



*"Watchman,
what of the night?"*

*The watchman said, The morning cometh, and also the night: if ye wi
enquire, enquire ye: return, come. Isaiah 21:11-12*

MILLER WRONG ON ONE POINT ONLY

Ankerberg Charges

William Miller with Five Wrong

Assumptions

Ford and Rea Assent

During the first telecast of the Ankerberg Show which featured "Seventh-day Adventism at the Crossroads," John Ankerberg asked the question - "Why do we even need a Sanctuary doctrine?" (Transcript 1-2) To this Dr. Desmond Ford replied: "For [the] Seventh-day Adventist, [the] Sanctuary Doctrine grew out of the Miller Revival - the Advent Revival of 1844 . . ." (Ibid.) A discussion as to where William Miller found a basis for his conclusion that Jesus would return in 1844, followed. Then Mr. Ankerberg summarized for the viewers, prefacing his remarks with a question. He said:

"How did William Miller pick the date of 1844 A.D. as the time Jesus would return to earth? He made at least five wrong assumptions to do so. First, he assumed two unrelated passages of Scripture - Daniel 8:14 and Daniel 9:24 - were actually related. Second, in Daniel 8:14

he assumed that the 2300 days mentioned could mean 2300 years. He was wrong. The Hebrew literally reads, '2,300 evenings and mornings,' which total 1,150 whole days. Third, he further assumed from Daniel 8:14 that in the words, 'Then shall the sanctuary be cleansed,' that the sanctuary stood for the whole earth, and 'cleansed' stood for Jesus leaving Heaven and coming to earth. Again he was wrong. The Hebrew word for 'cleansed' literally means 'vindicated.' Fourth, in the other verse - Daniel 9:24 - he assumed that when the seventy-sevens, or 490 years, were decreed, the word 'decreed' could be translated 'cut off from.' He was wrong. The Hebrew literally means decreed or determined. He further postulated the 490 years mentioned here were 'cut off from' the 2,300 years postulated in the other passage of Daniel 8:14. Fifth, from these two non-related texts, he joined his wrongly translated words in those texts to assume he knew when the 2,300 years began and when they would end. This postulated date, mixed with his assumption that the cleansing of the sanctuary stood for Jesus coming to earth led Miller to wrongly conclude that Jesus would come back to the earth on October 22, 1844 A.D. Later in a vision, Ellen G. White claimed it was revealed to her that Jesus did not come to earth, or 'the earthly sanctuary,' as she called it, rather, on October 22, 1844, Jesus changed His location in Heaven and entered the Heavenly Sanctuary, or Holy of Holies." (1-3)

Three of the five points really deal with one issue only - the relationship of Daniel 8:14 with Daniel 9:24-27. The

second point questions the meaning of the 2300 Days as understood by Seventh-day Adventists. The third point is admitted in part, and that part has always been recognized by Seventh-day Adventists as an error in Miller's assumptions. This has to do with the fact that "the cleansing of the sanctuary" did not mean the cleansing of this earth by fire as understood by Miller. He was right, however, that the word - cleansed - is the correct translation of Daniel 8:14. To all of these assumptions of Miller, Mr. Ankerberg, assuming them to be in error, then draws a faulty conclusion that the ultimate understanding of the meaning of the prophecy of Daniel and its interpretation resulted from a vision of Ellen G. White. To this summary of Mr. Ankerberg, neither Ford nor Rea dissented.

What is the truth?

Interrelationship of Daniel 8 & 9

Was William Miller correct when he associated together Daniel 8:14 and 9:24-27? Yes, he was correct from contextual and linguistic evidence. Let us note first contextual evidence. After receiving a vision of a ram, he-goat, and a little horn, he heard the voice of an heavenly being asking a series of questions - "How long shall be the vision, the daily, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot?" (Dan. 8:13) He was then told the answer - "Unto two thousand and three hundred days, then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." This concluded the vision. Daniel wanted an explanation. He then heard a commission given - "Gabriel make this man to understand the vision." (8:16) However, the eighth closes with the words - "I was astonished at the vision, but none understood it." The part of the vision left unexplained involved the 2300 days, or as noted - "the vision of the evening and morning." (verse 26)

The ninth chapter - describing events some eleven years later - tells of Daniel searching the books of Jeremiah, and entering into prayer concerning the prophecy found there. While Daniel is praying Gabriel comes. Daniel records it thus: "Yea, whiles I was speaking in prayer, even the man Gabriel, whom I had seen

in the vision at the beginning." (9:21) Daniel related the coming of Gabriel to the prior vision he had seen which had as yet not been fully explained. Gabriel himself confirms this understanding. He tells Daniel - "I am now come forth to give thee skill and understanding. . . . Understand the matter and consider the vision." (9:22-23) He gave Daniel no additional vision - and the only previous vision which Daniel had not understood was the 2300 days. Contextually, Miller was absolutely correct in associating these two chapters.

Now to the linguistic connection: In these two chapters, there are two Hebrew words used for the word - vision. How they are used serves as an important link between Daniel 8:14 and 9:24-27. One word for vision is ghah-zohn, the other, mar-eh. The word - ghah-zohn - is used to refer to the vision as a whole (Dan. 8:1-3), while the word - mar-eh - is used to refer to the 2300 days specifically. Observe closely how the word - mar-eh - is used. In Daniel 8:14, the word - "days" - is not from the usual word - yohm - but rather, "evenings (and) mornings." Thus this part of the vision is noted as "the vision of the evening and the morning." (8:26) In this instance, the word for vision is mar-eh. Gabriel was specifically instructed to make Daniel understand the vision - the word being - mar-eh. (8:16) When Daniel expressed astonishment at the vision, indicating that none understood it, the word is mar-eh. (8:27) When Gabriel returns, Daniel observes that he is the one whom he had seen in the vision - ghah-zohn - at the beginning, but when Gabriel tells Daniel to "consider the vision," the word is again, mar-eh. Gabriel then launches into the matter of the "seventy weeks." (Dan. 9:23-24) Further, when Gabriel tells Daniel that the during the "seventy weeks" a seal is to be placed upon the vision, it is the whole - ghah-zohn - to which Gabriel refers, and the only prior vision is the vision of Daniel 8. Again on the basis of linguistic evidence, William Miller was correct in his assumptions that related Daniel 8:14 and 9:24-27.

Evenings and Mornings

William Miller interpreted the 2300 evenings and mornings as full prophetic days. Ankerberg calls this a false assumption and stated that this was really only 1150 literal days. Prior to the pronouncement made to Daniel concerning the 2300 days, there had been a revelation concerning the "daily." In fact it had been included as a part of the question which evoked the response concerning the 2300 evenings and mornings. (Dan. 8:13-14) The word for "daily" - tamid - is used as either an adjective or an adverb, but in Daniel it appears as a substantive. An English comparison would be a predicate adjective. The first use of tamid in the Bible as an adjective is in Exodus 29:42. There it is translated, "continual," and refers to the daily sacrifice morning and evening. Thus the very time of the tamid burnt offering - morning and evening - is used by the one speaking to Daniel to show the association of the prophetic time - days - with the symbolism of the sanctuary services which served as a shadow of the Heavenly. But there is a distinct difference. The continual burnt offering is always referred to in sequence of morning and evening. While borrowing the same words in place of the usual Hebrew word for days - yohm - the order is made to conform to the definition of a whole days as found in Genesis 1:5 - "There was evening, and there was morning, day one." William Miller in his assumption that the 2300 evenings and mornings were full days, and not half days was correct.

"Cleansed" or "Vindicated"?

Ankerberg in the telecast stated - "The Hebrew word for 'cleansed' literally means 'vindicated.'" (1-3) He is of course referring again to Daniel 8:14. The word in the Hebrew is tzah-dak. This is to be found in the Massoretic text of the Hebrew scriptures and can be translated, "vindicated," or "justified" as indicated in the margin of the KJV. That this word - tzah-dak - is the word used by Daniel when he penned the answer given to him in Daniel 8:14 is open to serious question. The Massoretic Text is dated "between the 6th and 8th centuries [A.D.]. It is probable that the present text became fixed as early as the 2nd century A.D., but even this earlier date leaves a long interval between the original auto-

graphs of the O. T. writers and our present text. Since the fixing of the Massoretic text the task of preserving and transmitting the sacred books has been carried out with the greatest care and fidelity, with the result that the text has undergone practically no change of any real importance; but before that date, owing to various causes, it is beyond dispute that a large number of corruptions were introduced into the Hebrew text." (Encyclopaedia Britannica, Vol. 3, p. 504, 1958 edition) Jerome translating into the Latin in the 4th century was evidently using a text of Daniel which contained a word meaning "cleansed," as the Vulgate reads - mundabitur - "shall be cleansed." Then the LXX which can be dated back to 132 B.C., translated into the Greek the word used by Daniel as katharisthêsetai, again, "shall be cleansed." Our English word, catharsis, is derived from the basis of this Greek word. Recent Hebrew scholarship has demonstrated that the present "Hebrew portions of Daniel (i.e. chs 1-2:4a; 8-12) are, with the exception of the obvious interpolation 9:4-20, translated from Aramaic originals. . ." (Texts and Studies of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, Vol. XIV, p. 41) Dr. H. Louis Ginsberg, who authored Volume XIV of these studies, indicates that the original Aramaic text read for Daniel 8:14 - "shall be cleansed." Thus in three languages - the language in which the book of Daniel was originally written, and its translation into the Greek and Latin - the word in Daniel 8:14 is the future passive - "shall be cleansed." William Miller was correct in staying by the KJV for Daniel 8:14. Interesting also, the New KJV retains the translation of Daniel 8:14 - "then the sanctuary shall be cleansed."

"Decreed" or "Cut off"?

Ankerberg's fourth charge against William Miller reads - "In. . . - Daniel 9:24 - he assumed that the seventy-sevens, or 490 years, were decreed, the word 'decreed' could be translated 'cut off' from. He was wrong. The Hebrew literally means decreed or determined." (1-3) The linguistic justification of Miller's definition of the Hebrew word - ghah-thach - to be "cut off" is so ably defended by Uriah Smith in his 1897 edition

of Thoughts on the Prophecies of Daniel that we quote in full with Smith's analysis as to why men like Ankerberg consider the proper definition of the Hebrew word to be wrong. Smith wrote:

"Proof may be called for that the word rendered determined signifies to be cut off. An abundance can be given. The Hebrew word thus translated is . . . nehhtak. This word Gesenius, in his Hebrew Lexicon, defines as follows: 'Properly, to cut off; tropically [figuratively], to divide; and so to determine, to decree.' In the Chaldeo-Rabbinic Dictionary of Stockius, the word nehhtak is thus defined: 'Scidit, abscidit, conscidit, inscidit, excidit - to cut, to cut away, to cut in pieces, to cut or engrave, to cut off.' Mercerus in his Thesaurus, furnishes a specimen of Rabbinical usage in the phrase, khaticah shel basar, as 'a piece of flesh,' or, 'a cut of flesh.' He translates the word, as it occurs in Dan. 9:24, by 'praecisa est,' is cut off. In the literal version of Arias Montanus it is translated 'decisa est,' is cut off; in the marginal reading, which is grammatically correct, it is rendered by the plural, 'decisae sunt,' are cut off. In the Latin version of Junius and Tremellius, nehhtak (the passive of hathak) is rendered 'decisae sunt,' are cut off. Again in Theodotion's Greek version of Daniel (which is the version used in the Vatican copy of the Septuagint, as being the most faithful), it is rendered by . . . (sunetmethesan), were cut off; and in the Venetian copy by . . . (tetmentai), have been cut.' The idea of cutting off is preserved in the Vulgate, where the phrase is 'abbreviatae sunt,' are shortened.

'Thus the Chaldaic and Rabinnical authority, and the earliest versions, the Septuagint and Vulgate, give the single significance of cutting off, to this verb.'

'Hengstenberg, who enters into a critical examination of the original text, says: But the very use of the word, which does not elsewhere occur, while others much more frequently used were at hand if Daniel had wished to express the idea of determination, and of which he has elsewhere, and even in this portion availed himself, seems to argue that the

word stands from regard to its original meaning, and represents the seventy weeks in contrast with a determination of time (en platei) as a period cut off from subsequent duration, and accurately limited.'" - Christology of the Old Testament, Vol. II, p. 301, Washington, 1839.

"Why, then, it may be asked, did our translators render the word determined, when it so obviously means cut off? The answer is, They doubtless overlooked the connection between the eighth and ninth chapters, and considering it improper to render it cut off, when nothing was given from which the seventy weeks could be cut off, they gave the word its tropical instead of its literal meaning. But, as we have seen, the construction, the context, and the connection require the literal meaning, and render any other inadmissible."

Of interest on this point, just prior to Ankerberg's allegation that William Miller was wrong in five assumptions he had made in regard to Daniel 8 & 9, Dr. Desmond Ford has remarked - "The Adventists have said the word determined means 'cut off from.' So 490 years would be cut off from 2,300 and both should begin with the date of Daniel 9:25 - a decree to restore Jerusalem in 457 BC." After Ankerberg listed this as one of Miller's false assumptions, Ford never challenged this conclusion. However, in 1964, Dr. Desmond Ford, authored a book in Australia entitled, Unlocking God's Treasury. In this publication, he wrote - "The word used for 'determined' in Daniel 9:24 - 'Seventy weeks are determined' literally means 'cut off' and refers to the fact that these 490 years constitute the first section of the 2,300 years, and are cut off as a probationary period for the people of God in Old Testament times." (pp. 56-57)

If Dr. Ford had serious questions about the Sanctuary Doctrine prior to his baptism into the Seventh-day Adventist Church as he so freely stated before the AAF on the PUC campus, and now is in open opposition to this basic truth, what were his objectives in writing as he did in 1964? It is not alone in the matter of the meaning of the word in Daniel 9:24, but the book from his pen quoted above reflects historic Adventist teaching in

regard to the Investigative Judgment from pp. 51-58 - a teaching he now labels as false. So that the reader might assess what he wrote, we shall cite another sample of his then position: The question is asked - "Why is it that the judgment must take place before the second coming?" To this question, Ford wrote - "Before the advent. . . some must be 'accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection of the dead.' Luke 20:35. The righteous are thus declared innocent before they are released from the prison house of the grave." Then he quotes with approval, J. A. Seiss - "Resurrections and translations are products of judgment previously passed upon the dead as dead and the quick [living] as quick." (p. 54) Perhaps Ankerberg on his telecast should have asked Ford about the reasons for his vacillating theology.

A Further Question Answered

Some ask the question as to why eleven years lapsed between the time the vision was given "in the third year of the reign of king Belshazzar" (8:1), and when Gabriel returned to complete the explanation to Daniel "in the first year of Darius. . . of the seed of the Medes"? (9:1) The answer is rather simple. By the lapse of this amount of time, it forever settles the question whether the 2300 days should be considered as literal time or prophetic time. When Daniel was given the vision, he was not told when the time indicated was to be begin. If he had considered the 2300 evenings and mornings as 1150 full days as Ankerberg suggests erroneously the meaning to be, this would have meant a total of three years and two months. Nothing happened in this period of time after Daniel had the vision which altered the desolations of Jerusalem. If Daniel considered the meaning to be 2300 days, this would have meant six years and five months. Still nothing occurred. In another four years, there came a change in kingdoms. The "ram" power which Daniel had been told was a representation of "the kings of Media and Persia" was now a reality. Still the 2300 days had no fulfillment. Daniel turned to the "books" of Jeremiah and found that the seventy years of prophesied captivity were almost completed. He prayed with the result that Heaven responded by sending Gabriel back

to complete the commission assigned to him. Indeed, as Gabriel had first indicated, the vision was to reach to "the time of the end." (8:17) The 2300 days were to span the centuries and find their culminating date in 1844. "Then shall shall the sanctuary be cleansed."

William Miller did his "home work" well. He faltered on only one assumption of the five charged by Ankerberg. Three of the disappointed saints - Edson, Hahn, and Crosier (because of the erroneous assumption) - corrected Miller's faulty perception and gave meaning and significance to the relationship between the pattern sanctuary of Sinai, and the reality in the Heavens above. The historic Adventist faith still stands unmoved by challenges hurled against it by its adversaries.

[For further confirmation, secure the tapes - "The Certainty of Our Faith" and "1844 Re-Examined" with guide sheets. Both \$5.00 postpaid]

#

NOTES

W. J. S. : Would you like a friend to receive the Thought Paper each month? If so, show him or her, yours, and tell him to write asking to be placed on the mailing list. Everyone who responds to your request during the next three months will not only receive the Thought Paper, but will be sent - free, also - a copy of the monograph - The Times of the Gentiles Fulfilled. This special offer expires April 30, 1983.

THE LORD WILLING : We are planning ahead for our 1983 Itinerary Schedule. We hope to come East and North in April; West in June; and again East and South in October. If you wish to be included on the Internary for a meeting or a visit, please let us know this next month, so we can include you, if at all possible. We will do the best we can.

A. L. F. : The dates for the Adventist Laymen's Annual Fellowship for 1983 will be August 15 - 20. It will be held in the same place - Pinecrest Camp at Salus, Arkansas. It is not too early to arrange your schedule to be present.

#

"Truth is violated by falsehood, but it is outraged by silence."

- Henri Frederic Amiel

THE CHURCH MAKES A SETTLEMENT WITH WALTER REA

At the time Elder Walter Rea was dismissed from the ministry of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, he believed that his "firing" involved more than merely his position on Ellen G. White, and had something to do with the Davenport scandal. Elder Rea through legal counsel asked for redress. The Church through their lawyers have paid an unspecified sum of money which does not involve in any way Rea's sustentation when he becomes eligible, nor does the settlement restrict in any way his freedom to speak and write on the Ellen G. White issue, or the Davenport scandal. Walter Rea agreed to keep his presentations issue orientated, and not to mention by name personalities involved in his termination.

#

WORTH THINKING ABOUT

A good friend of mine in California sent me a book - Romans - Atonement and Justification. The author is D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones, a Welshman, who served his fellowmen, consecutively, as a physician and as a preacher. His ministerial service included a shared ministry with G. Campbell Morgan at Westminster Chapel in London. From this book, I wish to share some comments which can be related to the counsel in the "Adult Teaching Aids" for this Quarter's SS Lesons. Lloyd-Jones does not concur with W. G. Johnsson of the Adventist Review, who authored the Teaching Aids. Lloyd-Jones was against such an approach as unScriptural and the basis of ecumenicity. He writes:

"My final remark. . . is to point out that the great Apostle never confines himself to mere positive statements but often indulges, because he feels that he must do so, in arguments, in polemics. I make this point because I think there is a great deal of very loose and very false and flabby thinking on the whole question of polemics and of argumentation at the present time. The attitude of many seems to be, 'We do not want these arguments. Give us the simple message, the simple Gospel. Give it to us positively, and do not bother about other

views.' It is important that we should realize that if we speak like that we are denying the Scriptures. The Scriptures are full of argumentation, full of polemics. And the Apostle sees the necessity for it here. Having just reasoned up to that tremendous climax on the doctrine of the Atonement, he suddenly asks, 'Where is boasting then?' 'Is he the God of the Jews only, or is he the God of the Gentiles also?' 'Do we then make void the law?' In doing so he is arguing, he is disputing; this is sheer polemics.

"Disapproval of polemics in the Christian Church is a very serious matter. But that is the attitude of the age in which we live. The prevailing idea today in many circles in the Church is not to bother about these things. As long as we are all Christians, anyhow, somehow, all is well. Don't argue about doctrine, let us all be Christians together and talk about the love of God. That is really the basis of ecumenicity. Unfortunately that same attitude is creeping into evangelical circles also and many are saying that we must not be too precise about these things. But if you begin to object to clear statements about the doctrine of the Atonement you are beginning to argue. It is important that we should be clear about the doctrine of the Atonement. 'Ah but, you are beginning to argue, that is upsetting, that is going to divide people.'

"What I am trying to show is that if you hold that view you are criticizing the Apostle Paul, you are saying that he was wrong, and at the same time you are criticizing the Scriptures. The Scriptures argue and debate and dispute; they are full of polemics. You cannot read this Epistle to the Romans, or the Epistle to the Galatians, or indeed any one of these epistles, without seeing that very clearly. Let us be clear about what we mean. . . No man should like argument for the sake of argument. We should always regret the necessity; but though we regret it and bemoan it, when we feel that a vital matter is at stake we must engage in argument. We must 'earnestly contend for the truth,' and we are called upon to do that by the New Testament." (pp. 113-114)

#