



JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

Volume 5, Number 1 Spring 1994

ARTICLES

- By What Authority? 1
C. Raymond Holmes
- New Testament Use of the Old Testament 14
Richard M. Davidson
- Inspiration and the Imprecatory Psalms 40
Angel M. Rodriguez
- Divine Inspiration and the Canon of the Bible 68
Gerhard F. Hasel
- Revelation/Inspiration, Church, and Culture 106
Jack J. Blanco
- Inspiration, the Natural Sciences, and a Window of
Opportunity 131
John T. Baldwin
- The Inspiration of Scripture in the Writings of Ellen G.
White 155
P. Gerard Damsteegt
- History of Inspiration in the Adventist Church
(1844-1915) 180
Alberto R. Timm
- The Effects of Adam's Sin on the Human Race. 196
Norman R. Gulley
- Endnotes: Music as Ecumenical Force 216
Wolfgang H. M. Stefani

JOURNAL OF THE
ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

Volume 5, Number 1, Spring 1994

Editor: Frank Holbrook

Associate Editors: Gordon M. Hyde, George W. Reid, Ronald M. Springett

Editorial Executive Committee

C. Raymond Holmes, Chairman; Jack J. Blanco, Richard M. Davidson, Norman R. Gulley, Gerhard F. Hasel, Frank B. Holbrook, Gordon M. Hyde, C. Mervyn Maxwell, Ronald M. Springett, Leo R. Van Dolson, Mervyn Warren, Francis W. Wernick, Randall W. Younker, E. Edward Zinke.

Editorial Resource Board

Warren Ashworth, Samuele Bacchiocchi, Douglas Bennett, Jack J. Blanco, Thomas H. Blincoe, Paul Buchheim, Arthur Chadwick, Harold Coffin, P. Gerard Damsteegt, Laurel Damsteegt, Richard M. Davidson, Roy Gane, Norman R. Gulley, Gerhard F. Hasel, Frank B. Holbrook, C. Raymond Holmes, Hans K. LaRondelle, Leon I. Mashchak, C. Mervyn Maxwell, P. David Merling, Daegeuk Nam, James J. North Jr., Gerhard Pfandl, Siegfried H. Roeske, Angel Rodriguez, Ronald M. Springett, Loron Wade, Mervyn Warren, Pierre Winandy, Randall W. Younker, E. Edward Zinke.

Advisory Board

Bernell Baldwin, Marjorie Baldwin, Wallace Blair, Elsie Blair, Thomas H. Blincoe, Carol Buchheim, JoAnn Davidson, D. A. Delafield, Herbert E. Douglass, William Fagal, John Fowler, Erwin Gane, Rosalie Haffner Lee, Leslie Hardinge, Darrell Huenergardt, John Loor, John McFarlane, Sharon McKee, Cyril Miller, Jacob Norrey, Robert Peck, Paul Robberson, Al Sines, Jane Sines, J. Robert Spangler, Joel O. Tompkins, Mario Veloso, Velile Wakaba, Lewis Walton, Jo Ellen Walton, Francis W. Wernick, Izak van Zyl.

The JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY is published twice yearly by the Adventist Theological Society. Home office: P. O. Box 551, Collegedale, Tennessee 37315. Direct all correspondence to P. O. Box 86, Berrien Springs, Michigan 49103.

The JOURNAL is sent free to members of the Society whose dues are not in arrears.

The regular annual subscription price for non-members is US\$12.50 to addresses in the USA and US\$14.50 to addresses elsewhere.

The student and retiree subscription price for non-members is US\$10.00 in the USA and US\$12.00 elsewhere.

The single copy price is US\$6.00.

All items not copyrighted by their authors are copyright © 1994 by the Adventist Theological Society.

Opinions expressed in the JOURNAL are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the Society. The validity and accuracy of quoted material included in articles are the responsibility of the authors of the articles.

Journal of the Adventist Theological Society, 5/1 (1994):1-13.
Article copyright © 1994 by C. Raymond Holmes.

BY WHAT AUTHORITY?

By C. Raymond Holmes

Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary

Andrews University

Introduction

H. M. S. Richards, considered the dean of Adventist preachers, once said: "Whether some of us believe it or not, preaching is the most important function of the Christian church and of the Advent message."¹ Enlarging on that thought he added:

To take the position that the preacher's chief work is preaching will take courage and faith, I'll tell you. Why? Because in some conferences it is the man who does these other things [raise money, meet goals, promote projects, entertain, curry favor, seek promotion] who is wanted more than a preacher.²

By 1957 Richards had a national reputation as a radio preacher, and enjoyed the kind of stature within the Seventh-day Adventist Church that allowed him to speak such words without fear of censure, words that could never be spoken by a recent seminary graduate swaddled in his gown. But Richards knew what Sangster knew: "Being a religion of revelation, Christianity can only be known as it is proclaimed."³

If Richards was right, if preaching is the most important function of the Advent message, and if preaching is the Adventist minister's chief work, the following questions pose themselves: (1) By what authority do we preach, and wherein lies the power of preaching? (2) What is the proper role of language in preaching? (3) What posture must the preacher take before a biblical text?

Authority and Power

When the Master Minister finished His course in ministerial

training, He called the twelve apostles together for a concluding session. The Bible tells us, "He gave them power and authority" to "preach the kingdom of God" (Luke 9:1-2, NIV).^{*} The apostle Paul, who received his divine empowering and authority later, said in defense of his ministry that the weapons he used were

not the weapons of the world. On the contrary, they have divine power to demolish strongholds. We demolish arguments and every pretension that sets itself up against the knowledge of God, and we take captive every thought to make it obedient to Christ (2 Cor 10:4-5).

Throughout his ministry Paul demonstrated the power and authority of Christian proclamation. Some referred to his letters as "weighty and forceful" (2 Cor 10:10).

The powerful weapons to which Paul referred are both defensive and offensive. The five defensive weapons are truth, righteousness, the gospel of peace, faith, and salvation, which empower the believer to "stand against the devil's schemes. . . against the rulers, against the authorities, against the powers of this dark world and against the spiritual forces of evil in the heavenly realms" (Eph 6:11-12). The one offensive weapon is "the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God" (vs 17).

"Sharper than any double-edged sword," the Word of God exercises divine power as it *penetrates* even to *dividing* soul and spirit, joints and marrow; it *judges* the thoughts and attitudes of the heart. Nothing in all creation is hidden from God's sight. Everything is *uncovered* and laid bare before the eyes of him to whom we must give account (Heb 4:12-13, emphasis mine.)

Christianity would be but a human religion if the preaching of the kingdom of God depended upon the power of human talent, intellect, charisma, or persuasion.

The authority and power is in the Word not in the preacher. A vivid example of this is found in the dramatic story of Ezekiel preaching to the dead (Eze 37:1-14). God took Ezekiel to a valley covered with the bones of what may have been a vast army slain in battle, and asked: "Can these bones live?" It's hard to know if Ezekiel's answer reflected faith or skepticism, or perhaps some of both: "Only you know, God." In response came the divine directive,

Prophecy to these bones and say to them, "Dry bones, hear the word

of the Lord! This is what the Sovereign Lord says to these bones: I will make breath enter you, and you will come to life. I will attach tendons to you and make flesh come upon you and cover you with skin; I will put breath in you, and you will come to life. Then you will know that I am the Lord" (vss 4-6).

What did Ezekiel do? He preached. What did he say? He said exactly what God told him to say. He didn't try to persuade the dead that they were not really dead! He preached the message revealed, which met the need for restoration of life as seen from God's perspective.

And as I was prophesying, there was a noise, a rattling sound, and the bones came together, bone to bone. I looked, and tendons and flesh appeared on them and skin covered them. . . and breath entered them; they came to life and stood up on their feet—a vast army (vss 7-9).

Life was given not because Ezekiel preached, but because he preached God's Word. The power, the authority, is in the Word! The empowering authority to say what he said was in the Word of God. It declared a promise, and the power to bring the promise to pass was in the Word of God.

The Word of God is always a creative word. It not only says something, it does something. At creation, when God said "Let there be light," there was light! When Jesus cried, "Lazarus come out!"—Lazarus came out! Jesus disarmed the Devil with "It is written." And when Jesus returns, He will speak the Word of resurrection, calling His people from their graves!

Paul's hearers experienced that same power and authority, for which he was careful to thank God, "because, when you received the word of God, which you heard from us, you accepted it not as the word of men, but as it actually is, the word of God, which is at work in you who believe" (1 Thess 2:13).

Centuries later an accomplished London physician experienced that same power and authority, and became one of England's greatest evangelical preachers. In telling the story of his conversion he makes this observation:

What I needed was preaching that would convict me of sin and make me see my need, and bring me to repentance and tell me something about regeneration. But I never heard that. The preaching we had was always based on the assumption that we were all Chris-

tians, that we would not have been there in the congregation unless we were Christians. . . . Although I had heard the best-known preachers. . . of every denomination. . . I cannot recall that a single one of them touched my conscience. . . . We used to go to the services for enjoyment and eloquence, and if we got these we considered that the object of worship had been attained. But. . . the majority of the popular preachers did not aim at convicting anybody so much as at discussing the subject in a masterly and eloquent manner and having a 'goodtime.'⁴

When the Word of God is preached with power and conviction, the Church grows spiritually and numerically. The history of Christianity testifies to that truth. It happened when God made the world, when Ezekiel preached, when Jesus raised Lazarus. It will happen when we preach too, as long as we believe that the power and authority is in the sword of the Spirit which is the Word of God.

Paul told a young preacher to "Encourage and rebuke with all authority. Do not let anyone despise you" (Titus 2:15). The authority is the Word of God. When that authority is exercised in faith, it accomplishes a mighty, divine work, demolishing strongholds and arguments. That authority is not to be despised, in contradiction to all who scorn the Word of God preferring human wisdom and speculative reason instead. The exaltation of human reason has always been in opposition to the wisdom and knowledge that comes from God through His revealed Word. The preacher will be despised—even by an unbelieving world—if he fails to proclaim the Word of God, for he has no authority in himself.

The centuries demonstrate the struggle to maintain faith in the authority and power of God's Word. In the nineteenth century the focus of preaching shifted to the power of human oratory and rhetoric. Many preachers adopted a pulpit style that did not always represent their true selves. However, during that same century a welcome change commenced. Preaching style began to lose a great deal of its coldness and formality. A major strength became the renewed concern for exegesis, exposition, and the practical application of the biblical text to daily life.

In the secular context the most vivid example of this dramatic change was Abraham Lincoln's three-minute speech at Gettysburg. Its brevity, common language, and direct phrases, were characteris-

tic of the man himself. It became the most famous speech in American history, a powerful example of truth through personality.

Relative to preaching, the change toward a more honest and authentic personality in the pulpit was a wholesome development. However, in our time, the rhetoric and oratory of the past is often replaced by the charisma or crudity, linguistically and stylistically, of the twentieth century. Once again we are faced with unauthentic pulpit personalities, and what was initially a welcome improvement has become a deterioration.

In spite of the homiletical improvement, there arose major theological problems in the nineteenth century that impacted on preaching. The present shift away from preaching the great doctrines and themes of Scripture to therapeutic preaching—due to the development and spread of materialistic evolution, rationalism's criticism of the Bible, and scientific hostility to traditional religion—is directly related to the steady erosion of belief in the authority of the Bible as revelation of the mind and will of God.

What distresses many contemporary interpreters of the Bible are biblical teachings that run counter to the demands and desires of culture. Which no doubt motivated our colleague Kenneth Strand, in 1974, to ask:

In endeavoring to communicate God's Word to 20th century man, are we reliable transmitters of that Word, or is there a danger that we may tend to transform the Word instead? Or stated in another way, Do we proclaim the Word in such a way that it speaks its own message—God's message—or may we unwittingly at times allow 20th century culture and our own preconceptions to modify the gospel we proclaim?⁵

Twenty years later, however, such transformation and modification is in many instances deliberate rather than unwitting. To be sure, the Bible carries the mark of humanity as well as divinity. Yet when the preacher's primary focus is on its human dimension, it is easily concluded that the Bible is as unreliable as any other human product. Such a conclusion has a devastating impact on the pulpit. While the preacher still earns wages, and preaching is conceived to be a major function of ministry, the focus of preaching is less on doctrine and more on therapy. The goal is not

conviction of sin and transformation of life, but feeling good about oneself and about human relationships.

Moises Silva says, "It is now claimed that a full acceptance of the historical-critical method, with its assumption of biblical fallibility, is the only approach that does justice to the humanity of Scripture." He then continues, "Once we abandon the doctrine of infallibility, there is no meaningful way in which we can speak of the divine character of the Bible."⁶ If the preacher has no faith in the infallibility of Scripture, by what authority does he preach? Where does he get his message? Furthermore, from whence comes the power for preaching? Can the preacher be assured that the power of the Holy Spirit accompanies a message that does not have the infallible authority of God's Word? Can he hope to have anything near the experience of Ezekiel?

Historically the Seventh-day Adventist Church has been united in one body. It is a world church, not a loosely organized federation of independent conferences. Unity of doctrine and biblical interpretation have been essential to the dynamism of the Seventh-day Adventist Church's mission and the consistency of its message. Historically Adventism has claimed an understanding of the unified biblical message in its reference to "the truth" and "the message."

Today some critics say that it is not possible to understand a complete and unified message of the Bible, that the Bible writers contradict each other, that even the apostle Paul contradicts himself. If, as the critics say, there is no longer any unity of doctrine and interpretation, then truth becomes whatever any group confesses it to be (a congregation, a division, a conference, a group of theologians, a special interest group, etc.), and the reason for our existence collapses. Furthermore, the preacher's confessional responsibility becomes nonexistent. The prophetic element in Adventist preaching would disappear, as would enthusiastic evangelism.

If there is no certain, authoritative and infallible message, the very act of proclamation would be problematic and redundant. It has been the certainty of the Adventist witness to biblical authority that has empowered its evangelism and mission. This is also the

reason why the Church has not been content with minimal conditions for membership.

Role of Language

Literary expression must never take the place of the truth of the message. When belief in the authority of the Bible is lost, oratory, charisma, and therapy are ready substitutes. One may be entertained by the preacher's language, and pleased by his style. But if, after the worship service is over, one has to inquire if anything was said that was biblical—without finding a clear answer—then preaching is in serious trouble.

There are those today who say we need to create a new language that would better come to grips with the horrendous problems and struggles faced by the contemporary world. True, communication that has meaning must always be cognizant of those problems and struggles. But for Christians to use words from which biblical meaning has been leached out, is to misrepresent and to distort the mind of God, which always happens when greater confidence is placed in human philosophy and cleverness than in the Word of God and in the power of biblical truth. Such language does not contribute to the solutions we so crave, but becomes part of the problem. Such language on the part of professed Christians is actually a secular approach to religion and life.

To paraphrase Gerhard Ebeling: The ability to understand is undermined when language takes on an existence of its own and is isolated from its basis in reality. Consequently words are spoken into a void.⁷ They are no longer in touch with Scripture, do not reflect the mind of God, and even treat Scripture with hostility. Perhaps one reason so many professed Christians fail to verbalize their faith is that they no longer know what the language means. Faith can only live by the words it receives; consequently, that life can be strangled by words from which biblical meanings have been sucked out. Preaching loses touch with its purpose if it is cut loose from Scripture as the primary source of its thought.

The preacher/theologian is expected to be an expert on the mind of God as revealed in Scripture. Theology, like any discipline, requires its own language. But when the preacher/theologian speaks, whether to the world or to the church, the obligation is to

speak so as to be understood. The task should be an affirming one, not one that causes doubt and skepticism. The goal is to build, not to wreck, faith. Biblical answers must be provided for the questions and problems posed by contemporary life and philosophy. And the preacher/theologian must be brave enough and courageous enough to confront culture and society. Preaching, while always cognizant of a changing world, must be occupied with that which changes the world: negatively, sin, and positively the power of the Word of God.

As far as preaching and evangelism are concerned, theological pluralism contributes to the death of language. Yes, language establishes and maintains relationships, as the Orientals have taught us. But dependable relationships are possible only on the basis of truth. The function of language is also to convey truthful information. But if the language used has many meanings, can it be truthful language?

What image comes to mind when the word "Christ" is heard? Is it that of the crucified, suffering, Christ who took the sinner's place? Or is it of the sublime Christ who taught us how to face and overcome adversity? Or is it both? And the word "sin"? Does it speak of the morally responsible creature who has rejected and denied that responsibility? Or does it speak of the helpless creature who only needs sympathy, understanding, and love in order to be what he/she is capable of being? Some of what the Bible calls "sin" is now called "socially acceptable alternatives." But biblically understood, sin is much more than "dysfunction."

Attempting to combat sexism by eliminating all masculine references to God is actually a form of idolatry, as it recreates God according to a cultural image. When the Bible is read through the glasses of culture, sociology, or psychology, meanings are given to words that are not biblical, that do not represent the mind of God—the biblical perspective. Attempting to preach in language that takes into account every cultural sensitivity, for political reasons, makes preaching problematic.

The words used may be those of traditional Christianity, but they may not be representative of biblical reality. Thus while one may speak the same words, they can become untrue and therefore misleading. The specificity of the biblical word must not be replaced by banality, pious phrases, or inflated nothingness. What might be

admired as examples of charismatic preaching may be nothing more than "pseudo-dramatization" and "rhetorical explosions." Such language has the odor of death, the homiletical convulsions of a dying church.

If language is supposed to represent reality, what happens to preaching when the words used themselves become untrue, when they no longer embody and communicate biblical reality, when the preacher not only allows but contributes to the reshaping of those words by culture and society? The words become innocuous, they arouse neither the fervent passion of faith nor the antagonistic passion of hate.

Paul tells us that our language should be "full of grace" yet "seasoned with salt, so that you may know how to answer everyone" (Col 4:6). Our language must not be insensitive to multicultural concerns, but it must primarily proclaim the supremacy of the Word of God. There are, after all, Bible teachings that are nonnegotiable in spite of all pressure to the contrary. Not all opinions are equally valid. Many early Christians were made brutal sport of in the arena because they would not accept some Roman "alternative lifestyles."

Luther, always a preacher, said "The devil forced me to become a theologian." If preaching is a God-ordained method of communicating the gospel, and if the function of theology is to inform preaching, what kind of theology best informs preaching? The answer, of course, is biblical theology. All sound, trustworthy, theology must be biblical. When theology exists for its own sake, when it no longer is biblical theology that informs preaching, it becomes diabolical. Teachers of theology must be aware that the mind of the young preaching student is very impressionable. It can often be compared to the eager and zealous football player who catches the forward pass and races across the field only to discover he has run the wrong way!

Submission to the Text

While we do not accept the idea of dictation/verbal inspiration of the Bible, we cannot abandon belief in its infallibility. We must maintain our belief that, as the very first article of our *Fundamental Beliefs* states, the Bible is "the infallible revelation of His [God's] will." Though it is written by God's "penmen," it is authored by

God, thus assuring its infallibility. Therefore, the only safe posture before the biblical text is submission. The preacher falls under the critical examination of the text, not the other way around. Wise counsel says, "Take the Bible, and on your knees plead with God to enlighten your mind."⁸

Preachers fall into one of two categories: tradesmen or artists. A tradesman masters the use of certain tools and by the application of those tools can effectively perform a specific task. A skilled carpenter, following the blueprints created by an architect, can successfully build a house. The preacher who is primarily a tradesman has mastered a certain homiletical technique, applies it to a Bible text and produces a sermon.

However, the preacher who is an artist, while he may have mastered the use of homiletical tools, will take a different approach altogether. Interested in design as well as in technique, this preacher wants to design the house as well as build it. In this instance, text determines technique. Technique is in the service of the text. It is the text that will show the preacher what is the best thing to do homiletically. The preacher who is an artist is an instrument motivated, moved, by the text. The preacher's will is not imposed on the text. The text is allowed to use the preacher, to draw the preacher into its influence. The preacher does not dictate to the text, but is the text's slave. This preacher will sit before the text, like an artist sits before a scene, until the message in the text, eager to be preached, reaches out and grabs hold of heart and mind.

When a sermon is very difficult to prepare, it may be that the text is fighting with the preacher's method, struggling to get said in its own way. But when the preacher submits to the text, the sermon is born. This approach is most in harmony with the belief that the power is in the Word and not in the preacher or in homiletical technique. Homiletical technique must always be subordinate to the text. The preacher can be guilty of aborting the sermon if he does not sit long enough before the text, if he cuts off the process too soon. As Roy Allen Anderson has said, the preacher "not only possesses a message, but is himself possessed by the message. And to the degree that the truth is reproduced in the personality of the preacher—to that degree will the sermon be a power. It is the message possessing the man that makes him

dynamic. He then becomes a living witness, for his personality vanishes in the virtue of the Almighty."⁹ This is a preacher who listens through Scripture, who "sees" into the text. This is called "insight." And Ellen G. White said, "You must learn to see with your brain as well as your eyes."¹⁰

In order to be truly helpful the preacher needs to "see" the human needs, problems, or issues to which the text addresses itself, to see more deeply and profoundly the purpose for which the text was written.

Conclusion

With passion H. M. S. Richards said "O my friends, preach the great themes of Scripture. Don't fool around on the fringes, away on the circumference of things. Preach the great truths. You don't have time in this world for anything else."¹¹

Confession of faith in the authority of the Bible is not lacking among us. But the way in which the Bible is read, interpreted, and preached will produce either a right or wrong faith, ethic, and morality. Does our preaching demonstrate full or limited biblical authority? Does our preaching demonstrate the authority and power inherent in the creative Word of God? In the denomination in which I once served things are being taught and done that were unthinkable thirty years ago. It was an almost imperceptible change in presuppositions about the Bible, filtering down through the classroom and then the pulpit, that made possible the liberalization of faith and piety during those thirty years. This sad development is termed "progressive" by advocates, but the Bible calls it licentiousness and ungodliness, fruit of the unregenerate life.

In 1986 I was invited to attend the 75th anniversary of the congregation in which I interned as a Lutheran seminary student. I was hosted by a family I knew while serving as their student pastor 27 years before. In 1959 the wife was a devout church member, but in spite of my efforts, as well as those of my immediate successors, the husband did not become a member. Imagine my surprise to discover in 1986, after almost three decades, he was not only a member of that congregation but the chairman of the church board! Nevertheless, during my stay in their home, I observed that he was still the same man I had known 27 years before. The absence of

regeneration and transformation was evident in many obvious ways. He had not changed. The church had changed to the point where he felt comfortable as a member, yet living the same old ungodly life. What is believed about the Bible by teachers and preachers, eventually filters down to church members.

The question that we all, theologians, administrators, preachers, church members, must ask is: Are we interested in being changed by the biblical message, or are we more interested in changing the biblical message by conforming it to the modern spirit?

If one is to preach well, one must submit to the Word and preach often. Homiletical muscles will atrophy and become useless unless exercised on a regular and consistent basis. To perfect a specific skill that skill must be consistently practiced. It takes far less time to lose homiletical skills than to recover them.

If the only authority for preaching is the Word of God, and if the power for preaching is in the Word, then the only appropriate homiletical response is exposition. This is the only method that "preserves the purity of Scripture and accomplishes the purpose for which God gave us His Word."¹²

If the Bible is infallible, why bother with anything else whose truthfulness is uncertain? In terms of evangelism and church growth, who can be expected to commit life and means to the religiously tentative?

If we fail in our duty we will be guilty of a great tragedy: the destruction of the only safe ground upon which our children and grandchildren can safely stand in the years before the return of the Lord. If the race is to be lost it will not be over ground that has already been covered, but over ground that is yet ahead.

Fearless preachers are needed today! If preachers only echo popular contemporary views, they will not speak redemptively to the world. How can preaching be imbued with authority and power if the message preached is other than that given by revelation? Yes, contemporary relevance is essential, but the preacher's authority must rest on something far more substantial and reliable than the latest theological or cultural fad. Dietrich Ritschl was right when he wrote: "First, we must be concerned with the content of the sermon, and only secondly can we deal with the situation of the

Church and its people."¹³ Because the call of the Word of God has priority over human response.

"Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly as you teach and admonish one another with all wisdom" (Col 3:16).

We are to receive God's Word as supreme authority. . . . Then, as we make God's Word the guide of our lives, for us is answered the prayer of Christ: "Sanctify them through Thy truth; the word is truth." John 17:17. The acknowledgment of the truth in word and deed is our confession of faith. Only thus can others know that we believe the Bible.¹⁴

Endnotes

* Scripture citations are from the *New International Version*.

1 *Feed My Sheep* (Washington, D. C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1958), p. 34.

2 *Ibid*, p. 68.

3 W. E. Sangster, *Power in Preaching* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1958), p. 21.

4 David Martyn Lloyd-Jones, quoted in *D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones: The First Forty Years* by Iain H. Murray (Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1982), pp. 58-59.

5 Kenneth A. Strand, "Toward a Balanced Hermeneutic and Avoiding Extremes: Issues in Current Theology," *North American Bible Conference Notebook* (General Conference Biblical Research Committee, 1974), p. 8.

6 Moises Silva, *Has the Church Misread the Bible?* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1987), p. 44.

7 Gerhard Ebeling, *Introduction to a Theological Theory of Language* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1973), p. 77.

8 Ellen G. White, *Counsels on Sabbath School Work* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1938), p. 23.

9 Roy Allen Anderson, *Shepherd-Evangelist* (Washington, D. C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1950), pp. 316-17.

10 Ellen G. White, *Fundamentals of Christian Education* (Nashville, TN: Southern Publishing Association, 1923), p. 302.

11 *Ibid*, p. 33.

12 John MacArthur, Jr., *Rediscovering Expository Preaching* (Dallas: Word Publishing, 1992), p. 24.

13 Dietrich Ritschl, *A Theology of Proclamation* (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1960), p. 129.

14 Ellen G. White, *Testimonies for the Church* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1948 reprint), pp. 402-403, emphasis mine.