

IN CONFIRMATION OF THE SANCTUARY MESSAGE

By Richard M. Davidson
Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary
Andrews University

For the Seventh-day Adventist pioneers, "the subject of the sanctuary was the key which unlocked the mystery of the disappointment of 1844. It opened to view a complete system of truth, connected and harmonious, showing that God's hand had directed the great advent movement and revealing present duty as it brought to light the position and work of His people."¹ In 1906 Ellen G. White affirmed that "the correct understanding of the ministration in the heavenly sanctuary is the foundation of our faith."² For a century and a half the doctrine of the sanctuary has continued to lie at the foundation of Adventist theology and mission and has remained the most distinctive contribution of Adventism to Christian thought.³

The unique Seventh-day Adventist understanding of the sanctuary has frequently proven to be a storm center for disagreement and criticism both within and without the Adventist church.⁴ Because in the decade of the 1980s considerable agitation once again surrounded this basic tenet of faith, Adventists have been constrained anew to rigorously test the soundness of their sanctuary teaching against the standard of God's Word.

The past ten years have brought agonizing doubts for many; for some it has meant rejection of the historic Adventist

interpretation of the sanctuary doctrine; and for some it has meant the rejection of Adventism *en toto* and the withdrawal of their membership.

Just ten years ago, in the summer of 1980, the Glacier View Conference took place.⁵ In the aftermath of that momentous meeting, I had opportunity to read the 991-page published version of the document around which the Glacier View discussion had centered.⁶ I freely admit that questions were raised that I had never considered before, questions which struck at the heart of the pioneer Adventist understanding of the sanctuary, Daniel 8:14, and the investigative judgment. As I read I encountered many arguments that, on the surface at least, seemed to have considerable weight.

At that time several of my colleagues from pastoral days were leaving the ministry and the Adventist church. They urged me to read additional material that they considered cogent refutations of the sanctuary doctrine held by Adventists. I read, and again had to admit I did not have satisfactory answers to many of the arguments used.

These experiences made me determined to study the truth of the sanctuary doctrine for myself—to get to the bottom of the issues. I consciously decided that I would be willing and ready to leave the Adventist church if its teachings on this most crucial doctrine were not Biblical.

Long months of wrestling with Scripture and agonizing in prayer followed. I was not alone in my study; during this time many of my colleagues, and others throughout the church, persevered in plumbing the depths of the Scripture teaching on the sanctuary. We determined that our criterion should not be, “What do commentaries and theologians say?” but “What does Scripture say?” I can testify to the presence of God’s Spirit of truth working mightily at Andrews University and elsewhere in the earnest searching of God’s word during those years. I am deeply indebted to many—too numerous to mention by name—whose insights have helped me along the way. I am indebted particularly to the Daniel and

Revelation Committee that was appointed by the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists to grapple honestly with issues raised at Glacier View and elsewhere. I am also deeply indebted to the detractors, because they have forced me to face squarely the crucial issues and not sweep anything under the rug.

The past ten years since Glacier View have convinced me that God in His providence has allowed these issues to be raised to stimulate Seventh-day Adventists to dig deeper into God's word, to ground every belief more firmly on a "Thus saith the Lord."

My testimony concerning the results of the past decade of Biblical study regarding the sanctuary is straight-forward: I have become overjoyed as I have seen ever more clearly that the Adventist sanctuary doctrine can stand the test of the closest investigation. Point by point the objections and questions in my mind have steadily melted away like hoarfrost before the warm light of Scripture. My conviction of the truthfulness of the historic position of Adventists on the sanctuary message is stronger than it has ever been before, and now it is a more informed conviction, based upon better reasons than I dreamed existed.

My study these past years has yielded not only better reasons for believing, but deeper insights into the old truths. The sanctuary doctrine, once dry and irrelevant to me, has come alive. I am excited about the sanctuary, yes, even about the investigative judgment! Deeper study into the sanctuary message has not caused me to remove a single pin or pillar of the old landmarks, but rather, a close investigation has made the sanctuary truth shine even more brilliantly and revealed in it greater beauty and richness than I ever imagined I would find.

In the presentation that follows, I wish to share with you some of these fresh, rich insights into the sanctuary doctrine that have been gleaned recently by various students of Scrip-

ture among us and that have given even greater reason to believe and rejoice in this profound truth.

The Preadvent Investigative Judgment

One of the points most widely rejected in recent critiques of Adventist sanctuary teachings is the idea of a preadvent, investigative judgment of God's people.

I was excited to find that the idea of an investigative judgment taking place in the sanctuary in heaven is supported by far more than the few standard Biblical texts that we have used traditionally. In the first volume of the Daniel and Revelation Committee Series, *Selected Studies of Prophetic Interpretation*, William H. Shea, the associate director of the Biblical Research Institute, has examined at least 28 different Old Testament passages outside of Daniel, all of which deal with judgment from the sanctuary.⁷ In 20 of these 28 passages the judgment being discussed concerns the professed people of God. A number of these passages clearly involve the aspect of investigative judgment from the heavenly as well as the earthly sanctuaries.

The Old Testament passages on judgment from the sanctuary that occur outside of Daniel include all of the essential elements of the investigative judgment that Adventists have seen within Daniel. Even the word "investigative," which many claim is non-Biblical and for which they believe some other term should be substituted, is explicitly mentioned. For example, in Psalm 11:4 and 5, the Lord is said to *bachan*, to "examine, investigate," the children of men, from His heavenly temple.

Numerous other passages exist, besides the 28 cited in Shea's study, that do not mention specifically that the sanctuary is the place of judgment. But they do indicate God's *procedure* for dealing with His professed people before executive judgment is meted out. This procedure is often given a technical name in the Old Testament—a *rtb*, or covenant lawsuit—and it regularly involves a divine *investigation* of the

evidence before sentence is pronounced upon God's professed covenant people. Note, for example, the covenant lawsuits or investigative judgments described by Hosea and Micah upon the Northern Kingdom, and that of Malachi in the post-exilic period.⁸

But perhaps the most dramatic and illuminating of the examples of an investigative judgment of His professed covenant people conducted by God is found in the first ten chapters of Ezekiel.⁹

The Investigative Judgment in Ezekiel

Ezekiel, a contemporary of Daniel, wrote in the last days of Judah's history before the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the monarchy. His task was to give God's last warning message to the professed people of God before the close of their probation as a monarchy and they would experience the executive judgment. Ezekiel especially is instructive for us in the last days because the book of Revelation is indebted heavily to Ezekiel; in fact Revelation follows the basic structure and detailed descriptions of Ezekiel even more than it does the book of Daniel.¹⁰

In particular, note that the picture of the seal of God and the close of probation in Revelation 14 and 15 is built on the passage in Ezekiel 9, where a mark is placed on the forehead of those sighing and crying for the abominations in Jerusalem. John the revelator's extended citations and allusions to Ezekiel 1-10 in his portrayal of God's dealings with His people in the last days give us a clue that the events surrounding the end of probation for Judah as a monarchy may be seen as a microcosm or type of God's antitypical procedure of dealing with His professed people before the final close of probation.

And what was God's procedure in Ezekiel's day, in the closing years of Judah's history before the curtain was pulled—before executive judgment was meted out? The procedure was an investigative judgment, conducted over an

extended period of time, from the most holy place of the sanctuary.

In Ezekiel 1, dated July 592 B.C., God came riding upon His celestial chariot, sitting on his *movable throne*. Does this remind you of the movable throne in Daniel 7? The description of the wheels and wings show movement, that God is going somewhere. Where? Ezekiel 9, 10, a vision given the prophet some 14 months later, show us where God was headed in Ezekiel 1, for the time of the later vision He was leaving the most holy place of the Jerusalem temple where He had taken up residence.¹¹

In Ezekiel God comes to the most holy place of the earthly sanctuary for an extended period of time. But why has He come? Ezekiel chapters 3-8 give the answer. Israel is arraigned before the divine tribunal. There is a covenant lawsuit, an investigative judgment, not of the world at large, but of the professed people of God.¹² In chapter 8, the list of charges proceeds from lesser to greater until the climax comes in verse 16, the sin which causes God to bring down the curtain, with the words, "I will not spare." What is the climactic issue, the sign of rebellion, that brings the close of probation to Judah?

And he brought me into the inner court of the house of the Lord; and behold, at the door of the temple of the Lord, between the porch and the altar, were about twenty five men, with their backs to the temple of the Lord, and their faces toward the east, worshipping the sun toward the east (Eze 8:16).

Worshipping the sun! Does this sound familiar in terms of the last great issue in Revelation, false worship centered in the day of the sun?

In Ezekiel 9, the investigative judgment has ended. The result has been a separation of the professed people of God into two classes: those who really serve Him, who sigh and cry over the abominations done in the city, and those who profess, but do not really serve Him, but rather practice a counterfeit worship. The former receive the mark on their foreheads, the mark of the *tav*, the last letter of the Hebrew alphabet: they

are the faithful remnant. The latter are in line for the execution of the sentence.

What then is God's procedure? *Before* the executive judgment He conducts an investigative judgment of His professed people in which He discloses a distinction is revealed between the true and false worshipers of God.

Ezekiel reveals not only the divine procedure before the close of probation, namely an investigative judgment, but also the attitude of God at this time. God is no vengeful Judge, waiting to condemn all that He can. To the contrary, over and over in Ezekiel God cries out, "Why will you die, O house of Israel? For I have no pleasure in the death of any one, says the Lord God; so turn, and live." (Eze 18:32; 33:11).

This attitude can be perceived also in the way God leaves the temple at the conclusion of the investigative judgment. As we read Ezekiel 10-11 carefully, we see that the celestial chariot throne does not simply rush away as it had come. God's movable throne is first waiting empty, at the south side of the temple. Then the glory of the Lord slowly mounts up from its place of residence over the ark in the most holy place. The Lord moves to the threshold of the temple and pauses. Then in His chariot, He next pauses at the east gate of the temple precincts. It is as if the Lord is loathe to leave His people, as if He is waiting for still others to change their minds, to repent. He then moves slowly across the Kidron Valley, and pauses again on the Mount of Olives, as He would again pause six centuries later, the Son of man weeping over Jerusalem. The scene ends in chapter 11, with the glory of the Lord standing over the Mount of Olives. Does this picture in Ezekiel help us explain the nature of the delay in Adventist theology? Is the glory of the Lord even now hovering over the Mount of Olives, so to speak? God, with tears in His eyes, longing for more souls to come to repentance, before the curtain falls and probation closes?

Ezekiel adds a couple more brush strokes that further illuminate and enrich the picture of the investigative judg-

ment. The final chapters of Ezekiel (40-48) give a vision of a cleansed and restored Temple. And note the dateline for this vision, given in 40:1, the tenth day of the seventh month of the New Year.

That's the Day of Atonement, the day of the cleansing of the sanctuary, Yom Kippur. How crucial to note the date of the vision! The vision of the cleansed and restored temple is given on the day of the cleansing of the sanctuary, the Day of Atonement. Certainly God wants us to see the connection.

Next we note the emphasis of the book of Ezekiel upon the cleansing of the people. Ezekiel 36:25-27 presents not only a cleansed sanctuary but also a cleansed people.

Finally, Ezekiel even reveals the larger issue at stake in the investigative judgment. In chapter 36:22, 23, and again in 39:27, 28, the ultimate result of this entire divine procedure is pointed out: "Through you I vindicate my holiness before their eyes" (RSV), the eyes of the onlooking nations. It is for their sakes, to vindicate the character of God before the onlooking intelligences through the experience of His people, that God acts.

To summarize, the message of Ezekiel is the message of the Day of Atonement. In the *type* presented by Ezekiel, we have the same contours as in the *antitypical* Day of Atonement of the last days. God is active in setting things right in His sanctuary, God is active in cleansing a people, and God is active in vindicating His holy name or character.

I find these insights from Ezekiel electrifying news, present truth.

Recent Developments in Understanding Daniel

So many rich insights have emerged recently from studies in Daniel that it is difficult to decide what to mention here. We could engage in an exegesis of Daniel 7 which clearly indicates the preadvent investigative judgment on behalf of the saints.¹³ We could spend time on the major schools of prophetic interpretation, and show how the historicist view

was the view of the early church and of the Reformers, even though every major denomination today except the Adventists has abandoned this position.¹⁴ It excites me to see how the torch of the Protestant prophetic heritage is still being carried aloft by the Seventh-day Adventist church.

We could show how the historicist view of prophecy alone is able to do justice to all the data in Daniel. The preterists must say that prophecy failed, and the futurists must posit a gap where none exists in the prophecy. But the historicists can be consistent with the entire sweep of the great time prophecies.¹⁵

The historicist interpretation is based upon the year-day principle. Yet even as I preached it in the past, I felt a little uncomfortable with supporting the year-day principle from just Ezekiel 4:6 and Num 14:34, only two texts, both outside of Daniel. If you have not yet been “surprised by joy” over recent discoveries in regard to the year-day principle, may I recommend chapters 3 and 4 of the Daniel and Revelation Committee volume *Selected Studies on Prophetic Interpretation*.¹⁶ Here we find not just two or three lines of evidence but 23 different Biblical reasons for validating the application of the day-for-a-year principle to the time periods in the apocalyptic prophecies of Daniel and Revelation.

Particularly exciting is the specific evidence *from within Daniel itself*. In Daniel 8:14, for example, the 2300 evenings and mornings—which grammatically by the way (with no article, no conjunction, and no plural), must refer to 2300 full days¹⁷—the 2300 days, answer the question of verse 13. Verse 13 asks, “For how long is the *vision*? the *chazôn*?” Then comes the answer, for 2300 days, is the *chazôn*, the *vision*. But what does this vision include? The first two verses in the chapter indicate that the *chazôn* includes the *entire vision*, not just part of it. This means it must at least stretch over the time of the Medo-Persian and Greek empires, which specifically are mentioned in the interpretation of the vision (vss 20, 21). Thus the 2300 evenings-mornings cannot possibly be literal days,

but must be recognized as years. Years are the only unit of time that would allow the prophecy to span sufficient time to cover the entire vision.

This internal evidence of the year-day principle in Daniel 8 is further confirmed by a comparison between the vision of Daniel 8 and the straightforward non-symbolic explanation of the vision in Daniel 11. In Dan 11:6, 8, 13, the days of Daniel 8 are explicitly called years. In verse 13, the literal translation of the Hebrew is actually “at the end of the *time years*.”

Daniel used almost every conceivable way to alert us to the fact that the time prophecies do not refer to literal time. He used symbolic time *units*, such as “evenings-mornings” instead of days. He used symbolic time *numbers*, such as 2300 evenings-mornings, rather than six years, four months, and 20 days, the normal Hebrew way to express this in literal time. The same with the 1290 days (not the normal three years, seven months), and the time, two times and half a time (not the normal three and a half years). Not *one* of the time periods in Daniel’s symbolic prophecies is expressed the way it would have been if it had been used to express literal time in the normal manner. Hebrew readers would naturally perk up and say, “This isn’t referring to literal time.” Thus in many ways the principle of a day for a year, which constitutes the prophetic key for our sanctuary doctrine, is derived from Daniel itself. I cannot speak for you, but this makes me rejoice!

I rejoice also in the further confirmatory evidence concerning the beginning and ending dates of the great time prophecies that concern the sanctuary. Regarding the beginning date for the 2300 days and the 70 weeks, you are no doubt familiar with the fascinating story of how, some years ago, the discovery and translation of double-dated Elephantine papyri from the fifth century B.C. demonstrated that the date of Artaxerxes’ first decree was 457 B.C., as Adventists have believed, and not 458, as claimed by some.¹⁸

The various lines of Biblical evidence showing why this decree, and not some other, is the one which marked the

beginning of the 70 weeks and the 2300 days has been published in many Adventist sources.¹⁹ But one aspect of this evidence that has come to light recently fascinates me particularly.

It has been recognized for some time that the 70-week prophecy is couched in the framework of the Levitical Jubilee.²⁰ The 490 years decreed upon Daniel's people are ten jubilee periods of 49 years each. If indeed this period is counted with reference to the Jubilee, it is natural to expect the beginning and ending dates to be jubilee years. Recent analysis of literary evidence has now made it possible to determine the precise sabbatical and jubilee dates in Biblical times.²¹ Strikingly, the date of the decree of 457 B.C. alone, not of the other possible decrees, is a jubilee year.

No less stirring is the confirmation of the ending date of the 2300 days, October 22, 1844. I have heard it said quite often in the past few years that our Adventist pioneers were simple, unlearned men. They did not have the intellect or the sophistication to do responsible Biblical study, and thus we must discount many of the conclusions they reached. It is true that most of the pioneers did not have the advantage of higher theological education. It is also evident that they did not have all the light. But in my reading from the more than 1000 pages of pioneer articles on the sanctuary compiled by the Ellen G. White Estate,²² I have been amazed at the way God guided those humble and teachable men to such profound and reliable conclusions.

The date *October 22, 1844* is a case in point. Scholarly detractors like to point out that the Adventist pioneers chose a date for the Day of Atonement (Yom Kippur) that was proposed by an obscure Jewish sect, the Karaites, rather than taking the date accepted by the mainstream rabbinic tradition, which in 1844 came a month earlier than October 22. I fear I might have simply chosen the date calculated by the Rabbis if I had been alive in 1844. But not so the pioneers. They did their homework. It happens that the rabbinic cal-

culuation of the beginning of the religious year was and still is based upon fixed intercalation cyclical formulas for adding a second 12th month to bring the lunar calendar in line with the solar calendar. The procedure is linked to the spring equinox and *not* to the Judean barley harvest moon stipulation given in Scripture and thus often sets the festival dates one month too early. Only the Karaites, who rejected all rabbinic tradition and accepted *sola Scriptura* in 1844 still preserved the Biblical method for reckoning the festival dates, thus arriving at October 22 as the correct date for the Day of Atonement.²³

I understand that shortly after 1844 even the Karaites abandoned the Biblical method of reckoning. I am thankful God kept them faithful to the Biblical method until 1844. And I thank God for His leading of our pioneers in solidly founding this doctrine upon Scripture rather than on tradition.

For those who may still be skeptical about the Karaite calendar, God has recently raised up another witness to the accuracy of the date October 22, 1844. Through study of Babylonian astronomical and mathematical data, it is now possible to arrive at the precise date for the Day of Atonement in 457 B.C. and by mathematical calculation to establish the modern equivalent for this date in 1844. Such a study was recently undertaken by William Shea and clearly demonstrates by mathematical and astronomical reckoning, independent of the Karaite calendar, that *October 22* is the correct date for the Day of Atonement in 1844.²⁴ We have a sure and firm foundation for our faith!

The Adventist interpretation of the date indicated by the text of Daniel 8:14 is solid, and so is the interpretation of the *significance* of this date. There is no space here for a detailed exegesis.²⁵ But note the following striking point: the word for "cleansed" in Daniel 8:14 is *nitsdaq*. It comes from a root that has such a breadth of meaning that it cannot be captured by a single English word.²⁶

Three basic English nuances are associated with this

Hebrew word: (1) to “set right/restore” (as emphasized, e.g. in Isa 46:13), (2) to “cleanse” (as emphasized in Job 15:14; 4:17; and 17:9), and (3) to “vindicate” (as in Isa 50:8).

According to Hebrew thought patterns, it would not be unusual if all three of these English nuances were communicated in a single occurrence of this word. The context of Daniel 8 indicates that this is precisely the case in Daniel 8:14. In verse 13, we find a three-part question that can literally be translated: “For how long is the vision: (1) the *tamîd* (or ‘continual’), (2) the transgression that causes horror, and (3) the giving over of the sanctuary and host to be trampled under foot?”

According to this verse, three problems exist. First, there is the *tamîd* (or “continual”), which according to vs 12 is taken away. This word *tamîd* is used in the Pentateuch to describe the various parts of the *daily service* in the sanctuary and therefore antitypically refers here to the “continual” or *daily* mediation of Christ. The passage warns us that an apostate power would attempt to substitute an earthly priesthood and salvation by works for Christ’s mediatorial ministry.

Second, there is the “transgression which causes horror,” which, according to verse 12 (as recognized also by noted non-Seventh-day Adventist commentators), is the transgression of the host, i.e., the sins of the saints.²⁷

Third, there is the trampling underfoot of the sanctuary and host—the persecution of the saints, and yet more than persecution. In ancient thought, a host or army being trampled underfoot meant that the god of the host was weak and undependable. Thus, when the sanctuary and the host were being trampled, the true God and his system of worship were being defamed.

The joyous news for all three of these problems is contained in the three-fold semantic range of the word *nitsdaq*—set right, cleanse, and vindicate.

In verse 13, first the *tamîd*, Christ’s continual mediation in the heavenly sanctuary, the sanctuary truth that was taken

away (from the people), must be *set right* or *restored*. Second, the transgression of the sins of God's people that cause horror in the heavenly sanctuary, needs to be *cleansed*. And third, the God who has been defamed by the trampling down of the sanctuary and the saints must be *vindicated*.

There are separate Hebrew words for each of these ideas, "set right," "cleanse," and "vindicate," but *one* Hebrew word alone can simultaneously encompass all of these solutions, the word *nitsdaq*.

The full message of the investigative judgment is encapsulated in a single word. Seventh-day Adventists have been charged with interpreting Dan 8:14 out of context, but a closer look at the context (vs 13), far from overturning the doctrine, reveals instead the richness of the meaning of the investigative judgment. Thank God for the good news of the restoring, cleansing, vindicating investigative judgment of Daniel 8!

Evidence from the Book of Hebrews

In the New Testament book of Hebrews the basic issue is a hermeneutical one that concerns the nature of typology. This was pointed out to me forcefully by a teacher at an Adventist college who, shortly after the 1980 Glacier View Conference, felt compelled to reject the Adventist interpretation of the sanctuary. He subsequently left the ministry. Here is the gist of the argument he presented publicly just before he left the school. He stated that if one remained faithful to the typology set forth in Leviticus, then the Adventists were *right* in their teaching on the sanctuary. But he felt that the book of Hebrews contradicts the book of Leviticus and time after time manipulates the type to fit the antitype. Because he believed that Hebrews, being in the New Testament, was the norm for judging what is in the Old, he felt he had to accept the interpretation of the book of Hebrews and reject that of Leviticus. Furthermore, because he thought that Ellen G. White follows the book of Leviticus and not Hebrews, he had to reject her interpretation of the sanctuary as well.

Does the interpretation of Hebrews contradict the typology of Leviticus? Or is there a fundamental continuity between sanctuary type and antitype, between Leviticus and Hebrews? Is it possible that if we think we see a contradiction between Leviticus and Hebrews, the problem may not be with Leviticus, or with Ellen White who agrees with Leviticus, but with those of us who have not dug deeply enough to see the underlying harmony between the two?

Recent studies of the interpretation of sanctuary typology in Hebrews demonstrate that the author of Hebrews does not manipulate the Old Testament type to fit the antitype, but insists upon a fundamental continuity between type and antitype.²⁸ In fact the apostle so strongly affirms this basic continuity that he is able to argue from Old Testament earthly type to New Testament heavenly antitype.²⁹ He insists upon the reality of the heavenly sanctuary, the great original of which the earthly was a copy. He also implies a fundamental continuity between the earthly and heavenly, so that the earthly copy in its basic contours is instructive for our understanding of the original.

We do not have to decide between Leviticus and Hebrews or between Old Testament and New Testament typology. They are in complete harmony.

The major contours of the Adventist understanding of the sanctuary doctrine are taught clearly in the epistle. We have, first, Christ's death as the antitypical fulfillment of the Old Testament sacrificial system. This includes *all* the Old Testament sacrifices, even those of the Day of Atonement, because according to Psalm 40, *all* of the Old Testament sacrifices were to coalesce into the one Sacrifice. (See Heb 10:1-10 for exegesis of Ps 40:68).³⁰

Second, when Christ ascended in 31 A.D., He did not immediately commence the antitypical Day of Atonement but *inaugurated* the entire heavenly sanctuary. This is indicated explicitly by the specific Greek word *egkainizo* "inaugurate," employed in Heb 10:20 and 9:18. The nominal form of this

same word is used in the LXX for the inauguration ceremonies described in Numbers 7. Note also that the goats, calves, and bulls (Heb 9:12, 13) are the very animals mentioned in Numbers 7 and Leviticus 9 that were to be used as sacrifices for the inauguration ceremonies.³¹

Third, the ongoing work of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary at the time when the Epistle to the Hebrews was written was not the yearly Day of Atonement ministry, but rather the daily (*tamid*), holy place ministry. Repeatedly the continuing first-century work of Christ is compared with the *daily* work of the earthly priest. (See Heb 7:25-27; 10:11-14; 13:10-12).³²

Finally, from the point of view of the apostle, the Day of Atonement work of judgment was still in the future. And this concept of future judgment is not limited to Hebrews 9:23-27. In fact, George Rice has shown that the entire epistle is structured by a five-fold warning of future judgment, and that this judgment includes an *investigative* as well as executive judgment that specifically involves the *professed people of God*.³³ This particularly is evident in Hebrews 10:26-31.³⁴

In summary, the epistle to the Hebrews is fully consistent with Leviticus and with the Seventh-day Adventist understanding of the sanctuary doctrine. Of course, Hebrews focuses primarily upon first-century Christians and thus does not provide a detailed picture of the fulfillment of sanctuary typology still future to the apostle. For more comprehensive New Testament insights into this end-time focus, we must turn to the book of Revelation.

Fresh Insights into Revelation

The Daniel and Revelation Committee is just completing its work on Revelation. Fresh insights have rewarded diligent research. Several of my colleagues at Andrews have made significant breakthroughs in showing the soundness of basic Adventist interpretation and at the same time have opened

new windows into the depths and richness of the sanctuary theology in Revelation.

For example, it has been shown that the book of Revelation is structured by a series of visionary sequences and that each of the visions opens with an introductory sanctuary scene.³⁵ What is more, these sanctuary scenes move in sequence through the sanctuary. In the three series of visions dealing with the entire sweep of history through the Age of the Church—the churches, seals, and trumpets—the introductory sanctuary scenes (Rev 1; 4-5; 8:2-6) focus upon the *holy place* realities of the sanctuary, and describe activities in the temporal setting of Christ's "daily" or "continual" (*tamid*) ministry there.³⁶

Then as the focus moves to the great controversy in the final period of time before the close of probation, the fourth introductory heavenly sanctuary scene in Rev 11:19 shifts to the *most holy place*, portraying events in a temporal setting of the antitypical Day of Atonement. Kenneth A. Strand has shown that, in this same chapter (Rev 11:1) clear allusion is made to the cleansing of the sanctuary as described in Leviticus 16.³⁷

In the fifth sanctuary scene (Rev 15:1-16:1), the angels of the seven last plagues come out of the most holy place, the temple is filled with smoke, no one can enter, and probation is closed. All that follows in the book of Revelation occurs after the close of probation.³⁸

Thus, the introductory sanctuary scenes serve to structure the entire book of Revelation, and further serve as a guide as to where we are in the sweep of salvation history as we make our way through the book. They confirm that the first half of the book is the historical part delineating the Christian age during the holy place ministry of Christ up to the time of the antitypical Day of Atonement. Beginning with Revelation 11 the book moves to the eschatological events of the investigative judgment, second advent, millennium, executive judgment, and what takes place in the new earth.³⁹

A final word about the investigative judgment in Revelation. Many facets of this topic are involved in the book, but one aspect needs more attention in our church. If we are in Christ, what should be our attitude toward the investigative judgment? According to the book of Revelation, we need not fear the judgment but rather we can welcome and even long for the judgment. God's saints (pictured in martyrdom as souls under the altar) cry out, "How long, O Lord, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?" (Rev 6:20). This is not a spiteful cry for vengeance; it is a cry for justice. How long will it be till the appeals court in heaven investigates our cases and reverses the false verdicts of earthly courts, in order that proper justice can be affected? This has as its background the law of malicious witness in Deuteronomy 19:26-29, where the judge investigates (the literal Hebrew word here means "investigate") the case of the one maligned, and if he finds him innocent, vindicates him and executes justice against the malicious witness.⁴⁰

This is the context in which the Psalmist could cry out, "Lord, judge me!" (Ps 7:8; 26:1; 43:1). How many of us have prayed for the investigative judgment, for our names to come up as soon as possible? But if we are in Christ, this can be our stance. We can welcome and even long for the judgment. The investigative judgment becomes glorious news, in which we will be vindicated, our God will be vindicated, and the Accuser will be shown to have made false accusations. This perspective is not a new one to Adventism, although it has not always been properly emphasized. Ellen G. White in 1883 clearly expressed this perspective:

John in holy vision beholds the faithful souls that come up out of great tribulation, surrounding the throne of God, clad in white robes, and crowned with immortal glory. What though they have been counted the offscouring of the earth? In the investigative judgment their lives and characters are brought in review before God, and that solemn tribunal reverses the decision of their enemies. Their faithfulness to God and to His word stands revealed, and Heaven's high

honors are awarded them as conquerors in the strife with sin and Satan.⁴¹

Conclusion

This presentation has been in the form of a personal testimony. I believe in the truthfulness, the timeliness, and the richness of the sanctuary doctrine. To my personal testimony I can add the witness of my colleagues at Andrews University to whom I have listened as we have joined in a team-taught class in the doctrine of the sanctuary this past decade. I also rejoice in the testimony of students like the one I received not long ago. The student wrote on his final report, “I *came* to this class a sanctuary doubter; but after confronting the issues and the Scriptural evidence, I leave a sanctuary believer, and I can’t wait to get back to my conference where I can share the beauty of this doctrine with my father, a Seventh-day Adventist minister, who is still a sanctuary doubter.”

This confirmation of the sanctuary message is not presented here with the thought that the depths of the doctrine have been plumbed. Ellen G. White’s statement remains valid, “The significance of the Jewish economy is not yet fully comprehended. Truths vast and profound are shadowed forth in its rites and symbols.”⁴²

There are deeper insights yet to be gained. Perhaps even more importantly, there is a deeper experience yet to be gained in the time of the antitypical Day of Atonement. This confirmation of the sanctuary doctrine calls us to capture the fervor of the Day of Atonement experience, the fervor of *repentance*, affliction of soul, and putting away of sin; the fervor of *assurance* in the substitutionary death of Christ; and the fervor of *joy* over a “good judgment” in Christ and the soon coming Jubilee.

Endnotes

¹ Ellen G. White, *The Great Controversy*, p. 423.

² Ellen G. White, *Evangelism*, p. 221.

³ See LeRoy Edwin Froom, *Movement of Destiny* (Washington, DC: Review

and Herald, 1971), pp. 541-560, for an affirmation of the distinctive and central place of the sanctuary doctrine in Adventist theology.

4 For an overview of various detractors from the Adventist understanding of the Sanctuary, see Arnold V. Wallenkampf, "Challengers to the Doctrine of the Sanctuary," in *Doctrine of the Sanctuary: A Historical Survey*, Daniel and Revelation Committee Series, vol. 5, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, 1989), pp. 197-216.

5 For a report of the background to, and proceedings of, this conference, see the "Special Sanctuary Issue" of *The Ministry*, Oct., 1980, and Holbrook, ed., *Doctrine of the Sanctuary*, pp. 217-233.

6 Desmond Ford, *Daniel 8:14, the Day of Atonement, and the Investigative Judgment* (Casselberry, FL: Evangelion Press, 1980).

7 William H. Shea, "Biblical Parallels for the Investigative Judgment," *Selected Studies on Prophetic Interpretation*, Daniel and Revelation Committee Series, vol. 1 (Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1982), pp. 1-24.

8 The word *rib* explicitly introduces the covenant lawsuit of Hosea and Micah: Hos. 4:1; Mic. 6:1, 2. Sometimes the prophets use a synonym, *mipat* ("judgment"), as in Mal. 3:5; Eze. 5:8. The recent scholarly literature on the covenant lawsuit is immense. For introductory discussion, starting bibliography, and numerous Biblical examples, see Herbert B. Huffmon, "The Covenant Lawsuit in the Prophets," *JBL* 88 (1969): 291-304; the article on *rib* in the *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, eds. R. Laird Harris, Gleason Archer, and Bruce Waltke (Chicago: Moody Press, 1980) 2: 845-846; and Kirsten Nielsen, *Yahweh as Prosecutor and Judge: An Investigation of the Prophetic Lawsuit (Rib- Pattern)*, JSOT 9 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1978).

9 For basic insight and much supporting data regarding the investigative judgment in Ezekiel 1-10, I am indebted to Shea, *Selected Studies*, pp. 13-20. See his discussion for details.

10 See Albert Vanhoye, "L'Utilisation du Livre d'Ézéchiel dans l'Apocalypse," *Biblica*, 43 (1962): 436-476; Jeffrey M. Vogelgesang, "The Interpretation of Ezekiel in the Book of Revelation," Ph. D. dissertation, Howard University, 1985.

11 This analysis of the movement of the glory of God from the most holy place of the earthly sanctuary to the waiting chariot throne, is confirmed by the recent research of Moshe Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1-20*, Anchor Bible, vol. 22 (New York: Doubleday, 1983), pp. 195-198.

12 Note that all the major elements of the classical covenant lawsuit are found in this section of Ezekiel, and especially well illustrated in chapters 5 and 6: preamble (5:5a), historical prologue (5:5b), indictment (5:6, 7), sentence of covenant curses (5:8-17, citing the covenant curses of Leviticus 26), and witnesses (Eze. 6—even the mountain witnesses are corrupt; cf. Mic. 6:1, 2). (13) See William Shea, "Judgment in Daniel 7," *Selected Studies*, pp. 94-131.

14 See LeRoy Edwin Froom, *The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers*, 4 vols. (Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1946-1954), *passim*. (15) For examples of the contrast between these three main schools of prophetic interpretation, see Shea, *Selected Studies*, pp. v-vi, 25-55 (regarding Daniel 8) and Gerhard F. Hasel, "Interpretations of the Chronology of the Seventy Weeks," in *Seventy Weeks, Leviticus, Nature of Prophecy*, Daniel and Revelation Committee Series, ed. Frank B. Holbrook, vol. 3 (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, 1986), pp. 3-63 (regarding Daniel 9).

16 Shea, *Selected Studies*, pp. 56-93.

17 For detailed examination of various exegetical details of Dan 8:9-14, see Gerhard F. Hasel, "The 'Little Horn,' the Heavenly Sanctuary and the Time of

the End: A Study of Daniel 8:9-14," in *Symposium on Daniel*, Daniel and Revelation Committee Series, ed. Frank B. Holbrook, vol. 2 (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, 1986), pp. 378-461; see especially pp. 430-433 for discussion of the 2300 evenings-mornings; cf. Siegfried J. Schwantes, "Ereb Bôqer of Daniel 8:14 Re-examined," in *Symposium on Daniel*, pp. 462-474.

18 This evidence is discussed by Siegfried Horn and Lynn Wood, in *The Chronology of Ezra 7*, 2nd ed. (Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1970); summary in the *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, 3:100-104. See now also the careful article by William H. Shea in this issue of *JATS*.

19 See Arthur J. Ferch, "Commencement Date for the Seventy Week Prophecy," in *Seventy Weeks*, pp. 64-74; and William Shea, "The Prophecy of Daniel 9:24-27," in *Seventy Weeks*, pp. 84-88.

20 See Jacques Doukhan, "The Seventy Weeks of Daniel 9: An Exegetical Study," in *The Sanctuary and Atonement, Biblical, Historical, and Theological Studies*, eds. A. V. Wallenkampf and W. R. Leshner (Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1981), pp. 255, 256, for discussion and literature.

21 See the unpublished paper of Douglas Waterhouse, "Is it Possible to Date the Sabbatical-Jubilee Years?," Andrews University; cf. Ben Zion Wacholder, "The Calendar of Sabbatical Cycles During the Second Temple and the Early Rabbinic Period," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 44 (1973): 153-196.

22 Paul A. Gordon, ed., *Pioneer Articles on the Sanctuary, Daniel 8:14, the Judgment, 2300 Days, Year-Day Principle, Atonement: 1846 1905* (Washington, D.C.: Ellen G. White Estate, 1983); synthesized in *idem, The Sanctuary, 1844, and the Pioneers*, (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1983).

23 Following the Biblical method meant observing the ripening barley in Palestine to determine whether it would be ripe in time to wave during the Feast of Unleavened Bread, and if it did not, adding a second 12th month in the lunar year to bring it in line with the solar year. In 1844 the barley harvest in Palestine required the addition of an extra month to the calendar, thus making the Day of Atonement October 22 that year, not a month earlier (September 23). For a discussion of the Karaites and the continuation of the Biblical method of calendrical calculation as opposed to the rabbinic departure from the Biblical method, see Froom, *The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers*, 2: 196-199; 4: 792-797.

24 See Shea, *Selected Studies*, pp. 132-137.

25 For a detailed study of the meaning of Dan 8:14, see Hasel, "Dan 8:9-14," in *Symposium on Daniel*, pp. 378-461.

26 For a detailed analysis of the meaning of *nitsdaq* in context, see Niels-Erik Andreassen, "Translation of *Nitsdaq/Katharisthesetai*," in Dan 8:14," in *Symposium on Daniel*, pp. 475-496; Hasel, "Dan 8:9-14," in *Symposium on Daniel*, pp. 448-453; cf. Jerome Justesen, "On the Meaning of *sadaq*," *AUSS*, 2 (1964): 53-61.

27 See Edward J. Young, *The Prophecy of Daniel: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949), p. 172; cf. Hasel, "Dan 8:9-14," in *Symposium on Daniel*, pp. 440, 441.

28 See Richard M. Davidson, "Typology in the Book of Hebrews," in *Issues in the Book of Hebrews, Daniel and Revelation Committee Series*, vol. 4 (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, 1989), pp. 121-186; Alberto R. Treiyer, "Antithetical or Correspondence Typology?" in *Issues in the Book of Hebrews*, pp. 187-198.

29 See Heb 8:3-5; 9:23. In the few instances where there is a modification of the Old Testament type in the New Testament antitype, the author of Hebrews shows how this change is already anticipated and foretold in the Old Testament. For discussion, see Davidson, "Typology in Hebrews," pp. 173-178.

³⁰ For further discussion, see Davidson, "Typology in Hebrews," pp. 177, 184.

³¹ For further arguments supporting the conclusion that according to Hebrews Christ ascended to *inaugurate* the entire sanctuary and not to immediately commence the antitypical Day of Atonement in the heavenly most holy place, see *ibid.*, pp. 179-184. (This discussion includes treatment of the crucial terms *ta hagia* and *prote skene* in Heb 9:8, and interpretation of Heb 6:19, 20. Both these passages have reference to the *inauguration* of the heavenly sanctuary in fulfillment of Dan 9:24, and *not* to the antitypical Day of Atonement.)

³² For further discussion, see *ibid.*, pp. 183, 184.

³³ George Rice, "Apostasy as a Motif and its Effect on the Structure of Hebrews," *Andrews University Seminary Studies*, 23 (1985): 29-35.

³⁴ In this passage note (1) the future timing of the judgment from the apostle's perspective (vs 27), (2) the investigative nature of the judgment (vs 28) as well as the executive (vs 29), and (3) the focus of the judgment upon God's professed people (vs 30). It is likely that the reference to "the Day" in vs 25 is a technical term, not for the Second Advent of Christ, but for the Day of Atonement, as the Aramaic *yoma* "The Day" is used for the title of the Mishnaic tractate on the Day of Atonement.

³⁵ See Kenneth Strand, "The Eight Basic Visions in the Book of Revelation," *Andrews University Seminary Studies*, 25 (1987): 107-121; *idem*, "The 'Victorious Introduction' Scenes in the Visions in the Book of Revelation," *Andrews University Seminary Studies*, 25 (1987): 267-288; C. Mervyn Maxwell, *God Cares, vol. 2: The Message of Revelation for You and Your Family* (Boise, Idaho: Pacific Press, 1985), pp. 156, 157; and Jon Paulien, "Intertextuality, the Hebrew Cultus, and the Plot of the Apocalypse," unpublished paper presented at the Society of Biblical Literature national meeting in New Orleans, Nov. 18, 1990. For further discussion of what follows, see Richard M. Davidson, "Sanctuary Typology in the Book of Revelation," in the forthcoming Daniel and Revelation Committee volume on Revelation.

³⁶ It is interesting to note how the activities connected with the sanctuary in the first half of the book correspond to the basic order of the daily ministry of the priests as described in the Mishnah tractate *tamid*. See Davidson, "Sanctuary Typology in Revelation," in the in Daniel and Revelation Committee volume on Revelation.

³⁷ Kenneth A. Strand, "An Overlooked Old Testament Background to Revelation 11:1," *Andrews University Seminary Studies*, 22 (1984/3): 317-325.

³⁸ Of course there are spotlights on last events already in the first half of the book, and flashbacks into history in the eschatological part of the book. See discussion in Strand, "The Eight Basic Visions in the Book Revelation," pp. 107-121; and Maxwell, *God Cares, vol. 2, passim*.

³⁹ Not only does the book of Revelation move through the sanctuary from the holy place and daily services to the most holy place and yearly day of judgment. It also moves antitypically through Israel's festivals (as summarized in Lev 23). A close examination of Revelation reveals a movement from Passover (Rev 1-3) to Pentecost (Rev 4-7), trumpets (Rev 8-10), Day of Atonement (Rev 11-20), and Tabernacles (Rev 21-22). See Davidson, "Sanctuary Typology in the Book of Revelation" (forthcoming), for detailed analysis.

⁴⁰ Kenneth A. Strand, "Investigative Judgment in the Book of Revelation," *Pacific Union Recorder*, October 13, 1980, p. 2.

⁴¹ Ellen G. White, *Our High Calling*, p. 361.

⁴² Ellen G. White, *Christ's Object Lessons*, p. 133.