum, Andrews University.

centered in the Scriptures.” In fact, knowledgeable conservative Adventists belong to a tradition that eschews extremes to the fundamentalist right (a Bible in no way influenced by its cultural context and without errors of any kind) and to the liberal left (a Bible that is faulty and untrustworthy in most matters and entirely explainable by its cultural context without the intervention of God in any sense).

Any understanding of the eternal significance of the Bible as attaining meaning in the context of culture is feared by many fundamentalists because it undermines their faith-understanding of the Bible as having a validity outside of human circumstances. This latter belief stands in ultimate contradiction to the fact that God chose to send his eternal Word to be conditioned and defined by the specific culture of first-century Judea. This being so, how did Adventism manage to steer clear of the extremes? How did its centrist approach to the Bible come about?

There were theological reasons, of course. After all, Adventism inherited a centrist position from its roots in the Protestant Reformation. And numerous statements by Ellen White² protected Adventist scholars from taking extremist positions in either direction. But there is the further crucial fact that since the very first Adventist scholar received a doctorate in biblical studies, at least four generations of Adventists have been trained in a centrist tradition of biblical scholarship, which in the United States has been dominated, until recently, by the figure of William Foxwell Albright.³

Born in 1891, Albright was known long before his death as the “dean of biblical archaeologists.” In his own career he had swung from a fundamentalist upbringing (by American missionary parents) to a liberal skepticism (under the influence of Paul Haupt, a German “higher critic,” in his

graduate training). In 1919—the very year when 20,000 people attended the fundamentalist World Bible Conference in Philadelphia and left ready to join the “battle for the Bible” by going home and throwing the liberals out—Albright left the United States for an extended stay in Jerusalem. He developed a middle position when his own archaeological fieldwork and research in Palestine gave him renewed respect for the historical accuracy and validity of the biblical narrative.⁴

In Albright’s early days, there seemed to be two main options in the study of the Bible: a fundamentalist method, frequently uncritical, which often used texts out of context and which saw the Bible as inerrant in matters of history and science,⁵ and a liberal, “higher critical” method. This approach built on the evolutionary views of such Germans as Wellhausen (who thought the Old Testament sources could reflect only the standpoint of the times in which they were written down), Gunkel (who emphasized the oral, pre-literate forms of the Old Testament such as legends, hymns and laments) and Alt, Noth, and von Rad (who developed an approach that analyzed the history of transmission of biblical traditions and their varied settings in the life of the community).⁶ Some of their views so atomized biblical literature that it failed to speak with any authority to current concerns. Both of these methods (fundamentalist and liberal) dealt with “the Bible and the Bible alone”—that is they were “inner” methods detached from the advance of archaeological knowledge regarding the place of Israel among its neighbors, and thus they were without any external controls as to their validity. What Albright did was discover that disciplines uncovering the historical Near Eastern context for the Bible provided crucial controls unavailable to the other more subjective approaches.

He claimed that his own position was as far removed from the extreme liberalism of Wellhausenism as it was from obscurantist fundamentalism.⁷

Albright was wary of all interpretations and syntheses based on internal biblical data alone. One manuscript, one papyrus, one significant archaeological find he regarded as worth a thousand theories. This approach brought him a recognition of the Bible's substantial historicity. This meant he accepted the Genesis portrayal of the faith of the patriarchs, the existence of a historical Moses responsible for contributions to religion and law, the reality of the exodus and conquest, the evolution of Old Testament institutions during the time of the judges and kings of Israel, and the biblical view of the exile and restoration. To quote his own words:

To sum up, we can now again treat the Bible from beginning to end as an authentic document of religious history. Innumerable clarifications of the text greatly improve our understanding, especially of the poetic books. No translation which has yet appeared gives an adequate idea of the increase in our knowledge of Hebrew grammar, vocabulary and poetic style. It must be emphasized, however, that vindication of the historicity of the Bible and clarification of its meaning do not involve a return to uncritical belief in verbal inspiration and do not support an orthodoxy which insulates the Bible from the real world of today. The Bible must be judged as literature and history by exactly the same canons as we use in studying similar nonbiblical literature, but not by arbitrary standards imposed on it by dogmatic liberals or conservatives. Extreme views are alike unsatisfactory; the truth lies in the middle.⁸

Because of Albright's brilliance and ability and the convincing nature of his method, he quickly developed a loyal following. His approach to Old Testament studies, making use of the data being recovered from the Near East to interpret the Bible in its original ancient Near Eastern context, gave academic substance to a centrist approach to the Bible that already

characterized Adventism. So it is no wonder that a whole generation of Adventist scholars sought to receive their training in the "Albright School" of Old Testament scholarship.

Ironically, Lynn H. Wood, the very first Seventh-day Adventist to earn a doctorate in Old Testament (in 1937, from the University of Chicago), was influenced by Albright initially through the latter's Jewish student Nelson Glueck. For many years Glueck served as the director of the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem, then later as the president of Hebrew Union College—Jewish Institute of Religion in Cincinnati, Ohio. Wood spent a year in Palestine visiting sites of Biblical interest and working for Glueck's archaeological excavations as a draftsman. After his return to the United States, and completion of his doctoral studies, Wood became known in scholarly circles for establishing the earliest fixed date in history—1991 B.C. for the commencement of Egypt's Middle Kingdom. As chairman of the Department of Archaeology and History of Antiquity at the SDA Theological Seminary in Washington, D.C., Wood taught Siegfried H. Horn, the major link between "the Albright School" and the next two generations of Adventist Old Testament scholars.⁹

Born in Germany in 1908, Horn attended local schools including a Jewish high school and the Adventist training school in Friedensau until he went to Stanborough College in England to complete his ministerial training. He had hoped for a missionary call to the Middle East, but after he served as a minister in Holland (his wife's home country), the denomination instead sent him to the Dutch East Indies. There, because he was a German citizen, the Dutch interned him during the Second World War (1940–1946), then transferred him to a British concentration camp in India. There he followed a strict regimen of studying and

teaching biblical languages a specified number of hours each day. Upon his release, he came to the United States determined to follow up his self-education during imprisonment with formal studies. Horn first completed a bachelor of arts at Walla Walla College. While earning a master of arts under Lynn H. Wood at the SDA Theological Seminary, he simultaneously studied at Johns Hopkins University with Albright. However, Albright felt Horn already knew most of what he could get at Hopkins, so he suggested that Horn branch into a new area while working on his doctorate. That is how Horn came to complete a doctorate in Egyptology at the University of Chicago in 1951, before the joining the teaching staff of the SDA Theological Seminary as Lynn Wood's successor—a position he held until his retirement in 1976. (From 1973 to 1976 he

“The Bible must be judged as literature and history by exactly the same canons as we use in studying similar nonbiblical literature.”

served also as Dean of the Seminary, successfully keeping a steady hand on the helm during the beginning of a turbulent period for the denomination.)

During his tenure at the SDA Theological Seminary, Horn influenced the post-World War II development of Adventist theological scholarship in numerous ways. First of all, in his teaching he had access to hundreds of the denomination's best minds. In such courses as Introduction to the Old Testament, Old Testament Backgrounds, and Archaeology and the Bible, he took well-reasoned informed positions on many sensitive issues. On the age of the earth Horn suggested a relatively short period for life on earth, but not so short as Ussher's chronology suggests. He made a very important

distinction between genealogies of the sort found in Genesis, inadequate for exact dating, and specific chronological statements such as are found in Kings and Chronicles. Horn argued in favor of the historicity of the Bible, citing archaeological evidence for the authenticity of the patriarchs, while recognizing linguistic and textual problems, such as in the number of Israelites. He also argued for the early dating of Daniel, though he recognized the unsolved problem of the identity of Darius the Mede. Horn frankly admitted problems, but in his teaching concentrated on archaeological discoveries that supported the Bible's essential historicity and accuracy.

Second, Horn wrote what he taught. In 30 years he provided the church and the world with nearly 800 articles and several books. In fact, half the articles on biblical archaeology to appear in denominational journals during these years were authored by Horn. His employment of archaeological evidence had three major goals: to show how a knowledge of the ancient world makes the Bible more meaningful; to substantiate faith in the Bible by demonstrating the veracity of its historical statements; to demonstrate the faithful transmission of the biblical text, so no one need doubt what the biblical author intended to say.¹⁰

From the beginning, Horn was involved in the production of the multi-volume *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*. In addition to reading it all in manuscript and galley form, he himself authored 963 pages of articles and exegesis in the printed work. As a first attempt by Adventists to deal with an exegesis of the entire Bible, it was a remarkable achievement. Although produced in a very conservative climate, it nevertheless often gave the reader more than one interpretive option. Perhaps Horn's single most influential book is his *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Dictionary*, a part of the Review and Herald's commentary reference set, and now in a newly revised edition. Among one-volume Bible dictionaries on the market, it has been characterized as the most reliable

and best informed on archaeology. As an example of his readiness to assist the denomination with his expertise, he did the basic research for and co-authored *The Chronology of Ezra 7*, thus for all practical purposes settling the problem of the date of the decree of Artaxerxes I to 457 B.C. Not only did Horn himself write, he encouraged others to do the same. In 1963 he founded *Andrews University Seminary Studies*, the denomination's first scholarly periodical whose articles are now indexed, abstracted, or listed in at least 15 scholarly sources. Shortly thereafter he inaugurated *Andrews University Monographs: Studies in Religion* for book-length manuscripts.

Third, by conducting numerous study trips and tours to the Near East, Horn encouraged scores of denominational teachers, pastors, evangelists, and editors to incorporate into their ministries first-hand knowledge of the historical and geographical context of the biblical drama.¹¹

Fourth, Horn was not satisfied in merely utilizing the results of others' archaeological fieldwork. He wanted to make his own contribution; so in the early 1960s he joined the staff of the Shechem expedition. That experience only whetted his appetite for his own "dig" which he carefully planned and subsequently fielded at Heshbon in 1968, 1971, and 1973.¹² These excavations became the largest in the country of Jordan and the training ground for numerous national and foreign archaeologists. Heshbon soon became noted for its superb organization, its quality methods, and the prompt preliminary publication of its results. Though these results did not provide the date to confirm Horn's conservative and early dating of the Israelite conquest, they challenged him and his staff with the difficulties faced when attempting to relate archaeological evidence and biblical interpretations. They brought Adventist scholarship face to face with issues that had exercised biblical scholars for years. Horn consciously differed from his mentor, Albright, in such matters as the interpretation of Genesis

1–11 and the validity of the Bible's chronological information.¹³

Fifth, never one to work in isolation, Horn long belonged to a score of professional societies. Regular receipt of their publications and attendance at their meetings kept him in touch with the world of biblical and archaeological scholarship. When he began to frequent the annual meetings of the Society of Biblical literature during his graduate studies, he was sometimes the only Adventist to do so.¹⁴

Other Adventists who studied under Albright and completed their doctorates at Johns Hopkins, such as Alger Johns (formerly at Andrews University, now deceased), Leona Running (Andrews University), Siegfried Schwantes (French Adventist Seminary), and Wilson Bishai (Harvard University), followed Horn into the Society of Biblical Literature. They and others gather 100 strong each year for the Andrews Society of Religious Studies meetings immediately preceding the Society of Biblical Literature's annual meeting.

Horn continued to influence the direction of Adventist biblical scholarship because of the legacy he created. He inspired numerous "successors."¹⁵ Three of his students (Lawrence Geraty and William Shea, now at Andrews; and Larry Herr, SDA Seminary, Far East) went on to Harvard University to study with Albright's students, G. Ernest Wright, Frank M. Cross, and Thomas O. Lambdin. Shea, who has become a prolific writer for scholarly Old Testament journals, plus three more of Horn's students (Kenneth Vine, now at Loma Linda University; Douglas Waterhouse, Andrews University; and Alberto Green, Rutgers) went on to the University of Michigan to study with other Albright students, George E. Mendenhall and David Noel Freedman.

As the first director of the doctoral program at the SDA Theological Seminary, he insured that one strong concentration

would be archaeology and history of antiquity. Now his students who have since joined the Seminary faculty have guided several candidates through dissertations for their doctorates and into denominational teaching posts.¹⁶

Another major influence in Adventist Old Testament scholarship, one which recognizes the importance of archaeology and history, but focuses primarily on Old Testament literature and theology, can be traced to Adventists who have studied at Yale, Union Theological Seminary in New York and Vanderbilt University. Their emphasis on theology can be seen in the writing of Vanderbilt graduates Gerhard Hasel (Andrews University), Niels-Erik Andreasen (Loma Linda University), Jerry Gladson (Southern College), and Doug Clark (Southwestern Adventist College).

As we review the scholarly influence of Siegfried Horn, we must describe it as that of an informed conservative who sees the Bible as God's word to His children everywhere and at all times, but best and most correctly understood when it is seen in its ancient Near Eastern context. This

means that when a detailed and serious examination of the text of Scripture yields more than one possible interpretation (which it frequently does), then all the relevant data from archaeology, history, geography, and the pertinent languages must be taken very seriously. These external data constitute a significant force in influencing and making choices among possible interpretations. In other words, students of the Bible are not free to interpret it—at least with any authority—without the external controls provided by research in the Near East. Approaching the Bible in this contextual manner acknowledges its humanity and integral relationship to the world, while also eliciting respect for its historicity and divine message.

Even though extremists often question the centrist approach, as they did most recently at "Consultation II" in Washington, D.C.,¹⁷ most Adventist Old Testament scholars have remained true to it. Today, thanks to Siegfried Horn and his colleagues, there is academic underpinning for the centrist position on the inspiration of the Bible that the Seventh-day Adventist denomination took a century ago under the prodding of Ellen White.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Membership in Andrews Society for Religious Studies is open to all who pay the fee (U.S. - \$7, overseas - \$9, students - \$5) which entitles one to a newsletter and copies of papers presented at the annual meeting. For more information contact Larry Mitchel, ASRS Secretary/Treasurer, Pacific Union College, Angwin, CA 94508

2. Especially those now found in *1 Selected Messages* 15-23.

3. Adventist Seminary teacher Leona Glidden Running authored (along with D. N. Freedman) the definitive biography of her teacher: (*William Foxwell Albright: A Twentieth-Century Genius* New York: Two Continents Publishing Group, 1975).

4. Pivotal in this transition from the high water mark of literary criticism to a more centrist approach was Albright's *From the Stone Age to*

Christianity, now in a second edition (New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1957).

5. For more recent advocates of this approach, see L. Berkhof, *Principles of Biblical Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1950), or N.B. Stonehouse and Paul Wooley, eds., *The Infallible Word* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Guardian Publishing Corporation, 1946).

6. These German critics were not all bad, of course. For example, Gunkel's form criticism was taken up by Muilenberg and pushed into rhetorical criticism, not unrelated to structural analysis (being used to advantage by Adventists in Genesis and Daniel). And Alt's studies of Israelite law and covenant and of patriarchal religion find echoes in Mendenhall's and Cross' studies of the same topics, again appealed to with profit by Adventists. For

those interested in reading about schools or Old Testament interpretation, see H. F. Hahn, *The Old Testament in Modern Research* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966); H. H. Rowley, *The Old Testament and Modern Study* (London: Oxford University Press, 1951); R. E. Clements, *One Hundred Years of Old Testament Interpretation* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976).

7. *American Scholar*, Vol. 7, No. 2 (Spring 1938), p. 179.

8. *Christian Century*, Nov. 19, 1958, pp. 1329–1330.

9. Another Adventist Old Testament chronologist with a national reputation is Edwin R. Thiele, longtime Bible teacher at Emmanuel Missionary College and Andrews University, who also received his Ph.D. from the University of Chicago (in 1948), his dissertation being published as *The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings*. The chronological system he developed for the Israelite monarchy is still authoritative today; it is often compared and contrasted with that of Albright with whom Thiele had extensive interaction. S. H. Horn points to the importance of both Thiele's and Wood's work for Biblical scholarship in *Ministry*, March 1951, p. 23. Other Adventists who have made important contributions to the elucidating of biblical chronology include Grace Amadon and Julia Neuffer, the latter contributing all of the chronology articles to appear in the *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*.

10. See Horn's statements in *These Times*, Sept. 1, 1961, p. 26, and March 1972, p. 25.

11. It was on one of his trips to Mesopotamia that Horn discovered a cuneiform tablet (now known officially as the SDA Seminary King List) that became crucial in helping to establish the chronology of the 1st millennium B.C.

12. A spin-off from the Heshbon excavations was Horn's founding of the Archaeological Museum at Andrews University in 1970, to help house the artifacts brought home from the dig. After his retirement in 1976, it was renamed the Siegfried H. Horn Archaeological Museum, and its holdings and programs continue to grow.

13. *Ministry*, February 1973, pp. 6–8; *These Times*, July 1959, pp. 4–6.

14. But soon other Adventist students of Albright

joined him. Chief among these were Don F. Neufeld and his *Review and Herald* colleague Raymond F. Cottrell. Both of them left their methodological impact on the *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* and on the formation and development of what later came to be called the Biblical Research Institute. For 33 years Cottrell attended every meeting of its predecessors, the Bible Research Fellowship and the Bible Research Committee, endorsing a centrist approach to Scripture interpretation. Through his writings, Neufeld made a major impact on the careful and consistent use of biblical languages in the study of the Bible and on the use of sound hermeneutical principles. Cottrell endorsed Albright's middle-of-the-road stance in a *Review and Herald* editorial, Feb. 28, 1963, p. 14.

15. It is always dangerous to list people by name, for fear of leaving someone out. Nevertheless, many contemporary Adventist Old Testament scholars are mentioned here and later. The criteria are that they have completed doctoral studies in Old Testament and been published.

16. In addition to three students who have finished in this area (Larry Mitchel at Pacific Union College; Lloyd Willis at Spicer Memorial College in India; and Bjornar Storfjell at Andrews University), the program continues to provide many other teacher-scholars in the fields of Biblical and theological studies for the SDA church. Old Testament graduates of the program include Richard Davidson at Andrews University, Jacques Doukhan at Phoenix Adventist College in Mauritius, Arthur Ferch at Avondale College, Angel Rodriguez at Antillian College and Margit Syring at Toivonlinna in Finland.

17. For a convenient discussion of the conference and the issues, see J. R. Spangler, "Why Consultation II?" *Ministry*, February 1982, pp. 26–29. For an example of an extremist Adventist view, see the work of Donovan Courville, *The Exodus Problem*, privately published in 1971, or his more recent proposals in the *Adventist Review*, Aug. 10, 1978, pp. 6–8; Aug. 17, 1978, pp. 7–8.

For an extensive and revealing report on Theological Consultation II, see Alden Thompson's "Theological Consultation II," *SPECTRUM* (December 1981), Vol. 12, No. 2 pp. 40–52.

Genesis One in Historical-Critical Perspective

by Larry G. Herr

The “historical-critical” method of Bible study, used properly, can be a valid and powerful tool for Seventh-day Adventists. How might the use of the “historical-critical” method of Bible study affect the interpretation of Genesis 1, a chapter of great interest to Seventh-day Adventists? What follows is an example of the application of the method to Genesis 1. I am going to claim, first, that the primary focus of the chapter is on God’s creation of all things in a miraculous and ordered way, and second, that there is no justification for trying to harmonize modern science with the chapter’s implicit cosmology, or worldview. I hope to illustrate how an approach that attends to the culture, history, philosophy and religion of the Bible’s time and place can enhance our understanding of its message.

I will defend my claim by explaining briefly what the “historical-critical” method is; by defining two key terms I will be using; and by proceeding straight through the chapter in a fairly detailed examination of its contents. At the end I will sum up the results of the inquiry.

Larry G. Herr teaches Old Testament at the SDA Theological Seminary, Far East, in the Philippines. He received his doctorate at Harvard University.

The term “historical-critical method” has for various reasons become less precise than it once was; still, it is the term characteristically used within the Adventist community for the approach I am about to describe.¹ Basic to this method is the assumption that the Bible writers addressed issues important to their readers and used terms and concepts they could understand. This explains why the historical-critical approach emphasizes the study of the culture, history, philosophy and religion of the biblical period. The point is that, in order to do so, we must understand its literary and historical context. The method assumes that understanding of Scripture is really possible—that, unless otherwise affirmed, as in some passages of the apocalyptic literature, for example, nothing in the Bible was intended to be veiled by obscure, incomprehensible symbols. We may successfully comprehend it today if we understand its literary and historical context. In all of this, the method assumes, too, that in Scripture the truth of God is mediated through the limited languages and feeble understandings of mankind. What we find there is stamped by humanity, but the Word of God comes through in what is said.

The actual practice of the method requires a considerable acquaintance with a

variety of tools. First and foremost, of course, is an ample knowledge of the language of the text, in this case biblical Hebrew. But since many of the meanings and nuances of the ancient Hebrew words have been lost, we must rely, too, on a comparative study of the Semitic languages related to biblical Hebrew. We must also refer to the literature of the ancient Near Eastern world in order to enhance our understanding; the Bible writers wrote in the prevalent literary modes of their day just as we do in ours. Finally, we must allow the study of ancient Near Eastern history to inform our inquiry; it illuminates the political, economic and cultural framework within which the Bible writer works. All of these tools have been used in a variety of ways in the following exegesis.

Before going further I should discuss two major terms. Both words, "cosmology" and "cosmogony" are related in that they are based upon the same Greek root word, *kosmos*, meaning "world, universe." For our purposes, "cosmology" indicates the descriptive account of the universe as a whole; a "cosmological element" is any part of that cosmology, such as the sea, the moon, the plants, and the firmament. Cosmologies change through history as knowledge changes, so that we can distinguish the cosmology of Genesis 1, for example, from the cosmology prevalent today.

The term "cosmogony," on the other hand, refers to the theory of the origin of the cosmos. How did it come about? The doctrine of creation is a cosmogony; creation *ex nihilo*, or out of nothing, and creation from preexisting matter are two different creation cosmogonies. Evolutionary theory offers still another cosmogony. With the aid of these terms we can clarify the thesis of what follows. I will show that the cosmology of Genesis 1 is a vehicle for making what is ultimately a statement about cosmogony, namely, that the ultimate origin of the universe is God. Cosmogony, then, is ultimately the point of the chapter, not the details of its cosmology.

We will proceed to an extended verse-by-verse analysis, or exegesis of the first chapter of Genesis to see how the description of nature (cosmology) understood by biblical authors can be distinguished from their statements about God being the ultimate origin of the creation (cosmogony).

Verse 1

*"In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth."*²

This is usually understood to be an introductory summary statement of the upcoming creation account. Some hold, however, that this verse actually refers to the creation of a prior world which has been destroyed by the time of the creation event recorded in Genesis 1.³ This interpretation offers a way to harmonize the biblical account of creation with the apparently long history of the fossil record, which, it is said, represents the fauna of the earlier creation.

Unfortunately, however, this view does not take into account the literary structure of the narrative. Highly-structured texts of the ancient Near East, both biblical (like Genesis 1⁴) and non-biblical, often contain introductory and concluding statements in formulaic language.⁵ If Genesis 1:1 is such an introductory statement, where is the concluding one? Genesis 2:1, placed at the end of the six days of God's creative activity, concludes: "Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them." It is a simple concluding statement, corresponding perfectly with the simple introductory statement in verse one.

I cannot emphasize enough how typical these introductory and concluding statements are in biblical and contemporary non-biblical literature. This makes it clear that verse one is not talking about a prior creation which may be harmonized with the fossil record. Moreover, no other known ancient Near Eastern group knew of an

earlier creation, and to suggest that the Bible hides one here is sheer conjecture, with all supporting evidence pointing in the opposite direction.

“*In the beginning*” (Heb. *b^erē šît*). In light of its grammatical form, the first word of the Bible should be translated “In the beginning of,” and followed by a noun such as “time” or “the world” or “things.” But no noun is there. One suggested solution is that the remainder of the verse should be interpreted as a noun phrase, so that in English we get: “In the beginning of God’s creating the heavens and the earth,” or

“When God began to create the heavens and the earth.”⁶ Then Genesis 1:1, 2 would read: “When God began to create the heavens and the earth, the earth was without form and void.”

This translation implies that matter was preexistent at creation. On the other hand, the wording in the Revised Standard Version, “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth,” leaves this question open. And it is in fact the better translation, as we have seen. Verse one is a formal introduction to the whole narrative. It would be structurally and formulaically

Further Reading on Biblical Interpretation

compiled by John C. Brunt and Lawrence T. Geraty

Old Testament

For those who want to learn more about the Old Testament writings in their historical context, the following are recommended: B. W. Anderson, **Understanding the Old Testament**, 3rd ed. (NY: Prentice-Hall, 1975), J. M. Muilenberg, **The Way of Israel** (NY: Harper Torchbooks, 1965), G. E. Wright, **The Old Testament Against its Environment** (London: SCM Press, 1950).

For those interested in pursuing further how one goes about studying and appropriating the Biblical message for today, the following should be helpful: E. C. Colwell, **The Study of the Bible**, rev. ed. (Chicago: University Press, 1964); L. E. Keck, **Taking the Bible Seriously** (Nashville: Abingdon, 1962); J. Maier and V. Tollers, eds., **The Bible in Its Literary Milieu** (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979).

For those who are especially interested in Adventist views, the following jointly authored volumes of serious scholarship, all published by The Review and Herald, deserve mention: **Problems in Bible Translations** (1954), **Symposium on Biblical Hermeneutics** (1974), **The Sanctuary and the Atonement: Biblical, Historical and**

Theological Studies (1981), and **The Sabbath in Scripture and History** (1982).

New Testament

For those interested in further study on historical-critical methodology with regard to the New Testament, the following sources might prove helpful.

For a conservative discussion of New Testament criticism see George E. Ladd, **The New Testament and Criticism** (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967) and Ralph P. Martin, **New Testament Foundations: a Guide for Christian Students**, Volume 1, **The Four Gospels** (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975).

For a description of critical methodology from a liberal protestant perspective, see the “Guides to Biblical Scholarship,” series published by Fortress Press in Philadelphia.

For an example of the use of such methodology for positive presentation of the message of a New Testament work within an Adventist context, see a work with the unlikely title, **Religion in Overalls** by Dr. William Johnsson, the new editor of the *Adventist Review*. This book is a discussion of the message of Matthew.

bizarre for such a statement to be a dependent clause. This, together with other examples—in and out of Scripture—⁷ of this same problematic grammatical structure, indicates strongly that a traditional translation like that in the Revised Standard Version is correct. No clear statement regarding preexisting matter is thus available from a study of this word.

“Created” (Heb. *bārā*). This word, the second word of the Hebrew Bible, is often said to denote creation *ex nihilo*, or out of nothing, and is contrasted with *‘āsāh* (“to make”), used elsewhere in Genesis 1 and said to indicate creation from matter. This contrast is not justified, as verses 26 and 27 show. “Let us make *‘āsāh* man in our image,” says verse 26, while verse 27 asserts “So God created *bārā*’ man in his own image.” Each verb denotes the creating (or making) of the same object. The conclusion is very clear. *Bārā*’ does not necessarily indicate creation *ex nihilo* and *‘āsāh* does not necessarily indicate creation from matter. Otherwise verses 26 and 27 would be totally contradictory. *Bārā*’ therefore cannot be said to indicate creation *ex nihilo* only, nor can *‘āsāh* be said to indicate exclusively creation from preexisting matter.

“The Bible writers knew nothing about evolution, theistic or otherwise, and were not seeking to write either for or against it.”

“*The heavens and the earth.*” These are the two major realms of creation into which all creation was placed. They make up the total spatial cosmology of the biblical view. They are thus a convenient summary of the complete creative activity of God for use in this introductory statement. The “heavens” includes what is above the plane of human activity and the “earth” what is at or below this level.

Verse 2

“*The earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep; and the Spirit of God was moving over the face of the waters.*”

The two Hebrew words we meet here are for various reasons somewhat enigmatic.

“*Without form and void*” (Heb. *tōhū wābōhū*). The basic idea, however, seems to be not so for various reasons somewhat enigmatic. The basic idea, however, seems to be not so much physical chaos as spiritual and existential chaos. The physical chaos is simply a reflection of this higher level of emptiness, an emptiness to be explained by the lack up to now of the presence of God. The writer was apparently not really interested in whether there was preexistent matter,⁸ but was immensely interested in the arrival of the God who could bring meaning out of meaninglessness. The terms are thus cosmogonic in thrust—they illuminate the question of the explanation of the ordered universe.

“*Darkness*” (Heb. *hōšek*). This term is almost identical to the English word “darkness” in most of its nuances. Certainly in this context it symbolizes the absence of the Spirit of God who brings goodness, order and meaning. The phrase “and darkness was upon the face of the deep”—the deep is the primordial sea—is thus parallel to the previous phrase, “The earth was without form and void.” Both the earth and the deep were a meaningless waste before the Spirit of God arrived.

Verse two seems to assume the prior existence of two primordial realities: “earth” or land and “the deep” or the sea. The Hebrew language could have stated very plainly whether creation was *ex nihilo*; we should remember that, by and large, whether there was preexisting matter is a modern question and really should not be imposed upon the biblical text.

“Deep” (Heb. *t^lhôm*). The use of this term in the story of creation has occasioned much comment due to its linguistic relation to Tiamat, the evil goddess of the primordial sea in the Babylonian creation story. Although there is little doubt that *t^lhôm* and Tiamat are linguistically related, the use of *t^lhôm* in the Bible simply refers to the all-encompassing primordial sea. This non-mythological use of the term in a cultural milieu which was well acquainted with Tiamat and her myth is actually a striking disclaimer of the polytheistic myth in which Tiamat played a role.⁹ Far from being influenced by the Babylonian creation story, Genesis 1 rejects at least part of it, and constitutes a mild polemic against the polytheistic mythical religions.

“Spirit of God” (Heb. *rûah ’êlôhîm*). The “Spirit of God” was not understood by the Old Testament reader as the Holy Spirit of the Trinity. Indeed the Old Testament does not seem to be aware of the Trinity’s existence. Rather, the Spirit of God seems to have been understood as God’s presence. The picture in Genesis 1 is of the arrival of the latent creative force of God. The stage is set for the banishment of meaninglessness and the creation of the cosmos.

Verse 3

“And God said, ‘Let there be light;’ and there was light.”

Creation has begun and light—the symbol of meaningfulness and divine order—is the first item to be made.

Verse 4

“And God saw that the light was good; and God separated the light from the darkness.”

Here God symbolically separates order and chaos. Again we see the cosmogonic goal of the story. God brings in the good—and dispells the bad and the fearsome.

Verse 5

“And there was evening and there was morning, one day.”

It is natural to ask how on the first day there could be light and, indeed, the progression from evening to morning, without the sun which was not created until the fourth day? But what is important here is that the author of Genesis 1 has deliberately set out to separate light from the heavenly sources. He certainly understood the natural relation between day and night and the sun and moon; indeed, he describes that relationship in verses 14 and 15. At this point, however, he deliberately ignores this cosmogonic truth to lay down a cosmogonic truth. God’s presence is light, and therefore light must be the first item of creation. The sun, moon and stars are specific, limited created bodies—not his symbolic essence, but simply his creation. This is part of the author’s mild polemic against the polytheistic religions of his day. For them, the sun, moon and stars were divinities. By giving light, the symbol of divine presence, precedence over the luminaries, there can be no question that the one true God is supreme over all.

On the first day the daily cycle was also begun, a cycle that no doubt symbolized to ancient man the order and regularity of creation. The point here is that the daily cycle was to the author not ultimately dependent on the luminaries, but rather on God. The responsibility to keep that order is only later to be *given* to the sun and moon. The natural world and its laws cannot by themselves account for creation. Only the divine miracle can do that.

“Day” (Heb. *yôm*). Many scientists who wish to harmonize modern evolutionary theory with the biblical record, especially the proponents of the various breeds of theistic evolution, suggest that the term “day” as used in Genesis I refers to an indefinite length of time, not a 24-hour

period.¹⁰ To them, each “day” was sufficiently long to allow for the evolution of certain species from other forms more or less in the order the Bible presents; the “day” of Genesis 1 is thus an era of millions of years. But even though the term *yôm* can indeed refer to an indefinite period of time, this is *never* the case when the word is used with a number; when a number occurs with the word, a period of 24 hours is always meant. The Bible writers knew nothing about evolution, theistic or otherwise, and were not seeking to write either for or against it. They would have no reason whatsoever to intend very long periods of time when they used the word “day” in this context. The author clearly intends the creative act to be understood as a miracle which occurred in one literal day. The concern here is cosmogony.

Verses 6–8

“And God said, ‘Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it separate the waters from the waters.’ And God made the firmament and separated the waters which were under the firmament from the waters which were above the firmament. And it was so. And God called the firmament Heaven. And there was evening and there was morning, a second day.”

The account of the second day establishes the basic form of the cosmology of Genesis 1.

“Firmament” (Heb. *rāqîa’*). Science-oriented students of the Bible have often assumed that this word refers both to interstellar space—because the sun, moon and stars are placed in it—and also to the atmospheric mantle around the earth—since it separates the waters above the firmament from the waters below. It is only logical at first sight that the waters above are the

moisture-laden clouds and that the waters below are the seas. The atmosphere seems to fit very nicely and thus the ancient and modern cosmologies are harmonized.

Unfortunately, this view represents only a superficial understanding of the biblical text. In verse eight the firmament is identified with heaven. Verses six and seven show the firmament separating the waters above from those below; that is, it holds back the waters above from rushing down upon the waters below. Only something solid could do that. On the fourth day the luminaries were placed in the firmament which then must have been conceived as *beneath* the waters above the firmament; otherwise they would not be visible through the water. However, the birds also fly in the firmament in verse 20, showing that the firmament includes the region beneath the solid object. Psalms 19:1 and 150:1 confirm the identification of the firmament with heaven, the abode of God. The four occurrences of the word in Ezekiel 1:22–26 suggest the picture of a bright, shining canopy or dome with four living creatures beneath and the throne of God above. To the Old Testament mind, therefore, the firmament is a solid dome high above the earth which holds back the waters above it, and in which the heavenly luminaries have been placed. It also contains the throne or abode of God, just below its lower surface the birds fly.

The etymology of the Hebrew word *rāqîa’* supports this. It is a noun based on a verb meaning “to spread out.” This verb is used to depict the pounding of a smith as he beats metal ingots into various forms. One Canaanite variant of the word (Hebrew is a dialect of Canaanite) indicates a bowl hammered out from a metal ingot. Although etymologies should never be used to establish the meaning of a word at a single point in time, it certainly would seem to confirm the apparent biblical understanding of *rāqîa’* as a solid construction. Job 37:18 is the clearest in this regard: “Can you, like

him, spread out, [*rāqīa'*] the skies [equals firmament], hard as a molten mirror?" (Mirrors were made of metal in antiquity.) The idea is of a ceiling for creation. All subsequent creation is contained beneath this ceiling.¹¹

Of course, this view of the universe, which is similar to what we find in other writings of the ancient Near East,¹² is incompatible with our own view of an infinite space with the stars and galaxies sprinkled as far as human technology can reach, and undoubtedly farther. We know of no firmament and no waters above it. We cannot argue our way out of this impasse by suggesting that the firmament disappeared at the flood when the waters above it descended to the earth. The Psalmist talks of the firmament as if it was still present (Psalms 19:1 and 150:1). No text after the flood story clearly talks of waters above the firmament, but certain texts seem to imply floods or rain when the windows of heaven are opened (2 Kings 7:2, 19; Isaiah 24:18).¹³

“We must recognize that the Bible writer simply accepts the cosmology of his day, never questioning, then uses the cosmology to convey his basic message.”

There is no clever or magical solution. Instead we must recognize that the Bible writer simply accepts the cosmology of his day, never questioning it, then uses the cosmology to convey his basic message that the ultimate origin of the universe is God. A similar thing happens, as Adventists have always said, in Jesus' parable of the rich man and Lazarus (Luke 16:19–31). Although the parable seems to acknowledge the existence of a pre-resurrection life after death in both heaven and hell, Adventists have rightly appealed to the historical understanding of

the people during Christ's time when they apparently believed in such a life after death. We have further said that that concept although erroneous, was simply used by Christ as a vehicle to portray a much greater truth. Once we realize the general point I am making here, the problem of harmonizing the biblical understanding of the firmament with our modern cosmology disappears. What is important is the fundamental truth that God is Creator.

Verses 9–13

“And God said, ‘Let the waters under the heavens be gathered together into one place, and let the dry land appear.’ And it was so. God called the dry land Earth, and the waters that were gathered together he called Seas. And God saw that it was good. And God said, ‘Let the earth put forth vegetation, plants yielding seed, and fruit trees bearing fruit in which is their seed, each according to its kind, upon the earth.’ And it was so. The earth brought forth vegetation, plants yielding seed according to their own kinds, and trees bearing fruit in which is their seed, each according to its kind. And God saw that it was good. And there was evening and there was morning, a third day.”

On the third day, now that the firmament was keeping out the upper waters, dry land could appear from the waters below. Although the English word “appear” is not passive, the Hebrew word from which it is translated is the passive form of the verb “to see” (*rāāh*). The land did nothing of its own to become visible. At the command of God the waters simply ran off and exposed the dry land called “earth.” The accumulated water was then called the “sea.” Again, in conveying its basic message, Genesis 1 is simply using the cosmology of its time, which indicated a flat earth with a single land mass surrounded by seas.

“According to its kind” (Heb. *l'minō*). Any person of antiquity who observed the flora

about him realized that there were different kinds of plants. Although he did not yet classify them with the rigors of scientific taxonomy, the phrase “according to its kind” was meant to suggest that all the various types of plants known to the readers of Genesis 1 were created at the same time. The narrative leaves no room for the modern idea of the slow evolutionary development of plants.

Verses 14–19

“And God said, ‘Let there be lights in the firmament of the heavens to separate the day from the night; and let them be for signs and for seasons and for days and years, and let them be lights in the firmament of the heavens to give light upon the earth.’ And it was so. And God made the two great lights, the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night; he made the stars also. And God set them in the firmament of the heavens to give light upon the earth, to rule over the day and over the night, and to separate the light from the darkness. And God saw that it was good. And there was evening and there was morning, a fourth day.”

In verse 14 the lights are very clearly put into the firmament, a two-dimensional expanse, as we saw before, serving as the ceiling of the universe. The heavenly bodies were thus conceived as being on a single plane more-or-less equidistant from the earth. Again, the biblical view radically differs from our own and again our explanation must be that the common cosmology of antiquity was being used in affirming the cosmogonic truth that God was the creator.

“The greater light” (Heb. *hammā’ ôr hag-gādōl*). The use of this euphemism for the sun is deliberate. The ancient polytheistic religions almost universally worshipped a god of the sun whose name in many Semitic languages was simply the common word for “sun.” In its mild polemic against the polytheistic religions of the day, Genesis 1

seeks to avoid any possible confusion with a solar divinity by using the phrase “the greater light” instead of the name of the sun god. There is but *one* true God. And because the moon was also a god in the polytheistic systems, the euphemism “the lesser light” is used for the moon.

“*He made the stars also.*” As it stands in the Revised Standard Version translation this phrase seems to have been tacked on at the last minute as a secondary thought. Indeed some scientists and theologians, wishing to harmonize the Genesis 1 account with a young earth, have suggested that the original text did not include the phrase under question and thus the stars—some of which are millions of light years away—can be understood as already created.¹⁴ But no Hebrew manuscripts omit the phrase. And in the original language it is part of a typical grammatical construction and should in no way be considered secondary. Literally it should be translated, “and the stars;” (with no verb nor the word “also.”) An untranslatable grammatical marker preceding “stars” indicates that the phrase is the last of a string of direct objects, including “the greater light” and “the lesser light,” of the verb “made” (*āsāh*). In Genesis 1, as we have already seen, the verb *āsāh* refers to God’s creative activity during creation. There can be no doubt that Genesis 1 intends to say that all the heavenly lights, the stars included, were created on the fourth day. No attempt to explain this away can be squared with the text.

The solution to the problem—for us—of the great distance between the earth and the stars (the Hebrew term includes all heavenly bodies, including galaxies) is to be found not by attempting to harmonize modern science with the biblical account, but by realizing that Genesis 1 is using the known ancient cosmology. To the people of the Bible times, there were no great distances between the stars and the earth. They knew nothing of the light year or indeed that light traveled at a certain rate of speed. As far as they were concerned, all the

stars were placed within the firmament, as stated in verse 14. The author expresses the cosmogonic truth of divine creation in those ancient cosmological terms.

Verses 20–23

“And God said, ‘Let the waters bring forth swarms of living creatures, and let birds fly above the earth across the firmament of the heavens.’ So God created the great sea monsters and every living creature that moves, with which the waters swarm, according to their kinds, and every winged bird according to its kind. And God saw that it was good. And God blessed them saying, ‘Be fruitful and multiply and fill the waters in the seas, and let birds multiply on the earth.’ And there was evening and there was morning, a fifth day.”

On the fifth day comes the creation of life. (Plants were not considered life by the ancients.¹⁵) Of special interest among the living creatures are the “sea monsters” (Heb. *tanninim*). Out of all the multitude of various sea creatures, only the enigmatic *tanninim* are mentioned specifically. All others are included in the phrase “swarms of living creatures.”¹⁶

The background to the biblical understanding of the *tanninim* is one of the most frequent motifs in ancient Near Eastern literature, namely, the cosmic battle between the beneficent god and an evil force, usually the god of the sea, symbolized as a sea monster or a sea dragon. In Babylon, Marduk defeated Tiamat, and at Canaanite Ugarit, Baal defeated Yam.¹⁷

This battle genre was so well known that the Bible writers referred to it in several places as if it were Israel’s God who had defeated the great evil beast of the sea in establishing the created order (Psalm 74 and Isaiah 51).¹⁸ This does not mean that the Bible writers necessarily believed the story, but apparently they thought it expressed very nicely the awesome power with which divine creation came about.

Genesis 1:21 provides an interesting twist to all of this. Here there is no mythical context, not even an allusion to a myth. Instead the fearsome *tanninim* are simply creatures of God’s creation, totally subject to him. There is no hint of a cosmic battle; the scene is totally demythologized. Instead of fearsome divine opponents of God in the cosmic battle, they are merely his creatures sporting in the sea. If it were not for this polemic against polytheism, there would have been, indeed, no reason whatsoever to mention this one creature of the sea. The Israelites were not a people acquainted with the sea, though the biblical readers had undoubtedly heard stories of great sea monsters from neighboring seafarers. Not being able to confirm or deny the existence of sea monsters (nor even, probably, being interested in doing so), they simply included the *tanninim* in their marine bestiary. They thus had to be accounted for in creation.

Genesis I is theological in intent and scientists need not attempt to harmonize the ancient cosmology used by Biblical authors with the cosmology of modern science.”

Again, the ancient cosmology is used in pointing toward a cosmogonic truth: God is the creator and ruler of all, including the fearsome *tanninim*.

Verses 24–25

“And God said, ‘Let the earth bring forth living creatures according to their kinds: cattle and creeping things and beasts of the earth according to their kinds.’ And it was so. And God made the beasts of the earth according to their kinds and the cattle according to their kinds, and everything that creeps upon the ground according to its kind. And God saw that it was good.”

The account of the sixth day of creation (as with the third and fifth) includes the phrase “according to its kind.” The phrase indicates that all the observable types of animals were created at this time. Genesis 1 does not allow room for an interpretation that they developed from each other (the Hebrew language could have said so, if it wished).

Verses 26–31

“Then God said, ‘Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creeps upon the earth.’ So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them. And God blessed them, and God said to them, ‘Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the air and over every living thing that moves upon the earth.’ And God said, ‘Behold, I have given you every plant yielding seed which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree with seed in its fruit; you shall have them for food. And to every beast of the earth, and to every bird of the air, and to everything that creeps on the earth, everything that has the breath of life, I have given every green plant for food.’ And it was so. And God saw everything that he had made, and behold, it was very good. And there was evening and there was morning, a sixth day.”

The creation of man is the literary climax of the chapter. On no other day is a complete section of the chapter devoted to the creation of only one kind of creation. Moreover, the usual, consistent divine formulaic statement, “Let there be . . . ,” is dramatically broken by a new form of creative statement, “Let us make man in our image,” a statement which also identifies God with the creature being made. Man, the image of God, is the supreme work, the climax, of God’s creative activity.¹⁹

“Image” (Heb. *selem*). This word, frequent in the Old Testament, is used primarily for idols. The root idea behind the word is that man is physically like God, as a picture or a sculpture is like the object being represented, although the ancient Semitic mind would not have sharply differentiated between a physical and spiritual likeness.

“Dominion” (Heb. *rādāh*). God made man his coregent on earth. Man, who is God’s image, will rule all creation, including animals and plants, in God’s place. The text then says that God saw all that he had made and pronounced it very good.

Chapter 2:1–31

“Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God finished his work which he had done, and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had done. So God blessed the seventh day and hallowed it, because on it God rested from all his work which he had done in creation.”

After the statement of Genesis 2:1 concluding the narrative of the six days of creative activity God rests and thereby creates the Sabbath. One could be tempted to see this day as an anticlimax for several reasons. It follows: 1) the climactic creation of man; 2) the closing formulaic expression “And God saw everything that he had made, and behold, it was very good”; and 3) the formal concluding statement in Genesis 2:1. Actually, this is a typical form of ancient Near Eastern literature where a sequence of six (or other numbers) plus one is frequent. Literary works often picture a person traveling for six days and on the seventh reaching his goal. Or a fire may burn for six days and on the seventh it goes out. Many examples could be given.²⁰ In each, the seventh day represents a climactic release from the activities of the preceding six days. Certainly a similar pattern is present in the creation account of Genesis 1. Thus, far from being an anticlimax, it is a

type of climax. The creation of man is the climax of God's creative activity, but the seventh day, the day of rest and fellowship, is the meaning and goal of all that has happened up to now.

The above analysis, relying on close attention to the meaning of the words at the time they were used, suggests that the primary purpose and intent of the author of Genesis 1 was cosmogonic; he is affirming that the cosmos was created by the one true God in a miraculous and ordered way. It is the miraculous word of God which brings the universe into being; and *only* he could have done such a thing. The author is aware of a tendency among at least some of his readers toward polytheism. He wishes to state unequivocally that true Israelites are monotheists who disdain polytheistic systems, and he dismisses their divine luminaries, primordial seas, and cosmic battles as mere mundane reality.

It is against this background that we must read the chapter today. As we have seen, Genesis 1 is certainly not means to be primarily a compendium of scientific claims about the universe to which we must harmonize all our modern data. The chapter simply uses the common ancient Near Eastern cosmology in expressing what it takes to be the *theological* (or cosmogonic) truth.

Obviously, the ancient cosmology found in Genesis 1 cannot be harmonized with our present observations of the sun, moon and stars. One implication of the evidence we have examined is that Genesis 1 is theo-

logical in intent and that scientists need not attempt to harmonize the ancient cosmology used by biblical authors with the cosmology of modern science. The cosmological elements of Genesis 1 are simply the background for the cosmogonic point of the chapter: the ultimate origin of the universe is God. It is on *this* that a biblical people must take their stand, whatever modern science may have to say.

What does this do to the Sabbath, one of the most sacred of Adventist beliefs? Does the fact that some parts of Genesis 1 do not conform to our "known" view of the universe destroy our confidence in proclaiming the truth of the Sabbath, as some would hold? Once again it must be underscored that every problem we have encountered in Genesis 1 is a cosmological one. Here also the cosmology of Genesis 1 is the vehicle for its cosmogonic, or theological message. The Sabbath is in no way part of cosmology; it describes nothing of the universe. It is wholly cosmogonic. It is the symbol of, and provides the daily meaning for, the miraculous creative activity of God. As such, it is part of the central theological message of the chapter.

Have we subjected modern science to the Bible as Ellen White has suggested? Yes. We have insisted that the truth of Genesis 1 is its cosmogonic statement. God created the world miraculously in an ordered fashion. If science is to be related to the Bible, it is to this cosmogonic statement that the comparison should be made. After all, it is the theological message of a passage which is at stake, not the vehicle by which it is presented.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. See Edgar Krentz, *The Historical-Critical Method* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975).

2. All Biblical quotes are from the Revised Standard Version unless otherwise noted.

3. See E. J. Young, *Studies in Genesis One* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1964), p. 15. I have come across this view especially while talking with members of various conservative religious groups.

4. The repeated formulaic expressions throughout the chapter as well as the recognized relationship between the first, second and third days of the creation week to the fourth, fifth and sixth days, respectively, are a part of the structure.

5. Other biblical examples include the Book of Ecclesiastes where 1:2 is the introductory *inclusio* and 12:8 is the concluding *inclusio*. The opening vision of Ezekiel has an introductory *inclusio* in 1:4 and a

similar concluding *inclusio* in 1:28. Many other examples could be given. Extra-biblical examples are just as frequent. For an example see *Ancient Near Eastern Texts* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969); hereafter, *ANET*. pp. 414–418, “The Instructions for King Meri-Ka-Re,” Lines 1 and 144. Spot checking through *ANET* will reveal many more.

6. Young, *Studies in Genesis One*, pp. 1–3, discusses this alternative in detail.

7. Young, *Ibid.*, p. 3, gives several examples.

8. He could have answered this question very clearly, if he had so desired.

9. The extant tablets of this early Babylon composition date to the first millennium BC when it seems to have reached the heights of its popularity as Babylon became the cultural center of the ancient world.

10. One of the more recent uses of this interpretation was by Norman Young, *Creator, Creation and Faith* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976).

11. Some Hebrew dictionaries translate *rāqia'* as “expanse,” but it is clear that a two-dimensional expanse is intended, similar to a table top or the surface of a lake, not three-dimensional space.

12. Consult James B. Pritchard, ed., *ANET.*, pp. 4–6: The Theology of Memphis (Egypt); pp. 60–72: Enuma Elish (Babylon); pp. 129–142: Myth of Baal contains references to the cosmogonic battle, one of the Canaanite ideas of creation.

13. These “windows of heaven” may also be used to illustrate the solid nature of the firmament, but more likely they are intended as symbolic schematizations.

14. See, for example H. C. Leupold, *Exposition of Genesis* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1942), p. 76. There are many others.

15. To be considered “alive” by the ancients an organism must move (Genesis 9:3), have blood (Genesis 9:4) and visibly breathe (Genesis 7:22). Transpiration is, of course, a modern concept and does not fit this definition.

16. Other passages in the Old Testament that mention this beast show that “sea monsters” is more nearly, though not precisely, correct. In Psalm 74:13 the *tanninim* are great beasts of the sea who are defeated by God in an allusion to the Canaanite cosmic battle between Baal and the god of the sea which symbolized for the Psalmist the crossing of the Red Sea; the term Leviathan is parallel to it in the next line. Isaiah 27:1, in referring to the upcoming new exodus from captivity, pictures God slaying the *tanninim* which are again paralleled with Leviathan. They are a symbol of all that is evil. Isaiah 51:9 uses them to allude to the same cosmic battle as Psalm

74:13 (now symbolizing creation as well as the exodus); the *tanninim* were defeated and God’s established order is created. In a context of sorcery in Exodus 7 it is the *tanninim* which came from the rods of Moses and the magicians; there is thus a serpent aspect to the word. Fortunately, the Canaanite texts found at Ugarit, in Syria, have helped greatly to make this rather enigmatic beast known; text 1001 describes *tanninim* as having two tails and a forked tongue, and, like the Bible associates it with the sea. See Arthur J. Ferch’s recent discussion, “Daniel 7 and Ugarit: A Reconsideration,” *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 99, p. 81.

17. See Pritchard, pp. 4–6; pp. 129–142.

18. These passages also refer to the Red Sea experience during the exodus on another level.

19. “Let us make” (Heb. *ná ašéh*). Many have seen this word which is in the first person plural form to be proof for the existence of the Trinity, though the Trinity is mentioned or referred to clearly nowhere in the Old Testament. However, if we consider the literatures of the ancient Near East, it will be seen that an important divine address to the heavenly court is often phrased in the first person plural. This is especially true in the case of the highest of the gods. (See Patrick D. Miller, Jr., Genesis 1–11: *Studies in Structure and Theme*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Supplement Series 8 (Sheffield: University of Sheffield, 1978). The first person plural also occurs in Genesis 3:22 and 11:1–9, but the same picture of the divine address to the heavenly court is no doubt intended.)

We should certainly understand the pronouncement in verse 26 in the same manner. The decision to create man was the greatest decision of the creation plans and as such was recorded in Genesis 1 by the most solemn tones possible. The phrase would have evoked in the mind of the ancient reader a picture of God on his throne solemnly suggesting to the heavenly court surrounding him the creation of man in the image of God. It thus does not refer to the Trinity, but is instead consistent with the rest of the Old Testament on this point.

The three persons of the Trinity are first revealed in the New Testament and were apparently unknown to the Old Testament. Looking back, we can isolate the individual persons by theological projection, but the discipline of biblical study cannot talk about the Trinity in the Old Testament. Our modern concept of the Trinity, and indeed the term itself, developed during the Christological controversies of the fourth and fifth centuries AD.

20. For a few see E. J. Young, *Studies in Genesis One*, pp. 79–81.

Adventist Women Mix Career and Marriage

John G. Beach. *Notable Women of Spirit: The Historical Role of Women in the Seventh-day Adventist Church*. Nashville, Tenn.: Southern Publishing Association, 1976. 125 pp., bibl.

review by Carol Richardson Boyko

One dimensional approaches to the pioneer parents of Adventism are increasingly coming under fire, and several books have appeared that, in time, should help make the Seventh-day Adventist Church unafraid of criticism or investigation. Therefore, I find it incredible that such a book as John G. Beach's *Notable Women of Spirit*, a book plagued with interminable inspirational glosses of Adventism's founding mothers, should have found its way into print.

To begin with, the author has profoundly misunderstood his audience. He has apparently attempted to placate what he views as a surly group of feminist hotheads, while frankly admitting, in his own words, to being a "male chauvinist." The book continues with such "concessions" as a woman leader introduced to us as "Haskell's wife" and the imposing physician Kate Lindsay referred to as a "single girl." But because Beach is not so callous as to be unaware of rumblings in the women's ranks (though he cannot, he admits, understand them), he goes on to introduce to us a number of notable Adventist women who, though figuring heavily in the development of Adventism, somehow got lost in the shuffle when credit was given. We wish to see

women in the midst of a dramatic, exciting struggle, helping give birth to what they believe is God's last church on earth. But those who expect to meet flesh and blood mothers will be disappointed, since all vigor and intelligence are drained until these women dissolve into one vast, murky blur.

This is done, as in all propagandizing literature, by emphasizing similarities at the expense of personality, and Beach begins with physical appearance and "feminine charm." It is somehow important, for example, that Jean McIntosh, a pioneer in the development of Sabbath School visual aid material, raised "four equally beautiful daughters" (p. 58), and that Sera Henry, the famous prohibitionist, possessed certain secrets:

One of her secrets was her feminine charm—slim figure, black hair, soulful eyes, and deeply spiritual expression. As she grew older—her figure matronly and hair tinged with gray—she gave the overall impression of a mother with that "Can I help you?" look beaming from her eyes (p. 89).

It is unnecessary, of course, to point out the trivializing effect emphasis on appearance has on a treatise of this nature. But a fitting irony comes at the end of the chapter, where Beach has marshalled the following quotation from Margaret White's *Whirlwind of the Lord*:

The trend today is to exalt and exploit the superficial feminine qualities. The admiration of young people is daily directed in countless ways to the importance of beautiful hair, clear skin, and alluring smile, and a well-proportioned figure, instead of to the charm of cheerfulness, the premium of patience, and the pride of purity (p. 100).

Not surprisingly, a career in the Seventh-day Adventist Church for a woman has

always meant serving in a secondary capacity, yet Beach is unabashed in his praise for the many women who dropped these careers for marriage. Still, there were, unavoidably, some women who just did not fit the pattern—those few who never married and never faced Beach's false dilemma of serving church or family. Beach apparently meets his match in the defiant Dr. Lindsay. Since no amount of camouflage can conceal her obviously brusque, even severe personality, Beach can only offer us a faint: "underneath the surface beat a very warm and tender heart" (p. 83).

But the unmarried ladies are only excess baggage on the journey to Beach's most impassioned, though hardly surprising, point: women are to put family life before career. "God created woman to be a wife and mother as well as a member of the board of trustees" (p. 107). Aside from a callousness likely to ruffle unmarried or childless women, what is so vexing is the false dilemma he would perpetuate to make his point, and at the expense of many church leaders who themselves saw no dilemma.

Beach takes as a matter of course that women have a different basic nature from men, a nature more suited to domestic confines, and without giving evidence in support, he announces that "of course, most women, even today, still prefer the home to the office, the preparation of food to that of an audit report, and the training of a family to that of an office staff" (p. 14). And what really surprises is that the bulk of his own book denies the very point he is attempting to make. It is obvious that many women throughout the history of the Seventh-day Adventist Church have managed to make a significant contribution to the church while married and raising children. Beach's persistence in asking the false question, "which is more important—a family or a career?" (p. 109) suggests that he never really met these "notable women of spirit."

The Sabbath as a Witness to the Gospel

Niels-Erik A. Andreasen. *Rest and Redemption: A Study of the Biblical Sabbath*. (Studies in Religion, Andrews University Monographs, vol. 11) vii 137 pp., bibl. Berrien Springs, Mich: Andrews University Press, 1978.

review by A. Josef Greig

This work largely re-presents the fruit of Niels-Erik Andreasen's earlier tradition-historical investigation which was entitled *The Old Testament Sabbath* (1972), and reflects his theological treatment of biblical Sabbath texts. Andreasen's purpose in this present work is to present the theological and sociological implications of the Bible's Sabbath.

After an introduction and discussion of the origin and institutionalization of the Sabbath, Andreasen thematically develops relevant Sabbath texts in the Old Testament according to their literary history. Thus, chapter four, "The Sabbath, Work, and Rest," presents the Sabbath in its earliest form as law (basically prohibiting work on the seventh day) and draws out the theological and practical implications of those Sabbath laws. Chapter five, "The Sabbath and Freedom," theologically assesses the Deuteronomic texts, which unite the Sabbath with the theme of freedom, and allows Andreasen to introduce the humanitarian implications of the Sabbath, a theme that he pursues throughout the remainder of his book.

Finally, in "The Sabbath and Worship" Andreasen presents textual evidence, possibly priestly, that the very foundation of the Sabbath was a day of worship—a day when God was recognized as Lord of life and time. Despite the prophets' criticisms of Sabbath practices, their recognition of the need for

A. Josef Greig is associate professor of theology at Andrews University.

devotional time explains their deep interest in the Sabbath.

Compared to Sabbath laws, which are concerned with the cessation of labor and with worship, the creation Sabbath symbolizes the covenant relationship between creator and creature that is actualized in the Sabbath. Andreasen argues that Genesis 2:1-3 is more concerned with God's creative work than with the Sabbath institution. The Sabbath is offered to man, but he is not commanded to keep it; a point Andreasen takes to mean that we are not dealing simply with man's Sabbath-keeping, but with God's Sabbath-keeping. God's rest at creation seeks to convey the idea that God has turned away from further work in order to commune with man. Chapter eight further develops the characteristics of the Sabbath that allow it to function as a sign of the covenant. These are the aspects of the Sabbath that unite God and man, express God's presence, describe Israel's relationship to the land God gave her, and stress the relationship between Sabbath observance and covenantal participation.

The next-to-last chapter discusses the Sabbath controversies in which Jesus' teaching opposes that of contemporary Judaism. This chapter presupposes that these controversies in the various Gospels were original to Jesus and his contemporaries within Judaism, and not the invention of later Christian groups. Andreasen argues that, in both the grain field incident and in the healing miracles, Jesus is not addressing the rabbinic Sabbath regulations and their casuistry; rather, he is reassessing the fundamental meaning of the Sabbath by stripping away trappings that obscure its attractiveness. The Sabbath is a witness to the gospel and anticipates the hope of the final Sabbath rest.

The final chapter, "The Sabbath and Redemption," traces the evolution of the nature of Israel's perpetual hope for a time of rest. In the New Testament book of Hebrews that hope is reinterpreted in terms of Christ's redemption and associated with

the Sabbath, which contributes both a contemporary and eschatological dimension to the concept of rest for the people of God.

One criticism that may be leveled at Andreasen's book arises from his statement that New Testament scholars in recent years have rejected the position that the Sabbath controversies originated in the early church. It would be more representative to say that most New Testament scholars have abandoned the view that the Sabbath controversies in the Gospels are *entirely* the creations of the early church. The significance of Andreasen's position is that by concentrating on *Jesus'* view of the Sabbath, the problem of the Sabbath tradition in the early church, which is reflected in the Gospels, is largely ignored, and the kind of insights into the texts that he brings to the Old Testament portions of the book are largely missing from the New Testament portions. Andreasen gives us the historical Jesus pitted against the historical Pharisees. This criticism aside, Andreasen's study has enhanced the theological and sociological significance of the Sabbath in a way that will certainly command the recognition of laymen and professional theologians alike.

666 and All That

Martin Gardner. *The Incredible Dr. Matrix: The World's Greatest Numerologist*. 256 pp. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1976. \$8.95.

review by Ronald L. Numbers

In this story, Gardner describes his central character, Dr. Matrix as being the son of an Adventist missionary to Japan, William Miller Bush. It seems that young Bush, who takes the stage name of Dr. Matrix, first

Ronald L. Numbers is chairman of the Department of the History of Medicine, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

God wanted him to be “a laborer in the Adventist cause.” The discovery a few years later of D.M. Canright’s *Life of Mrs. E.G. White* shattered his faith, and he subsequently drifted into the entertainment world.

Martin Gardner, described by the *New York Times* as “probably the leading popularizer of mathematical recreations now writing in English,” writes a regular column in the *Scientific American*. In it, Gardner occasionally invokes the name of his fictional Dr. Leving Joshua Matrix, identifying him as the inventor of mathematical puzzles. In Gardner’s book, Matrix frequently draws on his Adventist background for illustrations. Once, after reading about the number 666 in Carlyle B. Haynes’ *Our Times and Their Meaning*, Gardner asked Matrix for his views on 666. “‘I could talk for hours about 666,’ the doctor said with a heavy sigh. ‘This particular application of the Beast’s number is quite old. Of course it’s easy for a skillful numerologist to find 666 in any name. In fact, if you add the Latin numerals in the name ELLEN GOULD WHITE, the inspired prophetess who founded Seventh-day Adventism—counting *w* as a “double *u*” or two *v*’s—it also adds up to 666’” (note that each word in Irving Joshua Matrix has six letters, giving 666).

An entire chapter of Gardner’s book is devoted to mathematical puzzles Matrix found in the King James Bible, presumably while writing a 13-volume biblical commentary. Again the doctor’s familiarity with Adventism is evident. “Mrs. White, in a trance, saw the 144,000 saints standing on a sea of glass in ‘a perfect square.’ She failed to realize, writes Dr. Matrix, that the square of 144,000 is not 120 or 1,200 but the irrational number 379.4733+” (but see p. 256 for a possible way of extricating Mrs. White from this embarrassment).

As a youth Gardner himself converted briefly to Adventism, perhaps explaining why this is not the first time Adventists have appeared in his writings. The chapter on George McCready Price in his widely read *Fads and Fallacies in the Name of Science* remains the most thoughtful assessment of the Adventist geologist yet written, and Gardner returns to Price in his quasi-autobiographical novel *The Flight of Peter Fromm* (reviewed in SPECTRUM, Vol. 5 No. 2, by Donald E. Hall). The Peter Fromm story should be read by all Adventists wrestling with their faith—as well as by those who may be called upon to counsel such persons. *The Incredible Dr. Matrix*, a much lighter work, simply provides a pleasant way to pass a quiet weekend.

Responses

Rea Expresses Dismay at Reviews of *The White Lie*

To the Editors: I have always enjoyed your magazine. However, after reading the critiques of my book *The White Lie*, I have wondered if it is possible in today's hysterical climate in Adventism to receive an objective and honest critique from an institutional worker. Both men seemed to me to be using the opportunity to give a polemic for their particular view of inspiration, rather than seeking to find the problems that I stated in the book. It has been fascinating to me to receive worldwide comment, and I note with some amusement that, almost without exception, the Adventist institutional worker keeps bleeding on the rug because of the style. But I have not heard one sentence from them concerning the tie-in between the church's administrators and the Davenport, Ford, Rea connection.

I would like to briefly make a comment on each critique. Jonathan Butler is quoted as saying: "Certainly Rea will not ingratiate himself to evangelicals with this line of argument." I am sending you a critique from the Christian Research Institute, an official evangelical voice sponsored by Walter Martin, in which neither he nor his staff take the view that Jonathan suggests. In fact, it would seem "that a prophet is not without honor save in his own country."

In his footnotes, Alden Thompson, who seems so anxious we all be accurate, has once again betrayed his inaccuracies. In the footnote he says: "He does not indicate, however, that the tapes of the Glendale meeting of January 28-29, 1980, were to be released only by joint agreement of Rea and PREXAD . . ." This is not only inaccurate, but part of the white lie. A careful audit of the Glendale tapes will show that I never gave such a commitment, to anyone, at any time. What did happen, was at the beginning of the first day, the group agreed that if I released my tape, they then could release one of the other two copies. At the end of the second day, however, in a meeting where I was denied vote or voice, they voted that the tapes, if released, should be released concurrently—an action I neither sanctioned nor was allowed to vote on.

Within five days of the January meeting, at least seven members of that committee went public with the so-called private information. Some of that information was not only misleading but an out-and-out lie, such as the February 11, 1980, article in the *Pacific Union Recorder* where President Harold Calkins stated that "the committee did not discover dependence on other authors in the Spirit of Prophecy writings." This was not only the opposite of what the committee had found and voted, but was an obvious attempt to distort the fact and mislead the

people. When he was informed by the attorney of the misinformation, he neither retracted the article nor acknowledged the white lie.

It was after this event that I notified Elder Ralph Thompson of the General Conference, who had chaired the meeting, that I would now release the tapes inasmuch as I felt the people should have an opportunity to listen to the facts as they really were, and let them draw their own conclusions.

I do hope that with all this energy being spent by so many over so little, we will soon get down to the serious problems and implications that have been raised in the last few years by the research of myself and others. To me, the most minor problem of all has always been her borrowing from others; the deeper problems arise when we ask ourselves if she really did it, and how much a part did she play in the later revisions of her work. It is now an admitted fact that we do not have the working papers involved in the preparation of the Ellen G. White Conflict of the Ages books (*Adventist Review*, July 26, 1979, pg. 6). We do not have the introduction to the 1886 or 1911 *Great Controversy* in her handwriting, nor can we find the statement from Ellen's writings quoted often, from Willie White, no less, that God would help her find the gems from the rubbish of others. Rubbish! When will we admit that it was humanly impossible to do what we claimed for her, even with God's help? Thus the discussion of "inspiration," "revelation" is mute in Adventism.

Walter T. Rea

Ford Defends Sabbath on a Round World

To the Editors: In his letter to SPECTRUM (September 1982) Harry V. Wiant says: "Actually, the day we call Sabbath is dependent upon an arbitrary, man-made date line."

I wish to enquire whether that is really the case. Inasmuch as SPECTRUM readers are scattered throughout the world, Mr. Wiant is affirming that the masses of earth are dependent upon a human institution of the 19th-century in order to find the seventh day of the week (or the first). How then did they manage prior to the international congress of 1884? Do we not find weekly reckoning across the globe until that time?

Is it not rather the case that the "arbitrary, man-made date line" affected far less than .001 percent of humanity, and that its influence upon them was in no wise deleterious jeopardizing their obedience to the Decalogue?

The week has never been a universal institution but rather one cherished by those influenced by biblical tradition. As such people migrated east and west they were travelling either with or against the sun and ultimately as the two tides met an adjustment was necessary—a decision to abide by either eastern or western time. Please note that either time was perfectly legitimate and that the only thing necessary was a decision which would avoid confusion *in that part of the world*. The date line did not influence one jot 99.999 percent of earth's inhabitants, and the tiny group it did influence were in no manner swayed from obedience to the Decalogue. "The powers that be are ordained of God" and where their decisions do not clash with biblical revelation they are to be obeyed. In many matters God leads by general revelation and His providence and Christians gladly welcome such guidance. God had said nothing in Scripture about a date-line, yet such would become necessary nearly two thousand years after the Canon was complete. A little common-sense would be quite equal to the task.

May I repeat that both eastern and western time are legitimate and it matters not one scrap which the tiny populations at the heart of the Pacific adopt. In reality, there is no such thing as gaining or losing time. Otherwise an old traveller would only need to persevere in one direction to find his youth or in the other to hasten his demise. Even before New Testament times, believers did not keep exactly the same hours in observing the Sabbath. The Jews of the Diaspora necessarily began and closed the holy day at various points dependent upon the time of sunset in their particular habitat.

Is it not strange that no one seems to have experienced difficulty in finding the first day of the week for nineteen centuries of the Christian era, but suddenly when the claims of the fourth commandment are taken literally, a previously unknown confusion arises. All believing men have been agreed on the succession and numbering of the days of the week, yet with the coming of 1884 amnesia sets in universally.

Those interested in the current Sabbath debate may wish to read my book, *The Forgotten Day* which answers in detail the scores of quibbles recently resurrected and worthy only of a further burial. Does not the present phenomenon tell us something about human nature? Nine of the ten commandments are recognized as binding from creation on all believers, but the one which safeguards the rest (provides time for their learning) is seen as temporary and only meant for a few?

Sincerely,
Desmond Ford
Auburn, California

Men Should Support Equality for SDA Women

To the Editors: I want to commend you for printing Janice Daffern's excellent article entitled, "How Long Must Women Wait? Prospects for Adventist Church Leadership" (Vol. 12, No. 4). As a member of the ordained Adventist clergy, I find it most embarrassing and unfortunate that we have failed to take a more enlightened position regarding ordination and leadership of women in the church.

After recently starting doctoral studies at Claremont, I was amazed to find that the majority of students in my classes were women. This surprise was largely due to the fact that my seminary classes at Andrews were often made up completely of men, or included one or two women at the most. There seems to be no biblical, prophetic, or cultural reason why the Church is dragging its feet on this issue. Scripture seems quite clear that the principle of equality (Gal. 3:28) is the ideal that the Christian community should be constantly striving for. Ellen White warned against being the first or the last to promote significant social change. It is obvious that we, as Adventists, are not in danger of being the "first" to promote equal rights for women; but must we be so cautious and fearful of conservative reaction in the church that we are content with being among the "last" to act concerning such important matters?

How regrettable it is that we had more female departmental directors in the 1940s than we do today. We can no longer afford to ignore the leadership gifts and the potential service that women offer the denomination. Nor can male leadership in the church afford to assume that this is a cause which is best left to women. As Christians we must recognize how awkward it is for women to call attention to the inequities that exist without appearing to be self-serving in their efforts. This makes it all the more imperative for men to speak out as their consciences convict them. Equality in Christ and His gospel demands nothing less.

Steve Daily
La Sierra Campus Chaplain
Loma Linda University
Riverside, California

Shortening of the response, "The Sabbath and the International Date Line," in the Vol. 13, No. 1, issue of SPECTRUM required omission of many helpful footnotes and other material. For a complete copy of the paper, write Harry V. Wiant, Jr., 113 Scenery Drive, Morgantown, WV 26505.

—Editors

Update

Worthington Foods Back in SDA Hands

by Bonnie Dwyer

Choplets, Vega-Links and Wham won't taste any differently because someone new owns the kitchens where they are made. Some of the original Adventist owners of Worthington Foods, Inc., in Worthington, Ohio, bought the vegetarian food company from A. G. Bayer on Oct. 15, 1982.

President Allan R. Buller said he and approximately 25 other Adventist business and professional people put up the money to purchase the company's assets through a private sale of stock at \$20 a share. James L. Hagle, a former president and stockholder of the company, will be the chairman of the board and treasurer. George T. Harding, Jr., director of the Harding Hospital in Worthington, assumes the responsibilities of vice president and secretary. Buller, who has been with the company for 37 years, is the only officer with daily operational duties.

From 1939 until 1970, Worthington operated as a private corporation producing food for the Adventist vegetarian market. Then Miles Laboratories purchased the company. The makers of Alka Seltzer and 1-A-Day Vitamins foresaw rapid growth in food and nutrition products as America's fitness boom was beginning. Through a strong advertising program it hoped to tap a new market of health conscious people. Under an additional label, Morningstar Farms, a spicier version of Worthington's original products was developed for people accustomed to eating meat.

Then in 1978, when A. G. Bayer of West Germany decided to add a U.S. company to

its corporate family, it purchased Miles Laboratories. (Previously its aspirin line had simply been marketed in the U.S. by the Stirling Company.)

Buller and Hagle learned early in 1982 that Bayer management would prefer to concentrate on marketing pharmaceuticals, so they put together an offer to return Worthington to Adventist owners.

"We're thrilled to be able to do it," Buller said. "We feel it is a market which deserves to be serviced. The people at Miles/Bayer were very supportive, too. They offered to continue to help us, if we wanted them to, in any way."

With a total of 240 employees, Worthington is one of the largest Adventist self-supporting institutions. Buller said Worthington Foods, Incorporated, is applying for membership in the Association of Adventist Self-Supporting Institutions.

The company plans to offer investment and employment opportunities for Adventists, in addition to good food, he said. Both Morningstar Farms and Worthington Food product lines will continue to be produced at the company's Worthington, Ohio, plant.

Autumn Council Creates 7th-largest Health System

by Robin Duska

The most far-reaching action of the Autumn session of the North American Division—convened in Washington October 27 to November 2—was the creation of a single Adventist health care corporation, Adven-

tist Health Systems/United States. The new corporation comprises the largest Protestant hospital system in the United States and is the seventh-largest among all operators of acute care hospital beds in the country. The question is whether creation of this new corporation enhances the authority of health care administrators or of elected denomination leaders over what has come to be an enterprise with a \$1.5 to 2 billion yearly budget.

The new corporation will serve as an umbrella organization for the five existing corporations (Eastern and Mid-America, North, Loma Linda, Sunbelt, and West). Each of the five existing corporations remain intact, with their local boards now continuing to function and hold the hospital properties. However, the new corporation is constituted so that whenever its board wishes, it can hold property, including, if all parties agreed, the properties now held by the four regionally defined corporations.

The Board of Directors has a clear preponderance of denominational officials—only 11 of the 30 directors coming from the health care corporations. Others include: General Conference, 7; union conference presidents, 8; Loma Linda University; 1; laymen not employed by the church, 3. The constituency of Adventist Health Systems/United States, which has the power to change its constitution and bylaws, is composed of 121 people, with a large minority—54—coming from outside the health care institutions. The constituency includes the following groups: General Conference, 38; Union Conferences, 28; Health care corporations and hospitals, 21; Adventist Health Systems/United States, 33.

Don Welch, head of the Sunbelt Corporation with its headquarters in Collegedale, Tennessee, has been elected president of the national corporation. Where the president of Adventist Health Systems resides has been regarded as a significant indication of whether health care administrators or denominational officials in North America will dominate. Don Welch is not

currently moving to Washington, D.C., although the president is expected to move within two years to the vicinity of the General Conference.

There had been conjectures that scheduling a session that drew North American conference and union presidents apart from the regular Annual Council of the General Conference (this year held earlier in Manila) might be an occasion for discussions about an independent North American Division. But no formal explorations of the matter was to take place, as Neal Wilson, president of the General Conference, made plain at the start of the Washington, D.C., meeting.

Robin Duska teaches English at Columbia Union College, and is also an editorial assistant with the Gas Research Institute of Washington, D.C.

Theological Consultation In North Pacific Union

by Alden Thompson

In meetings held September 5–9 at Camp Mivoden in Northern Idaho, the North Pacific Union Conference convened its own theological consultation, the first—and thus far only—union to act on recommendations going out of the division-wide consultation of August 1980 and November 1981. Focusing on the topic of inspiration in Revelation, the 87 delegates included union and local conference officers, a selection of pastors from each conference, academy Bible teachers, along with the religion staff and key administrators from Walla Walla College.

The North Pacific Union administration had initiated plans for the session, asking the School of Theology at Walla Walla College to assist with the planning and to provide resource personnel.

The program stressed inductive-type assignment and small group discussions.

The college staff prepared three sets of assignments covering the Old Testament, New Testament, and Ellen White material. Monday's assignment on the Old Testament touched on the composition of a prophetic book (Jer. 1, 36, 51-52), the comparison of parallel prophetic oracles (Isaiah 2; Micah 4; Joel 3) and parallel historical accounts, such as the story of Hezekiah; (2 Kings 18-20; 2 Chron. 32; Isaiah 36-39). Tuesday's assignment on the New Testament called for an evaluation of the similarities and differences in the four different gospel account of Peter's denial. Wednesday's assignment on the Ellen White material focused on the descriptions of the inspiration process as found in the introduction to the book, *The Great Controversy* and *Selected Messages*, Volume 1. The assignment also asked the delegates to compare Ellen White's finished statement in *Selected Messages*, Volume 1, pp. 19-21, with her source document, a passage written by Calvin Stowe. No evening meetings were held, the time having been set aside for the study of the next day's assignment.

Evidence that response to the consultation has been distinctly positive is the fact that the leadership of the North Pacific Union has asked the college staff to assist in carrying on similar consultations in the local conferences.

Alden Thompson, professor of religion at Walla Walla College, received his doctorate in Old Testament at the University of Edinburgh, Scotland.

Adventist Media Center Makes More Cuts

by Bonnie Dwyer

Six more people lost their jobs at the Adventist Media Center in October; the latest

round of dismissals came at Adventist Media Productions, the component that makes tapes, slides and films. Reducing the Media Productions staff by one-third leaves nine people. It remains a separate component within the Media Center, despite recommendations from the General Conference to terminate Media Productions as a separate entity.

In August, the General Conference Media Center Study Committee presented its report to the Center Board of Trustees, and suggested total elimination of Media Productions, warning that if present trends continue the financial operation of the entire Center could be seriously jeopardized. "Adventist Media Productions is carrying an inventory of over \$250,000, much of which is not moving," the report said. "Continuing operating losses have completely wiped out the working capital that it may have had previously and as of April 30, 1982, there was a cash flow deficit of \$701,416. Total losses for 1980 and 1981 amounted to \$515,358."

However, the Center board did not accept the committee recommendation to terminate Adventist Media Productions. Instead, the administration of the Media Center, while eliminating several departments within Media Productions, will continue to operate its film studio.

In another board action, a new committee was established to determine the distribution of General Conference money to the various components within the Adventist Media Center as a whole. While previously Media Center administrators Robert Frame and Robert Lawson effectively made such decisions, now three General Conference officers and two Media Center administrators will decide how the General Conference appropriation is divided among the five components.

In the 36-page report delivered to the Board by the General Conference study committee, each component received some kind of commendation followed by recommendations; however, Faith for Today and

Media Productions were singled out for more extensive treatment. The sections on these components carried a long list of "factors reviewed." Then in the Appendix section a sampling of responses regarding these two components was also listed.

"It appears that AMP was created with the hope of finding a need for it rather than to fill a need. When you use an 18-wheeler to run to the grocery store for a loaf of bread, it makes the bread terribly expensive," said one.

"Faith for Today needs to do something! From information available to me, they have spent the entire year of 1981 producing one feature film. And, that film makes little or no reference to Seventh-day Adventists, their work or teachings," said another.

Although discussion of Faith for Today ran 14 pages out of the total 36, the board took no action at its August meeting. The General Conference officers decided in July to give Faith for Today until January 1, 1983, to develop a comprehensive proposal for the restructuring of its program.

In addition to discussion of the various components, the study committee report contained suggestions for the Center Administration and the General Conference.

"That the Adventist Media Center and component management study the feasibility of forming a consolidated Bible School that would eventually be under the direction of the Center," was one general recommendation. Another suggested that beginning in 1983, an annual offering appeal be made for television ministry (instead of Faith for Today) and that funds received be distributed by the Center board.

New SDA Hymnal By 1985 General Conference

by George Gainer

The SDA Church Hymnal Committee plans to have a new hymnal off the Review and Herald press in time for the 1985 General Conference session. The 1983 Annual Council will make the final decision as to what hymns will be included. The 18-member committee, chaired by Charles Brooks, associate secretary of the Sabbath School Department in the General Conference, with Wayne Hooper of the Voice of Prophecy serving as the executive secretary, began their work by evaluating the results of two surveys sent to working pastors, selected administrators, musicians, and the 86-member Church Hymnal Advisory Committee. One survey indicated that from one-third to one-half of the 703 songs in our present *Church Hymnal* have "never been sung or have fallen into disuse."

The news that a growing number of our churches have begun purchasing other hymnals helped the church recognize the need to a new SDA hymnal to replace the present *Church Hymnal* in use since 1941. The Review and the General Conference standing Music Committee approached the General Conference and received approval for the project. A plan was devised whereby the standing Music Committee (also chaired by Elder Charles Brooks) would be responsible for the content of the new hymnal with the Review and Herald responsible for production and marketing. In contrast, the 1941 *Church Hymnal* was a purely General Conference project.

George Gainer is the youth pastor for Sligo Church located in Takoma Park, Maryland.

SPECTRUM ADVISORY COUNCIL

Charlene and Floyd Anderson	Marga and Elton Kerr
Lucille and Alan Anderson	Dorane and William King
Ramona and Len Bierlein	Claire and Richard Knierim
Ben R. Boice	Ruth and Edward Komarniski
LeJean and Allen Botimer	Doreen and Irwin Kuhn
Neridah and Bernard Brandstater	Verla and Alvin Kwiram
Betty and Bruce Branson	Karen and Mel Lake
Mary and Floyd Brauer	Anita and Robert Lang
Merrilyn and Ray Brown	Roberta and Bradley Litchfield
Marilyn and Robert Burman	Ewald Lonser
Harold S. Campbell	Heidi and Richard Ludders
Dos and Molleurus Couperus	Thelma McAdoo
Eryl Cummings	Irene and Kenneth McGill
Walter Cummings	Marguerite and Robert Marsh
Elsie and Raymond Damazo	Iola and Julius Martin
Thelma and Lloyd Dayes	Neva and Bill Meek
Mary and James Dunn	Jacqueline and Robert Moncrieff
Mary and Wilfred Eastman	Lyla Neumann
Juanita and Richard Engel	Valerie and Glenn Patchen
Nancy Engeset	Marilyn and Daniel Patchin
Janine and Wilmer Engevik	Cecilia and Ernest Plata
Mary and Rene Evard	Verna and Winslow B. Randall
Lois and Walt Fahlsing	Martha and Alfredo Rasi
Erika and Jim Fallbeck	Arlene and Merlin Reeder
Marjorie and Albert Farver	Carole and Gordon Rick
Karen and Ronald Fasano	Anieta and William Rippey
Beth and Jack Fleming	Thais and James Sadoyama
Joy and Gerry Fuller	Ursula and Donald Shasky
G. Elaine Giddings	Gordon and Lovina Short
Joyce and David Grauman	Grace and Walter Stilson
Nadine and Gordon Hale	Carlene and Leonard Taylor
Deanne and David Hanscom	Dort and Nancy Tikker
Cheryl and Milford Harrison	Mareidith and Rudy Torres
Sally and Robert Hasselbrack	Ken Tucker
Donald Hawley	Nancy and Robin Vandermolen
Hanna and Hjaltar Helmerston	Nancy and John Vogt
Claudette and Jack Hennemann	Carol and Bruce Walter
Margaret and Wilfred Huse	Karla and Kenneth Walters
Marjorie and John Jacobson	Janice and Harry Wang
Liv and Eugene Joergenson	Barbara and Rodney Willard
Dorothy and Bernarr Johnson	Vicki and Chuck Woofter
Genevieve and Paul Johnson	Morton Woolley
Katie and Richard Johnson	

The SPECTRUM Advisory Council is a group of committed SPECTRUM supporters who provide financial stability and business and editorial advice to insure the continuation of the journal's open discussion of significant issues. For more information, contact:

Dr. Raymond S. Damazo, Chairman
855 106th Avenue N.E.
Bellevue, WA 98004

(206) 454-2722 Office
(206) 455-4522 Residence

