

send you the prophet Elijah before that great and dreadful day of the LORD comes" (Mal. 4:5, NIV).

Bibliography

- Boersma, T. *Is The Bible a Jigsaw Puzzle?* St. Catherines, Ont.: Paideia Press, 1978. See pp. 32-43.
- Doukhan, J. B. *Daniel: The Vision of the End.* Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University Press, 1987.
- Froom, L. E. *The Prophetic Faith of our Fathers.* 4 vols. Hagerstown, Md: Review and Herald Publ. Assn., 1954.
- Keil, C. F. *Commentary on the Old Testament.* Vol. 9. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans. See p. 486.
- Larondelle, H. *Understanding End-time Prophecies,* 122.
- Seebass, H. "Acharith," in *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament.* Vol. 1. Botterweck and Ringgren, eds. Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans, 1977. See pp. 207-212.
- Vanderwaal, C. *Hal Lindsey and Biblical Prophecy.* St. Catherines, Ont.: Paideia Press, 1978.
- White, J. "The Time of the End," *The Signs of the Times.* Pacific Press Pub. Assn. Vol. 6, no. 28 (July 22, 1880), editorial.
- Willis, J. T. "The expression *be'acharith hayyamim* in the Old Testament," in *Restoration Quarterly.* Abilene Christian College. Vol. 22, Nos. 1, 2, (1979), pp. 55-71.

Journal of the Adventist Theological Society, 2/2 (1991):35-66.
Article Copyright © 1991 by Norman R. Gulley.

DANIEL'S PRE-ADVENT JUDGMENT IN ITS BIBLICAL CONTEXT

By Norman R. Gulley

Southern College of Seventh-day Adventists

Only a few non-Seventh-day Adventist scholars believe in a pre-advent judgment. It is almost universally overlooked in Daniel studies.¹ By contrast, Seventh-day Adventists find in Daniel 7-8, together with Revelation 14:6, 7, Biblical evidence for a pre-advent judgment. We call this judgment "pre-advent," denoting its time; and "investigative," denoting its method.

This presentation, employing the hermeneutical principle of *sola scriptura*, attempts to follow the Bible's self-interpretation of the pre-advent judgment in Daniel. After defining the way the term "pre-advent judgment" is used, we will document evidence for it in Daniel, evaluate the alternative view held by most historical critical scholars, and consider Daniel's presentation in the light of Leviticus 16, Zechariah 3, Hebrews, and Revelation 13-19. The good news of the pre-advent judgment is seen in the Biblical salvation-history context, with Calvary before it, Christ's intercession during it, and Armageddon following it.

The Pre-advent Judgment in Daniel

1. Who are judged? The usual definition for the "pre-advent judgment" focuses on the investigation of God's people of all ages. I concur with this. But many of God's end-time saints, who live during this end-time judgment, look on the pre-advent judgment as

anything but good news, even though the first angel's message places the judgment in the context of the "eternal gospel" (Rev. 14:7, NIV used throughout, unless otherwise indicated). They apparently consider the judgment apart from its relation to the little horn in Daniel and apart from its roots in the cross, its relation to Christ's intercession, and its outworking in Armageddon.

The everlasting gospel is the truth about Calvary. If "the sacrifice of Christ as an atonement for sin is the great truth around which all other truths cluster" and if "in order to be rightly understood and appreciated, every truth in the Word of God, from Genesis to Revelation, must be studied in the light that streams from the cross of Calvary,"² then Calvary must give us insight into the pre-advent judgment. No subsequent judgment calls in question the judgment of Calvary, neither is it different from, nor does it add to, but only reveals and applies what was completed there.

In other words, judgment day primarily and initially was equated with Calvary.³ Jesus said of the cross, "Now is the time for judgment on this world; now the prince of this world will be driven out" (John 12:31). Calvary judgment means ultimate deliverance for God's people and destruction of their enemy. This is worked out in salvation-history through pre-advent, millennial and post-millennial judgments. Calvary's double verdict of "deliverance-destruction" needs to guide our definition of the pre-advent judgment verdict.

According to Biblical typology, the pre-advent judgment, concluding human history (see next section), is typified by the annual Day of Atonement (Lev. 16). That annual judgment was only for Israel, and never included other nations (Lev. 16:16). One would expect a correspondence of this in the antitype (Dan. 7). Although Daniel 7 does not name who is being judged in the pre-advent judgment, it designates those who will receive the judgment verdict (Dan. 7:22, 26). It is logical to assume that they are included in the judgment investigation. The two groups receiving this verdict are: 1. God's people attacked by the little horn (Dan. 7:20-22, 25-27); and 2. the little horn, as a professedly Christian system (Dan. 7:22, 26).

But is it legitimate to include the little horn? Ellen White says "the only cases considered are those of the professed people of

God,"⁴ and further defines these as "all who have believed on Jesus,"⁵ yet also significantly includes "all those who have ever taken upon themselves the name of Christ."⁶ If two groups come to view here, that is, genuine believers and those taking on Christ's name, then the little horn corresponds to both. For the little horn has members within it who love God and the saints whereas the system hates God and the saints. It would seem reasonable that the judgment includes: 1. "All persons (of whatever communion) who have professed a relationship with God," as Bill Shea suggests;⁷ and 2. the little horn, as a counterfeit system, because it masquerades as Christian—taking "the name of Christ." It should be remembered that because Israel also was composed of the genuine and the nominal, there is a correspondence between the type and the antitype. It should also be remembered that Christ mentions a pre-advent inspection in Matthew 22:1-14, of what Ellen White refers to as "a mixed company," for "not all who profess to be Christians are true disciples."⁸ Remember that the original attack against Christ and His position in heaven was made by Lucifer while he still pretended to be a loyal angel. He works through this same guise in the attack of the little horn as a professedly Christian system.

It also is instructive that the immediate background to Daniel (2 Kings 21-25, 2 Chron. 33-36),⁹ as well as the contemporary prophets, Jeremiah and Ezekiel,¹⁰ document that Judah was judged by God for desecration of His sanctuary, and setting up of other gods in His place—the precise thrust of the little horn against Christ and His New Testament sanctuary service. It should also be kept in mind, that in contrast with the secular nations mentioned in Daniel (all which also lose their dominion, Dan. 7:12), the saints and the little horn both claim to be Christian, and either receive or lose their dominion subsequent to the judgment.¹¹

As Baldwin puts it, "The heavenly court decrees that **his dominion shall be taken away**, and that he whose rule has been destructive will in turn see his dominion totally destroyed."¹² The Seventh-day Adventist Commentary states, "The judgment will pass sentence of extinction upon the papacy. This power will continue its war against the saints to the very last. Then its dominion over them will be forever removed, and it will be consumed."¹³ Internal contextual evidence suggests that the saints and the little

horn equally share in the pre-advent judgment verdict, which includes three inter-related acts: 1. dominion is given to the Son of Man (Dan. 7:14, cf vss. 13, 14); 2. dominion is taken from the little horn (Dan. 7:26); and 3. dominion is given to the saints of the Most High (Dan. 7:18, 25). These three acts represent judgment in favor of the saints (vs. 26) and judgment against their little horn enemy (vss. 21, 22). It should be noted that the loss of the little horn's dominion is eschatological (Dan. 7:21, 22, 25-27), unlike the loss of dominion by the beast powers (Dan. 7:12). Christ comes in the second advent "for judgment" (Mal. 3:5), which Ellen White says is "His coming for the execution of the judgment,"¹⁴ i.e., the implementation of the pre-advent verdict, that destroys the little horn/beast in Armageddon, as we will note later.

Scriptural evidence for including the little horn in the judgment is found in Hebrews, which describes backsliding Christians (*katapatesas*, Heb. 10:29, cf 29-31) in similar terms as Daniel describes the little horn (*mirmas*, MT, *sunpatethesetai*, LXX Dan. 8:13, cf vs. 10)—both "trample" on Christ, both have an anti-Christ thrust.¹⁵ It is of interest that, in speaking of these backsliding Christians, to whom Hebrews was written, Calvin likened them to the Papacy. He said, "Our business with the Papists is similar in the present day; for they confess with us that Christ is the Son of God, the Redeemer who had been promised to the world: but when we come to the reality, we find they rob him of more than one-half of his power."¹⁶ It is precisely this same kind of backsliding, with its rebellion against God (Jer. 6:28; Eze. 2:3; Dan. 7:12) and desecration of His Old Testament temple (2 Kings 21, 23; Jer. 23:11; Eze. 5:11; 8:1-18), that brought judgment on Judah in the time of Daniel as noted in footnotes 9 and 10.

Further scriptural evidence for including the little horn in the pre-advent judgment is found in Second Thessalonians 2:2-4, where Paul speaks of a coming apostasy (*apostasia*), that opposes God, sitting in the temple of God (*naon tou Theo*), as if God. Here is described a religious power usurping Christ's place, in his New Testament temple. The roots of this passage are in Ezekiel 28:2, Isaiah 11:4, and Daniel 11:36. The last text speaks of the little horn. Hans LaRondelle rightly concludes that "Paul did not think of the

antichrist as an atheistic power but as a staunchly religious one, who will claim to speak instead of and on behalf of Christ."¹⁷

Still more evidence is found in Revelation, with its reference to the true and false Christian churches—the two woman of chapters 12 and 17 respectively. Also in Revelation, the three angel's messages refer to the "beast" (little horn) in the context of the pre-advent judgment (Rev. 14:6-11). Biblical evidence suggests that the little horn is a counterfeit "Christian" system, and as such is included in the pre-advent judgment.

Daniel 7 contains the first mention of the little horn in Scripture, and each of the three times the little horn is mentioned, Daniel immediately mentions the judgment (vss. 7, 8 followed by vss. 9, 10; vss. 11, 12 followed by vss. 13, 14; vss. 20, 21 followed by vs. 22). In the light of what we have said thus far, it seems that the repeated mention of the little horn within the context of the pre-advent judgment is significant.

The little horn is the beast of Revelation 13:1-10. It is united with the dragon and false prophet (Rev. 16:12-16), which together constitute the enemy of God's end-time remnant. They gather the entire world against the saints (Rev. 16:14; 13:3, cf 12:17). Thus the little horn of Daniel 7 is a type of this end-time global alliance against God's saints, according to the hermeneutical principle of escalation, a principle well demonstrated by Richard M. Davidson.¹⁸ Put with this fact of escalation the equally important fact that the Day of Atonement not only typifies the pre-advent judgment, but also the millennial and post-millennial judgments.¹⁹ Thus we see that the judgment of Daniel 7 corresponds to only part of the Day of Atonement type in Leviticus 16. The Day of Atonement includes judgment against the scapegoat (Lev. 16:20-22) enemy of God's people that corresponds with judgment against the little horn enemy of God's people in Daniel 7.²⁰

The pre-advent judgment has a double verdict (1) deliverance for God's saints, and (2) destruction for their enemy, which is an unfolding of the double verdict of Calvary. Internal contextual evidence in Daniel, beyond chapter 7, seems also to support this double verdict. Thus, "deliverance" (*sheyrib*, 3:17, 28; 6:20; *matsil*, 3:29; 6:16; *malat*, 12:1) of Daniel and his three friends, from lions' den and fiery furnace, gives insight into the eschatological deliver-

ance of those who have their names written in the "book" (12:1), which is the book used in the pre-advent judgment (7:10). Escalation from local deliverances to a universal deliverance is involved.²¹ The historical deliverances for God's people also include destruction of their enemies in both the fiery furnace (Dan. 3:22) and lions' den (Dan. 6:24).²² Likewise, the eschatological deliverance of the saints has its counterpart in the destruction of their enemy (little horn; Dan. 7:26-27).²³

Corroborating this conclusion is the fact that Babylon as a literal enemy nation of God's people in Daniel is a type of spiritual Babylon, the enemy of God's people in the end-time in Revelation. Here the escalation is from one nation (Dan. 1:1, 2) to all the world (Rev. 13:3; 17:1-19:21). Babylon is a type of the enemy of God's people, spoken of as the little horn in Daniel 7 and as the woman or beast in Revelation 13-19. Daniel 7 and Revelation 13-19 clearly speak of the same power that attacks God's people. Daniel says, "As I watched, this horn was waging war against the saints and defeating them" (Dan. 7:21). Revelation records, "Mystery Babylon the great the mother of prostitutes and of the abominations of the earth. I saw that the woman was drunk with the blood of the saints" (Rev. 17:5, 6).

Ancient Babylon is not investigated in the pre-advent judgment because it never claimed allegiance to God. But antitypical Babylon apparently enters the pre-advent judgment precisely because it claims to be Christian. I doubt there is much need to investigate the little horn as a system,²⁴ for its actions are blatant against God and His saints (Dan. 7:21, 25, 26; 8:9-11, 25, 26; 11:28-32; 12:11), but it seems clear that both the little horn and the saints receive the pre-advent judgment verdict, which is not true of any other nation presented in Daniel.

2. Time of the pre-advent judgment. Is there internal contextual evidence that the judgment of Daniel 7 is pre-advent? The answer is yes. There is a triple sequence of time in Daniel 7:21-22: (1) The little horn wages war against the saints in phase one. (2) "Until," a temporal adverb, introduces the second phase in the time sequence. This is the phase of judgment at the end of which a verdict is pronounced in favor of the saints. (3) "At that time," another time expression, introduces the third phase. This indicates

that the time of judgment ends when another "time comes" and that time is the time of the "saints taking possession of the kingdom" at the second advent. This triple time sequence is repeated in Daniel 7:25-27. Clearly this repeated triple sequence places the investigative phase of the judgment prior to the second advent.

This pre-advent time-focus is corroborated by the larger context of Daniel. For Daniel traces the rise and fall of human kingdoms until God sets up His kingdom. God's on-going judgment lies behind these changes. For God "sets up kings and deposes them" (Dan. 2:21). Note the parallel sequence in Daniel 2, 7, and 8, as follows:

Dan. 2:37-44. Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, Rome, 10 kingdoms, God's kingdom.

Dan. 7:4-14, 22, 27. Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, Rome, little horn, God's kingdom.

Dan. 8:2-9, 20-26. Medo-Persia, Greece, little horn (Rome, Pagan/Papal).

Daniel names three of the kingdoms as Babylon (2:24, 38), Medo-Persia (8:20), and Greece (8:21). The data on Medo-Persia and Greece, from chapter 8, informs us of the two nations to follow the Babylonian kingdom of chapter 2. History corroborates this sequence²⁵ and records that Rome followed Greece. According to Daniel 7:7, 8, the little horn follows the fourth kingdom (Rome). The crucial fact is, the little horn not only follows Rome, but is followed by God's kingdom according to Daniel 7:14, 22, 26, 27. So Daniel 7 reveals that a judgment is convened and concludes by (1) taking away the dominion of the little horn (vss. 23-26) and in (2) establishing the dominion of God's eternal kingdom (vss. 27, 28). The removal of the one gives way to the establishing of the other. This judgment must therefore be pre-advent in its investigation and execution.²⁶

The placement of the little horn in this sequence of nations clearly puts it beyond the time (2nd cent. B.C.) of Antiochus IV Epiphanes (believed to be the little horn by many scholars), as he is not alive today in this end-time when the dominion of the little horn is about to be taken away by the arrival of God's eschatological kingdom.

3. Other reasons for rejecting Antiochus IV Epiphanes. Scholars have noted the close relation between Daniel 2 and Daniel

7,²⁷ but have overlooked the same eschatological conclusion given in both (Dan. 2:31-35, 44, 45; 7:13, 14, 17, 18, 21, 22, 27).²⁸ It is precisely this eschatological time-frame that disqualifies Antiochus IV Epiphanes. Maurice Casey's assertion that the destruction of Antiochus inaugurates the eternal kingdom of the Jews lacks empirical evidence.²⁹ Jerome answered this question in refuting Porphyry. He said, if the Jew, Judas Maccabeus defeats Antiochus, how does Judas come with the clouds of heaven like a Son of man to the Ancient of Days in heaven (see Dan. 7:9, 13), how was royal power bestowed upon him, and how is his kingdom eternal (see Dan. 7:14)?³⁰ Obviously the scene in Daniel 7 is far larger than Judas and Antiochus. By contrast, G.K. Beale rightly refers to the judgment "book" of Daniel 7 and 12 as appearing "in contexts of eschatological persecution."³¹

Nevertheless, Antiochus is believed, almost universally, to be the "abomination of desolation" of the sanctuary mentioned in Daniel 8:11-13; 9:27; 11:31; and 12:11. But Christ referred to this "abomination of desolation" as still future in His day. He said, "So when you see standing in the holy place 'the abomination that causes desolation,' spoken of through the prophet Daniel—let the reader understand" (Matt. 24:15). We must allow scripture to interpret scripture, particularly when Christ gives specific guidance and urges that understanding be sought in this matter. There could be no clearer refutation of a second century B.C. interpretation, nor a better mandate to seek for another solution. (cf 2 Thess 2:1-12.)

The pagan Neoplatonist philosopher Porphyry (3rd cent. A.D.) is the earliest known source for supporting the Antiochus interpretation.³² According to Jerome, "Porphyry wrote his twelfth book against the prophecy of Daniel."³³ Whereas Christ accepted Daniel's prophecy of a coming desolation (Matt. 24:15), Porphyry, rejecting Daniel's ability to predict the future, jettisoned a sixth century date for Daniel's composition; opting instead for a second century date so that the prophecies were merely events recorded after the fact. Porphyry's views were rejected by Jerome (Dan. 7), Eusebius of Caesarea, Apollinarius of Laodicea and Methodius.³⁴ But historical-critical scholars have followed Porphyry in these matters. The basic difference between Christ and these critics is their worldview. Christ believed in a God who is in control of human

history; who, because He knows the end from the beginning, can predict future events; and who evidently inspired Daniel to present authentic predictions. In fact this is a fundamental theme in the book. Recent scholarship provides evidence for a sixth century date for Daniel, and therefore for its authentic predictions.³⁵

There are four schools of interpretation for Daniel.³⁶ Some preterists (6th century date for Daniel) and all historico-critical (2nd century date for Daniel) scholars believe the little horn was Antiochus. The other two views reject Antiochus, believing the papal (historicist) or some future antichrist (futurist) to be the little horn.

4. Daniel compatible only with historicist view. There is only one little horn in Daniel, not two. Samuel Nunez documents nine different interpretations for the little horn in Daniel 8, from 1700-1850.³⁷ Calvin believed the little horn in Daniel 7 was Julius Caesar, and the other Caesars,³⁸ and Antiochus in Daniel 8; and also that the little horn of Daniel 8 only reaches up to the first advent of Christ.³⁹ By contrast, the little horn is shown in Daniel to have a history that reaches back to Roman times and forward into the eschatological future. Paul corroborates this view, speaking of an anti-God power already at work in the first century that is to be revealed before Christ's return (2 Thess. 2:1-12). This is different from preterism, historico-criticism, and futurism.

5. The 2,300 literal years. The little horn is named in Daniel several times (7:8, 21; 8:9). Its attack upon the daily (*tamid*) ministry of the sanctuary (Dan. 8:11) is linked to 2,300 "evenings and mornings" (Dan. 8:14). First Maccabees⁴⁰ and Josephus' *Antiquities of the Jews*⁴¹ describe the desecration of the Jerusalem temple by Antiochus IV Epiphanes. Historical-critical scholarship interprets the 2,300 "evening-morning" period as the time when sacrifices to God ceased due to the desecration of the temple/altar by Antiochus. The sacrifices ceased for either 2,300 literal days or 2,300 literal sacrifices—the latter would compute to 1,150 days to account for the morning and evening sacrifices.⁴² But the period calls for over six years (2,300 days), if it were literal. This is double the time of the cessation of sacrifices caused by Antiochus. For on the 15th of the ninth month (Chislew) of the 145th year, Antiochus "set up the abomination of desolation upon the altar" (1 Maccabees 1:54) and

on the 25th day of the ninth month of the 148th year, Jews "offered sacrifice according to the law upon the new altar of burnt offerings, which they had made" (1 Maccabees 4:52). The time period is only ten days over three years.

The problem obviously is worse for the shorter 1,150 days. Beyond that, the 1,150-days choice is not possible on linguistic grounds, because the words *ereb boqer* are identical in their sequence with those in Genesis 1 for the days of creation (Gen. 1:3, 6, 13, 19, 23, 31). As the creation days were classified as *ereb boqer* it is logical to equate the 2,300 days similarly. Because of this, Sigfried Schwantes believes Daniel borrowed the phrase from Genesis 1.⁴³ In spite of the glaring differences between the 2,300 years of Daniel 8:14 and the attempts to fit them to the strictures of Antiochus, writers gloss over these gaps with creative imagination, such as "These 2300 days cover *about* the period of time during which Antiochus Epiphanes did his wicked deeds,"⁴⁴ or the time from the temple's desecration by Antiochus till deliverance by Judas Maccabees "was *exactly* two thousand three hundred days."⁴⁵ Looking beyond such creativity, if Daniel was written after the events, as critical scholarship claims, then why is the computation of the 2,300 days so far off?

Only the historicist interpretation subscribes to the 2,300 years in Daniel 8:14. It is based on "a day for a year" principle, which is found within scripture,⁴⁶ and best describes the Messianic context of Daniel 9:24-27, and the historical time-frame of the little horn as coming between pagan Rome and God's eschatological kingdom. Is there internal contextual evidence for this "day for a year" principle? Yes there is. In Daniel 8:13 the angel asks "until when," (*ad-mathay*), not "how long" (NIV), "will be the vision, **which includes** the continual service and the transgression causing horror, to make both sanctuary and host a trampling?"⁴⁷ What is the term used for vision here? Is it the entire vision, or only its latter part? The answer to this question determines the length of the 2,300 "evenings and mornings," and therefore its length in the answer of verse 14, "Until 2,300 evenings and mornings, then the sanctuary shall be cleansed."

Internal contextual evidence demonstrates that the vision includes the entire period, and not just a final segment.⁴⁸ Here is

the internal evidence. (1) The term for vision is "*hazon* and not *mar'eh*, which refers to a sub-element of the vision (to be considered later). (2) What is included in the *hazon*, according to what Daniel was shown? In Daniel 8:1, 2 the term is used three times, and includes all that follows. Thus the *hazon* vision begins with the ram (Medo-Persia, vss. 3, 4), continues through the goat (Greece, vss. 5-8) and into the latter part of the little horn power (vss. 8-12), because the angel says, "Son of man, understand that the vision (*hazon*) pertains to the time of the end" (vs. 17). Thus the *hazon* reaches from the beginning of the vision to the time of the end. It covers the entire period from the time of the Medo-Persian empire to the "time of the end." This includes the entire history of Greece, and the entire period of the little horn in its pagan and ecclesiastical phases to the "end of time" (vs. 17). Thus it only can be 2,300 years. Therefore, the sequence of question and answer demands that "evenings and mornings" be equated with literal years for no other equivalent will reach from Medo-Persia until the "time of the end" when the sanctuary will be cleansed.

Luther identified the little horn as the papacy. H.C. Leupold said, "We also hold that in stating that the pope is the Antichrist the Lutheran Confessions were correct much as some men have derided and belittled that view. Such belittling grows out of forgetting how thoroughly the reformers understood the papacy."⁴⁹ But Calvin did not. He said of the little horn in Dan 7:8, "Some twist this to mean the Pope, and others the Turk; but neither opinion seems to me probable; they are both wrong." Calvin believed the prophecy only reached up to the first advent.⁵⁰ He computed the 2,300 days as literal days.⁵¹

It should be kept in mind that classical prophecy speaks in literal terms and times, whereas apocalyptic prophecies communicate through symbols and symbolic time. Hence the image and beasts, symbolizing kingdoms in Daniel 2, 7, 8 are found in a context where time is given symbolically as "time, times and half a time" (Dan. 7:25; cf Rev. 12:14 and vs. 6), "2,300 evenings and mornings" (Dan. 8:14) and "seventy weeks" (Dan. 9:24). These are identical to or associated with the 2,300-year prophecy. It would take us beyond the confines of this topic to study the 2,300 years, reaching from 457 B.C. to A.D. 1844. Scholars have done extensive work docu-

menting this historicist view,⁵² and documenting 1844 as the beginning of the pre-advent judgment in heaven's sanctuary.

Thus, rather than forcing onto the Biblical text a preconceived interpretation from the second century B.C., it is incumbent upon the Biblical scholar to allow the Bible to interpret itself. This *sola scriptura* hermeneutic opens up the Biblical meaning of these numbers. We have noted the internal contextual evidence for 2,300 years. We need to examine the term "evenings and mornings" (*ereb boqer*, Dan. 8:14) linguistically now. Is this a term used of sacrifices, as supporters of the Antiochus interpretation claim? Is this temple language? Only in part. It is used relative to tending the lamps (*me ereb 'ad boqer*, Ex. 27:20, 21), but never of the daily sacrifices. These are always spoken of as "morning and evening."⁵³ For example "morning and evening burnt offerings" (*laboqer wela 'areb*, 1 Chron. 16:40). So the division of the 2,300 "evenings and mornings" into 1,150 literal sacrifices is not supported by the term, which stands only for a full day, and never for the sacrifice sequence.

6. Contribution of the last half of Daniel. This term "evenings and mornings" (Dan. 8:14) is referred to as the "evening and morning vision" in Daniel 8:26. In both the Aramaic and Hebrew, to this point in Daniel, the word for vision is the same in twelve occurrences (in Heb. *chazon*; Dan. 2:19; 4:5; 7:1, 2, 7, 13, 15; 8:1, 2, 13, 15, 17). There is also the word *mar 'eh* (Dan. 8:16, 26a, 27). The word *mar 'eh*, "vision," is used six times in Daniel 9 and 10 (Dan. 9:23, 10:1, 7; 10:8, 16). The reason for this usage seems deliberate, for every subsequent mention of *mar 'eh* links the explication given with the "evening and morning *mar 'eh*" of Daniel 8:26. Thus, the word *mar 'eh* links these chapters to the little horn, and therefore to the pre-advent judgment context.

In Daniel 8, the little horn's attack upon the *tamid* is mentioned (vs. 11). We will look at the meaning of this term and its relation to the little horn and the sanctuary later, suffice it to note now that like the term *mar 'eh*, this word *tamid* is found in several chapters of the second half of Daniel (Dan. 8:11, 13; 11:31; 12:11), and provides further evidence that these chapters speak about the little horn and therefore provide insight into the pre-advent context. Thus, much of the final half of Daniel has to do with the little

horn and contributes to our understanding of the pre-advent judgment.

7. An overview of Daniel 7-9. H. H. Rowley rightly maintained that Daniel 7 has connections with both halves of Daniel.⁵⁴ It should be interpreted in the light of the historical and prophetic insights. Andre Lacocque notes that Daniel 7 is "intimately linked" with the rest of the book.⁵⁵ J. J. Collins sees Daniel 7 to 12 as complementing and clarifying each other.⁵⁶ Although defending an Antiochus interpretation, which we deny, these scholars are right in estimating the importance of Daniel 7, and its relation to subsequent chapters. W. H. Shea has demonstrated convincingly that chapters 7 to 9 are arranged in an "effect-cause" sequence, the inverted order to that which we follow in the west.⁵⁷ The eastern mind goes to the result first, and then into the factors that lead up to that result. In a sense, one may say that some insights in chapters 10 to 12 further corroborate this sequence.

We will follow this "effect-cause" sequence, beginning with Daniel 9 and working back to chapter 7. The "seventy weeks" (*shabu'im shib'im*, Dan. 9:24-27) are "cut off" (*nechtak*) from the 2,300 years of Daniel 8:14. This 70 times 7, or 490 years, is the first part of the 2,300 years. It speaks of making atonement for sins (Dan. 9:24) and the Messiah being cut off (*yikkarith*, Dan. 9:26), which brings us down to Calvary.⁵⁸

The fact of Calvary already brings us down past the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, and substantiates the principle of a literal year for a symbolic day. As Gerhard Hasel notes, "Daniel 9:24-27 is one of the most controversial in the entire OT."⁵⁹ Hasel's article conclusively proves the validity of the Historicist's Christological interpretation, employing the "year-for-a-day" principle.

Chapter 8 traces the little horn, coming out from one of the four winds of the heavens (Dan. 8:8),⁶⁰ after Greece (Dan. 8:5-8, 21, 22). This little horn spans the pagan-papal Roman powers, and expands horizontally (vss. 9, 10) and vertically against the host, causing them to be trampled (vs. 10). He magnifies himself against the prince (*sar*) affecting His continual (*tamid*) ministry. Three times reference is made to the *tamid* (vss. 11, 12, 13) in the context of the place of His sanctuary being cast down (vs. 11) and truth being cast to the ground (vs. 12). The *tamid* has the supplied word

“sacrifice” in several versions.⁶¹ But the *tamid* is broader than sacrifice. It is the entire sanctuary service or ministry. Then the question is raised, “until when” is the vision which includes the attack on the continual sanctuary service in heaven by this little horn (Dan. 8:13)? The answer comes, “until” two thousand, three hundred evenings and mornings, then the sanctuary will be vindicated/cleansed (*nisdaq* vss. 13, 14).⁶² The angel interpreter is clear that the time focus is the duration of the entire vision and not just the little horn’s part in it.

The solution to the problem of chapters 8 and 9 is given in chapter 7 (following the effect-cause sequence). As Heaton pointed out, Daniel 7 is the apex of Daniel.⁶³ Daniel 7 is a literary unit, as convincingly shown by Arthur Ferch.⁶⁴ This vision was given to Daniel two years before that of chapter 8 (Dan. 7:1, 8:1), and it forms the content for which chapters 8 and 9 are the explication. In other words, the attack of the little horn on the heavenly sanctuary ministry, and hence its attack upon Christ, is the reason for the judgment it receives in chapter 7. Although the little horn comes out of the ten horns of pagan Rome (and hence does not cover the pagan Roman period as it does in Daniel 8—Dan. 7:7, 8, 8:8, 9, 21), the focus of Daniel 7 is upon what the little horn does in its papal period.

We already have learned that the end-time is the focus of Daniel 7. Daniel is shown in vision what the little horn is doing, and at the same time, what God will do to the little horn. The two scenes, earthly and heavenly, are concurrently played out before the prophet. He is directed to view events in both spheres—the sphere of the little horn and the sphere of the judgment. His gaze is horizontal and vertical in continuing sequence throughout the vision. All these events do not take place on earth as some conclude.⁶⁵ Baldwin rightly says Daniel “is seeing heaven.”⁶⁶

The scene on earth traces the history of the little horn (particularly vss. 1-8, 23-28), whereas the scene in heaven (besides the brief setting up of the judgment, vss. 9, 10) focuses on the results of the judgment (vss. 13, 14, 18, 22, 27). To this degree Daniel 7 continues to enlarge on the reasons for the judgment given in chapter 8. Three times reference is made to the great things the little horn speaks (vss. 8, 11, 20) which are summed up as words

against the Most High. This anti-God power opposes the saints of the Most High (vs. 25). Together, Daniel 7 and 8 describe the little horn as opposing God, the Prince, His sanctuary, and continual (*tamid*) ministry, speaking great words against God and persecuting His followers. But Daniel 7 shows that in spite of the great words of the little horn, God will have the last word—judgment.

Thus the sanctuary vindication includes a judgment that says “no” to the great words of the little horn. These great words have to do with casting truth to the ground (Dan. 8:12). The truth about Christ in His sanctuary ministry has been cast to the ground by the little horn’s deflecting people’s gaze to its counterfeit priesthood on earth (Dan. 8:11, 12). The little horn’s attempt to change times and laws, its persecution of the saints (Dan. 7:25), and attack against the Prince of princes (Dan. 8:25, all present it as an anti-Christian religious power.

We see, then, that the execution of the pre-advent judgment of Daniel 7 includes God’s response to the little horn’s attack against the Son of Man⁶⁷ and His remnant. So the watching prophet sees the little horn overcoming the saints until the Ancient of Days came and judgment was given in favor of the saints (vs. 22) and “judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his rulership, to cut off and destroy until the end” (Dan. 7:26). As Baldwin notes, “The heavenly court decrees that **his dominion shall be taken away**, and he whose rule has been destructive will in turn see his dominion totally destroyed.”⁶⁸ Keil-Delitzsch suggest that the consequences of the judgment are given in verses 26, 27.⁶⁹

Daniel 12 gives further insight into the judgment’s result. It focuses on the time when Michael (or Christ) will stand up (vs. 1). This is the opposite of being seated as found in Daniel 7:9. Standing suggests the end of the pre-advent judgment, just as being seated suggests its beginning. For, when Michael stands up, although there will be a final great time of trouble for the saints—suggesting that the little horn power is still to have its final fling against them (cf Rev. 13:3, 11-18)—Michael will deliver His remnant who have their names written in the book (vs. 1). This book relates to the books looked at in the judgment. (See Dan. 7:10.) If our reasoning is correct, Daniel 12:1 is a promise given to the saints that, in spite of an end-time final trouble, the pre-advent judgment will result in

deliverance for them and destruction for their enemies. This judgment verdict presupposes a pre-advent judgment, for it is executed in the final moments of history and in connection with the coming of Christ's eschatological kingdom (cf Rev. 16:12-16; 18:10-24; 19:1, 2, 11-21).

Daniel traces the rise and fall of four major kingdoms that come to an end within history (Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome) and also the little horn power that comes to an end at the eschatological end-time. Just as the stone of Daniel 2 crushes the image, symbolizing the end of all political kingdoms with the arrival of God's kingdom (see Dan. 2:34,35,44,45), so the pre-advent judgment issues in a verdict that takes away the counterfeit dominion of the little horn by establishing Christ's dominion, and that of His saints, forever. (See Dan. 7:21-27.)

Day of Atonement as Type of the Pre-advent Judgment

The annual atonement for the sanctuary and "for all the sins of the Israelites" (Lev. 16:33, 34) came towards the end of the Jewish year. After it was over the sanctuary and people were clean. It was followed by the Feast of Tabernacles that celebrated the completed cleansing, among other things.⁷⁰ Daniel was familiar with this important annual pre-"advent-of-the-new-year" judgment. It is within this context that we should contemplate the words "Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed" (Dan. 8:14, KJV).

The end of the 2,300 days did not bring the execution of the judgment, but the beginning of the process that would produce that verdict. It was time to "fear God and give him glory, because the hour of his judgment has come. Worship him who made the heavens, the earth, the sea and the springs of waters" (Rev. 14:7). The day of atonement was the time to gather around the sanctuary and focus on the high priest as representative of the people ministering in the most holy place before God. It was a time of personal investigation.

On October 22, 1844, the antitypical day of atonement began. This pre-advent judgment is time to focus on the second phase of Christ's ministry in heaven's sanctuary. Such a focus is opposite to

that of the little horn that deflects from Christ's sanctuary ministry by calling attention to its own priestly service.

Pre-advent Judgment in Hebrews

Is the pre-advent judgment found in Hebrews? William G. Johnsson believes "In Hebrews the law/court model is not present and should not be imported nor superimposed." He suggests that "the court model, valuable as it is, is but one of the ways by which the human dilemma and Christ's work to solve it are set forth in the Scriptures."⁷¹ It is true that the multiple atonement theories are evidence that Christ's work is greater than any one type.⁷² However, Johnsson does see in Hebrews a judgment theme, "but it (Hebrews) does not pull together the concept of 9:23—the necessity of purifying the heavenly things—with this theme."⁷³ Johnsson sees three unambiguous references to the Day of Atonement in Hebrews 9:6-7, 24, 25 and 10:1-4.⁷⁴ It would seem, however, that he separates the cleansing of 9:23 from the Day of Atonement in 9:24, 25. He also believes "Hebrews does not take up the **time** of the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary and the judgment (Heb. 9:23)."⁷⁵

In contrast to Johnsson, Richard M. Davidson believes that Hebrews 9 "does provide hints of it [time] by his reference to the cleansing of the sanctuary (9:23), followed by reference to a future judgment (vs. 27) and the second coming of Christ (vs. 28)." He further suggests that "five additional passages refer to a future judgment (2:2-4; 4:1-3; 6:7-12; 10:28-39; 12:26-29). These passages suggest an investigative (4:12; 6:10; 10:28-30) as well as executive judgment involving the professed people of God. These hints regarding timing are consistent with the OT type."⁷⁶ George E. Rice divides Hebrews into five units, comprised of three identical elements, the third being judgment in each (2:2-4; 4:1-13; 6:7-8; 10:32-39; 12:25-29).⁷⁷

Johnsson's and Davidson's views demonstrate two ways of looking at the antitypical day of atonement in Hebrews. Johnsson believes the function of the day of atonement references in Hebrews is to demonstrate that even at the high point of the cultic sacrifices the old cultus was inadequate. "All that the old system failed to do because of its inherent insufficiencies, all that the repeated days of

atonement could not accomplish, has now been done by Calvary."⁷⁸ Hence "the leitmotif of the sacrificial argument of Hebrews (8:1-10:18) is the **better blood** rather than the Day of Atonement."⁷⁹ Johnsson concludes, "9:1-5 (altar of incense in Most Holy Place) should already have put us off the track of trying to reason from type to antitype in this section"⁸⁰ Efficacy of the sacrifice, and not typology, seems to be the key for Johnsson.

By contrast, Davidson demonstrates that "typology in Hebrews is comprised of the same basic conceptual structures found in the typology of the rest of Scripture."⁸¹ This includes both the horizontal and vertical correspondences. As far as Hebrews 9:1-5 is concerned, the altar of incense seems to be placed in the Most Holy Place, not because of any shoddy understanding of the Old Testament sanctuary by the author, but because *echousa* (having) seems to indicate that it "properly belonged to" the Most Holy Place in function.⁸² Furthermore, all modifications of Old Testament types in Hebrews are not further evidence of a turning away from typology, for each instant is rooted in Old Testament control passages that legitimize the modifications.⁸³

What do we make of these two different views relative to the day of atonement in Hebrews? It seems to me that Hebrews, although a carefully crafted sermon, does not systematically unfold the judgment in time, and does not take pains to distinguish between a pre-advent and final judgment. Nevertheless, judgment is within the purview of the writer. So the term judgment is mentioned in process—9:27; 10:27; 13:4; result (eternal judgment)—6:2; and judgment fire is mentioned in 6:8 and 12:29). Judgment synonyms are found in no "escape" (*ekpheuzometha*, 2:3) and "giving account (*hos logon*, 13:17). Finally, God is mentioned as "God the judge of all" (*kritei theo panton*, 12:23).

What is the significance of this data on the judgment? That Hebrews is addressed to backsliding Christians is clear throughout the letter.⁸⁴ The writer's concern is to demonstrate that they are giving up that which is much better—Christ (1:4); "better hope" (7:19); "better covenant" (7:22); "better promises" (8:6); "better" sacrifice (9:23) with better blood (9:12). The key word "better" (*kreitton*) appears thirteen times.⁸⁵ Although judgment can be considered a passing reference, it is what they get (present), and will

get (future) in exchange for what they have given up. Both sides of the equation seem to be in the writer's mind.

Moreover, Hebrews speaks of *tupon* (8:6) which necessarily points to *antitupa* (9:24): that is to say, the earthly sanctuary prefigures the heavenly. Hence, returning to the question of Hebrews 9 (mentioned above), one would expect the cleansing of 9:23 to be linked with the Day of atonement of 9:24, 25. Internal contextual evidence supports this typological correspondence. In Hebrews 9:22-27, the heavenly sanctuary is to be cleansed (*katharizesthai*, vs. 23), which is a direct reference to Daniel 8:14 (*katharizesthai*, LXX, *nizdaq*, MT). Christ entered the *antitupa* (vs. 24, cf *tupon* in 8:5) to appear in the presence of God on our behalf, by offering His own sacrifice. In that "good news" context mention of judgment follows (vss. 24-28). It would seem, then, that 9:23 should not be separated from 9:24, 25.

One more text needs comment. In Hebrews 10:26-31 the writer addresses the professed Christian who has "trampled" (*katapatesas*) "the Son of God under foot, who has treated as an unholy thing the blood of the covenant that sanctified him, and who has insulted the spirit of grace" (Heb. 10:29). As Lenski insightfully says, "'To trample under foot' is illustrated by Matt 7:6 where the hogs trample pearls into the mire. To do this to 'the Son of God' brings to mind all that this epistle has said of his infinite exaltation from 1:2 onward. The writer does not say trample down some gift the Son of God brought as he says 'Moses law' but trample down this infinitely exalted Son who is very God himself."⁸⁶ These words applied to the Hebrew Christians, who had backslidden, remind us of the little horn magnifying itself to Christ ("leader of the host"), taking away His daily service (*tamid*), upon which it was trampling, Dan. 8:13, cf vs. 10). The trampling in Daniel and Hebrews has the same antiChrist thrust. This also can contribute to our understanding of the pre-advent judgment as we will note later.

These two passages (Heb. 9:22-28; 10:26-31) do seem to suggest some reference to the pre-advent judgment in Daniel. The first is a specific identity (cleansing the sanctuary/people) and the second refers to a common rejection of Christ that causes the negative verdict of the judgment. Although the judgment-court scene is not developed in Hebrews, as it is in Daniel, the writer's references to

type-antitype (horizontal/vertical) suggest that it was not far from his mind.⁸⁷

In summary, Johnsson looks from Calvary back to the entire cultic services and rightly says "Better blood—even better than the day of atonement sacrifices." What he apparently does not do is to look forward and up from Calvary and say "better priesthood too." In the author of Hebrews' own summation in Hebrews 8:1, 2, he focuses on Christ's priesthood. F. F. Bruce reminds us, "More than any other New Testament book it [Hebrews] deals with the ministry which our Lord is accomplishing on His people's behalf now."⁸⁸ Johnsson is right in saying that the law-court model is only one way of expressing the work of Christ, but so were the sacrifices. Many Old Testament types found their antitype in Christ's sacrifice, yet, as Davidson reminds us, "all other aspects find their respective fulfillments in the course of Christ's priestly ministry."⁸⁹

It is precisely in this ministry, and its cleansing work, that typology is doctrinally instructive, for it was the Old Testament type that Hebrews referred to when speaking of the New Testament antitype (Heb. 9:22, 23). Thus the cleansing of Hebrews 9 finds its type in the Day of Atonement, which corresponds to the pre-advent judgment predicted in Daniel 8:14. As Calvary was better than all previous sacrifices, so the cleansing is better in heaven's sanctuary, and Christ's present intercession (also in the judgment) is better than all previous mediation. For, according to the type/antitype correspondence, an escalation is involved.

Revelation Corroborates Daniel

There is some evidence that Revelation 4 and 5 may be parallel with Daniel 7.⁹⁰ In both references God is pictured sitting on His throne (Dan. 7:9, Rev. 4:2-3), other thrones surround God's throne (Dan. 7:9, Rev. 4:4), a book of records is mentioned (Dan. 7:10, Rev. 5:1-5)⁹¹ and Christ is central, as receiving the judgment verdict (Dan. 7:13, 14) or alone worthy to unseal the book (Rev. 5:8-10)—an act to come at the execution of the verdict.⁹²

Kenneth Strand has convincingly demonstrated that Revelation is divided into eight major prophetic sequences, with chapters 4-14 as historical-era visions, and chapters 15-20 as eschatological-judgment era visions. Judgment culminates each of the four escha-

tological sections.⁹³ The climatic focus, in both Hebrews and Revelation, is on the judgment.

There are some important parallels between Daniel and Revelation, which space precludes taking up.⁹⁴ The little horn of Daniel is designated the beast in Revelation, as the following comparison of Revelation 13 with Daniel 7 reveals:

Beast (Rev 13)	Little horn (Dan 7)
Speaks boastfully (vs. 5)	Speaks boastfully (vs. 8)
War against saints (vs. 7)	War against saints (vss. 21, 25)
In power for 42 months (vs. 5)	In power for 3 1/2 yrs (vs. 25)

Counterfeit worship is attributed to the little horn (Dan. 8:14) and to the beast (Rev. 13:4-8, 12-15). Death decrees to enforce counterfeit worship are mentioned in Daniel (Dan. 3:4-6; 6:5-12). In the same way that an image was raised on the plain of Dura, and all had to worship it or die (Dan. 3:4-6, 16-18), Revelation says a power "ordered them to set up an image in honor of the beast" decreeing that death should come to all who refuse to worship it (Rev. 13:14, 15). Worship is the central eschatological issue. Mankind will be confronted with the ultimate decision—worship the beast or worship God. Beast-worship will bring God's fury/judgment (Rev. 14:9-11). The golden image was set up by Babylon. The beast is spiritual Babylon (Rev. 17:5). God's call is "Come out of her (Babylon) my people" (Rev. 18:2-5, cf 14:8). "Worship him who made the heaven, the earth, the sea and the springs of water" (Rev. 14:7), "Worship God!" (Rev. 22:9). This call finds its roots in the call for Israel to return from Babylonian captivity under Ezra and Nehemiah. The call to come from worshipping the beast to the worship of God is a crucial part of the pre-advent judgment hour message (Rev. 14:7).

So striking is this identity between the beast and the little horn that Gregory K. Beale believes "Revelation 13 is modeled on Daniel 7."⁹⁵ Revelation shows how the verdict against the little horn (Dan. 7:21, 22, 26, 27) is executed. This takes place in the final pre-advent⁹⁶ battle between Christ and the beast.⁹⁷ Armageddon (Rev. 16-19) is the final pre-advent confrontation of God against Babylon (little horn, beast, and followers Rev. 13:3), and presents the devastating judgment of God on the enemies of His people.

Then "I looked, and there before me was a white cloud, and seated on the cloud was one 'like a son of man' with a crown of gold on his head and a sharp sickle in his hand" (Rev. 14:14). Here the second advent comes to view with Christ riding on a cloud, which Hans LaRondelle has persuasively proven to be "His cloud chariot"⁹⁸ for "He makes the clouds his chariot" (Ps. 104:3). Here Rev. 14:14 connects with the pre-advent judgment scene of Daniel 7, where the prophet sees "one like a son of man, coming with the clouds of heaven" (Dan. 7:13). T. Longman believes that in Daniel 7:13, Christ is riding "the Divine War Chariot."⁹⁹ In Daniel 7, Christ moves Godward to receive the verdict of the pre-advent judgment, whereas in Revelation 14 He comes manward to execute that judgment. This double movement in heaven climaxes the double gathering on earth (Rev. 14:6-13; 16:12-16). The reception of the judgment verdict before implementation is powerful evidence for a pre-advent judgment.

Christ, on His cloud chariot, leaves heaven's temple, and three angels come out of the temple, and participate in executing judgment (Rev. 14:14-20).¹⁰⁰ It is appropriate that judgment (verdict and execution) should issue from the temple which the little horn/beast attacked (cf Christ's second advent on a white horse, with angels on white horses, coming to battle against the little horn/beast in Rev. 19:11-21).¹⁰¹

What is the Good News About the Pre-advent Judgment?

1. Christ is for us and against our enemy. We are now ready to return to Hebrews. No New Testament book develops so completely the post-resurrection ministry of Christ as does Hebrews. Christ's intercession for His people is a part of Christ's better ministry as compared with that of Old Testament priests, even as His better sacrifice was better than the multiple cultic sacrifices. Although it is right to say that no systematic development of the law court is found in Hebrews, there is a systematic presentation of Christ's intercession, which is the major contribution Hebrews makes to the pre-advent judgment doctrine. Examination of the records (Dan. 7:10) is only one side of the judgment. The other is the intercession, or advocacy of Christ (cf 1 Tim. 2:5, 1 John 2:1). Christ is there in the presence of God on our behalf

(*huper hemon*, 9:24), where He is able to fully save (*panteles*, 7:25) and where He is ever living to intercede on behalf of them (*pantote zov eis to entugchanein huper auton*, 7:25).

This is the advocate-intercessor portrayed in Zechariah 3, where the cosmic/great controversy dimensions of the pre-advent judgment come into focus. Joshua, representative of God's people, is in dire need. While he was dressed in filthy garments Satan accuses him (Zech. 3:1-3). Zechariah's vision sees a law court scene with an accuser and a defender of the convicted. Joshua is referred to as "a burning stick snatched from the fire" (Zech. 3:2). Keil-Delitzsch notes that "the fire out of which Joshua had been saved like a brand was the captivity, in which both Joshua and the nation had been brought to the verge of destruction."¹⁰² They had deserved the captivity.¹⁰³ They had rebelled against God, who gave them over to their captors (Dan. 1:1-2). They had nothing to recommend them, save their utter need. This could also be said of the backslidden Christians to whom Hebrews is addressed. (Both the Jews of the captivity and Christian Jews reading Hebrews had rebelled like the little horn). It is precisely for people who have sinned, but realize their need (the little horn never does), that Christ intercedes. So Joshua stood accused by Satan, and with clothing to prove the charges correct.

Joshua was desperate. Here he was at the judgment bar, and yet clothed in sin. Later Christ would speak of the king coming in to inspect the guests, and finding "a man there who was not wearing wedding clothes" (Matt. 22:11). That man evidently thought he could make it on his own in the judgment, that he was good enough, that his garments would suffice, that his life-record was sufficient. But he was thrown out (Matt. 22:13). Unlike this man, Joshua apparently knew his need, and could look only to God for help. Had not God led Israel back from Babylonian captivity just as He had out of Egypt? Could He not rescue them spiritually too? Joshua had nothing to recommend him. He simply stood there with utter faith in God alone. It must be stressed that Christ's intercession is not to change His Father Judge, but to answer Satan's accusation. Jesus said, "I am not saying that I will ask the Father on your behalf. No, the Father himself loves you because you have loved me" (John 16:26-27).

"Zechariah's vision of Joshua and the Angel applies with peculiar force to the experience of God's people in the closing up of the great day of atonement."¹⁰⁴ Zechariah 3 therefore is a type of the pre-advent judgment. While Satan rebuked Joshua, Christ¹⁰⁵ said "take off his filthy clothes.' Then he said to Joshua, 'See, I have taken away your sin, and I will put rich garments on you'" (Zech. 3:3-4). Oh the wonder of salvation! No doubt Joshua exclaimed words such as these "I delight greatly in the Lord; my soul rejoices in my God. For he has clothed me with garments of salvation and arrayed me in a robe of righteousness" (Isa. 61:10). It is precisely this intercessor-advocate that comes to view in Hebrews, for Christ did not finish His intercession when the judgment began—He continues it, as demonstrated by Zechariah's vision. It should also be remembered that the typical daily morning and evening sacrifices were also offered on the Day of Atonement.

The end-time remnant needs to capture the full impact of Zechariah and Hebrews relative to the continuing intercession-advocacy of the conquering Christ during the pre-advent judgment. Their focus must be on Christ and not on themselves. Revelation is precise: in the judgment hour the saints worship Christ as their Creator (Rev. 14:7), realizing that just as He brought them into this world so only He can get them into the next world.¹⁰⁶ End-time saints are pictured as naked (Rev. 3:18) just as Adam and Eve at the fall (Gen. 3:10,21). No fig leaves, or human works, can supply the need. Only the slain lamb can supply the covering, only the robe of Christ's righteousness (Isa. 61:10; Rev. 6:11), the wedding garment supplied by the Lord (Matt. 22:11, 12), will suffice. The prodigal son needed the best robe to cover his tattered rags (Luke 15:22).

The pre-advent investigation involves the saints. It is only those who have their names in the book that are delivered (Dan. 12:1). It would seem that they pass the judgment because they are different from the little horn. They do not speak great words against Christ, or magnify themselves, or persecute the saints, or think to change God's times and laws, or put themselves in Christ's place, casting His truth to the ground.

Zechariah speaks of the pre-advent judgment from the great controversy perspective. The saints are attacked (in the investigation process in heaven) by their ultimate enemy, while Daniel

focuses on their being attacked on earth by the little horn enemy. Christ stands up for them in the investigation (Zech. 3) and in its execution (Dan. 7, cf Rev. 16-19).

Ellen G. White pictures the struggle. Satan "presents their sins before them to discourage them. He is constantly seeking occasion against those who are trying to obey God. Even their best and most acceptable services he seeks to make appear corrupt. By countless devices, the most subtle and the most cruel, he endeavors to secure their condemnation. Man cannot meet these charges himself. In his sin-stained garments, confessing his guilt, he stands before God. But Jesus our Advocate presents an effectual plea in behalf of all who by repentance and faith have committed the keeping of their souls to Him. He pleads their cause and vanquished their accuser by the mighty arguments of Calvary."¹⁰⁷

2. Calvary is pre-eminent. We are now ready to penetrate to the heart of what is underway in the pre-advent judgment, and for that matter, what will continue in the millennial and postmillennial judgments (Rev. 20:7-15). God does not need the judgments, because He is omniscient (Ps. 33:13-15; 56:8, 104:24; 139:2, 6; 147:4; Isa. 44:28, 46:9, 10; Mal. 3:16; Matt. 10:29,30, Acts 15:8, Rom. 11:33, Eph. 3:10). "The Lord knows those who are his" (2 Tim. 2:19). He holds these judgments for the sake of created beings.¹⁰⁸ In the pre-advent judgment the universe is looking at the records of human works, good and bad (Dan. 7:10). But more than that, they are looking to see whether individuals have accepted or rejected the saving work that Jesus did for them on the cross.¹⁰⁹ Their relation to the substitutionary judgment of the covenant-Saviour is determinative (cf John 16:26-27; 17:3).

It is precisely that, and nothing else, that determines personal destiny. So the pre-advent judgment is Christ-centered and not man-centered.¹¹⁰ It is not so much what individuals have or have not done per se that is decisive. Rather it is whether they have accepted or rejected what Christ has done for them when He was judged in their place at the cross (John 12:31). It is also true that the judgment has more to do with vindication of God than vindication of man, for it involves the great controversy issue, and not just human salvation.

The judgment does not repudiate Calvary. It is the Crucified

who intercedes for us. The pre-advent judgment is part of the unfolding in salvation-history of what was accomplished at the cross. Calvary moves inexorably to the deliverance of God's people and the destruction of their enemies because both were accomplished by Christ on the cross. It is by the authority of Calvary that Christ delivers His saints and destroys Satan and all their enemies. So our gaze should be backward to Calvary and upward to Christ, rather than inward to character. Although we must be forgiven and forsake sin and be fitted for heaven, such comes through beholding Christ (2 Cor. 3:17,18). "If they kept their eyes fixed on Jesus, who was just before them, leading them to the city, they were safe."¹¹¹ Only Jesus can say, "I am the way and the truth and the life. No one comes to the Father except through me" (John 14:6). Only Christ can clothe prodigals with the robe (Luke 15:22). Only Christ can carry the lost sheep all the way home (Luke 15:5).

We need to understand fully Satan's scheme. What he has done on a general level, in deflecting attention from the authentic heavenly sanctuary service to his counterfeit earthly priesthood (little horn), he is doing on the personal level by deflecting attention away from mankind's only Substitute to humans themselves. Looking to an earthly priesthood or to our own personhood equally deflects the gaze away from Christ.

For many, their greatest need is not to be obsessed with the present judgment, but to be transformed by Calvary. Look away from your life to His, from your sins to His salvation. Long and deep was His struggle. No other being can ever understand how long was the night He lived in this world that forsook Him. Even His own people rejected Him—precisely because they clung to their own works instead of accepting His works for them. Busily attempting to earn their way to pass a judgment, rather than accepting His judgment in their place.

There is wondrous good news in the pre-advent judgment. For it does not stand by itself. It is surrounded by Calvary before it, Christ's intercession in it, and Armageddon beyond it. In all three events Christ works consistently for His people and against their enemies. (This is why the little horn is investigated in the judgment and receives the judgment verdict in Armageddon). In all three events Christ is "the same yesterday, today and forever" (Heb.

13:8). What Christ accomplished on the cross is simply unfolding in all subsequent salvation-history, including the pre-advent judgment. This is why the "hour of his judgment" is part of the "eternal gospel" (Rev. 14:6,7). In this judgment hour it is our crucified Saviour who "is able to save completely those who come to God through Him, because He always lives to intercede for them" (Heb. 7:25).

Endnotes

1 There are four major schools of interpretation in Daniel studies: 1. Preterist, that considers the scope of Daniel's prophecies reaching either to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, or Christ's first advent, or Jerusalem's destruction in AD 70. 2. Futurist (Dispensational and Non-Dispensational), that sees Daniel's prophecies as applicable to eachatological end-time. 3. Historicist, that sees the prophecies of Daniel covering the entire historical time-span from the Babylonian empire to the second advent. (These three schools subscribe to a sixth century B.C. date for the book of Daniel, and to authentic divine predictions.) 4. The historical-critical school, that, by contrast, denies the authenticity of prophecies, for all so-called prophecies in Daniel were written in the second century B.C., as *vaticinia ex eventu*. For a thorough documentation of these schools from, 1700 to 1900 see Samuel Nuñez, *The Vision of Daniel 8, The Interpretations from 1700 to 1800* (sic 1900), (Berrien Springs, Michigan: Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series, Andrews University Press), 1987.

2 Ellen G. White, *Gospel Workers*, (Washington D.C.: Review and Herald Pub. Assn., 1920), p. 315.

3 Scholars rightly find in Calvary the antitype of the typical Day of Atonement (Lev 16), but almost all fail to see further correspondence in a pre-advent judgment. Once the additional correspondence is seen, the implications of the cross to understanding the pre-advent judgment needs to be explored.

4 Ellen G. White, *The Great Controversy*, (Mountain View, California, Pacific Press Pub. Assn., 1950), p. 480.

5 *The Great Controversy*, p. 483.

6 *The Great Controversy*, p. 486.

7 William H. Shea, *Selected Studies on Prophetic Interpretation*, (Lincoln, Nebraska: College View Printers), 1982, p. 125. (See pp. 123-125.)

8 Ellen G. White, *Christ's Object Lessons*, pp. 309, 310.

9 During Manasseh's reign the temple was desecrated with altars to other gods (2 Kings 21:4-5), and in it pagan priests and mediums ministered and children were offered as sacrifices (2 Kings 23:4-24). Judah did more evil than the nations God had destroyed (2 Kings 21:9).

10 Jeremiah prophesied judgments on Judah (7:34; 15:14; 21:5-6; 25:9-14; 32:29; 34:2, 22; 35:15; 37:3; 52:13-14), for she had forgotten God (2:32), become hardened in rebellion (6:28), forsaken the law (9:13) and her prophets and priests were godless, even desecrating the temple (23:11). Judgments came because "the Lord will take vengeance, vengeance for his temple" (51:11). Ezekiel prophesied

God's judgment because Judah had defiled God's temple (5:11), even flaunting idolatry in the temple (8:1-18). In vision God is pictured as coming to the OT temple to judge (1:1-2; 8:1).

11 It would seem that the loss of dominion by the little horn subsequent to the judgment has more to do with the judgment than with the fact that it also is subsequent to the other nations mentioned in Daniel.

12 Joyce G. Baldwin, *Daniel*, (Leicester, England: IVP, 1978), p. 146.

13 *S.D.A. Bible Commentary*, p. 834.

14 *The Great Controversy*, p. 425.

15 See "Pre-advent judgment in Hebrews" section.

16 John Calvin, *Hebrews*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1989), p. xxviii.

17 Hans LaRondelle, "The Middle Ages with the Scope of Apocalyptic Prophecy," *JETS* 32/3, 1989 (345-354), p. 351.

18 Richard M. Davidson, *Typology in Scripture, A Study of Hermeneutical *tipos* Structures*, Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series, (Berrien Springs, Michigan, AU Press, 1981), p. 397. Kenneth A. Strand, "An Overlooked Old-Testament Background to Revelation 11:1," *AUSS*, Vol. 22, No. 3 (317-325), p. 318.

19 Daniel and Revelation Committee Report in *Issues in the Book of Hebrews*, ed Frank B. Holbrook, (Silver Spring, Maryland: Biblical Research Institute, 1989), p. 10.

20 The scapegoat represents the ultimate enemy, Satan, and its being led away into the wilderness to die corresponds to the millennial and post-millennial judgment upon Satan (Rev. 20:2,3; 7-10). By contrast, the little horn enemy operates during pre-advent historical time. Nevertheless, the correspondence between type and antitype concerns judgment upon an enemy of God's people.

21 Compare the deliverance from Babylonian captivity, after the 70 years, as a type of the call to come out of Babylon in Rev. 14 and 18.

22 If looked at sequentially, the destruction came first before the deliverance in the fiery furnace incident, and the reverse in the lions' den experience. Although the typology should not be overly pushed, there is correspondence in the double result of "deliverance-destruction" between these two historical events and the result of the pre-advent judgment. It would appear that these historical events give some insight into the result of the apocalyptic pre-advent judgment, which is climaxed in the deliverance of the saints and the destruction of their enemies in Daniel 12:1 (cf Rev. 16-19).

23 Hans LaRondelle rightly sees that "the historical narratives of Daniel's own experiences in Babylon and Persia carry also typological significance for the end time," *JETS* 32/3, 1989, p. 345. See Hans LaRondelle, *Chariots of Salvation*, (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Pub. Assn., 1987), pp. 155-157.

24 I concur with William Shea's conclusion in *Selected Studies on Prophetic Interpretation*, p. 124.

25 H. H. Rowley gives the three interpretations of these four held through the Christian era, noting that the Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome "view has been by far the most popular traditional view." (*Darius the Mede and the Four World Empires in the Book of Daniel. A Historical Study of Contemporary Theories*, (Cardiff: Univ. of Wales Press Board, 1964), p.6. Rowley is representative of critical scholars who divide the second kingdom into Media and Persia. For a full

historical accounting see Samuel Nuñez, *The Vision of Daniel 8*, particularly pp. 396-408.

26 The execution of the judgment on the little horn includes the second advent (see Rev. 18-19).

27 H. C. Leupold, *Exposition of Daniel* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1969), pp. 276-278. André Lacocque, *The Book of Daniel*, trans David Pellauer (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1979), p. 122. Louise F. Hartman and Alexander A Di Lella, *The Anchor Bible. The Book of Daniel*, vol 23, eds W.F. Albright and D.N. Freedman (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1978), pp. 208, 209.

28 An exception to scholars overlooking the eschatological implications is Hans LaRondelle, *JETS* 32/3, 1989, 345-354.

29 Maurice Casey, *Son of Man, The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7* (London: SPCK, 1979), pp. 45, 46.

30 *Jerome's Commentary of Daniel*, trans Gleason L. Archer, Jr. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1977), pp. 80, 81.

31 G. K. Beale, *The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and in the Revelation of St. John*, (Maryland: University Press of America, 1984), p. 239.

32 See *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel*, trans Gleason L. Archer Jr. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1977), p. 80. Porphyry was not the first to question the authenticity of predictions. Celsus (c. A.D. 180) may well have been the first to question prophecy. See Gerhard F. Hasel, *70 Weeks, Leviticus, Nature of Prophecy*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Washington D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, 1986, p. 292.

33 *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel*, p. 15.

34 *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel*, p. 151.

35 See documentation for this in Gerhard F. Hasel, "The Book of Daniel and Matters of Language: Evidences Relating to Names, Words, and the Aramaic Language" in *AUSS*, 19, (1981), pp. 211-225.

36 See Samuel Nuñez, op. cit., pp. 111, 409, 410, 429-432.

37 Samuel Nuñez, op. cit., pp. 27-83.

38 *Calvin's Commentaries*, vol 13, p. 27.

39 *Calvin's Commentaries*, vol 13, p. 128f. Calvin rejects the idea that Antiochus is a type ("figure," "analogy") for the anti-Christ. Daniel is, to him, only relevant to the time before the first (not the second) advent of Christ.

40 1 Macabbees 1:54-5:1 tells the story from the setting "up the desolation upon the altar" till a new altar was built.

41 *The Works of Flavius Josephus*, trans William Whiston, vol 3 (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1988, pp. 181-183. The desecration of the temple included sacrificing swine upon the altar.

42 For example, Lacocque, *The Book of Daniel*, p. 164; and Norman W. Porteous, *Daniel, A Commentary* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1965), pp. 126, 127.

43 Siegfried J. Schwantes, "Ereb Boqer of Daniel 8:14 Re-examined" in *Symposium on Daniel*, p. 473.

44 A. C. Gaebelein, *The Prophet Daniel, A Key to the Visions and Prophecies of the Book of Daniel* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Kregel Publications, 1968), p. 99. Italics supplied.

45 M. R. De Haan, *Daniel the Prophet* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, npd), p. 230. Italics supplied.

- 46 For an excellent exposition of the "year for a day" principle, see William H. Shea, *Selected Studies on Prophetic Interpretation* (Lincoln, Nebraska: College View Printers, 1982), pp. 56-93.
- 47 Gerhard F. Hasel, "The 'Little Horn,' The Saints, and the Sanctuary in Daniel 8," in *The Sanctuary and the Atonement*, pp. 198, 199.
- 48 I am indebted to Gerhard F. Hasel for this Biblical insight.
- 49 H.C. Leupold, *Exposition of Daniel* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1969), p. 323.
- 50 John Calvin, *Commentaries on the Book of Daniel*, vol 2, trans Thomas Myers (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker book House, 1989), p. 26.
- 51 For example, Calvin said of the 2,300 days of Daniel 8:14, "Evidently we ought to understand natural days here, consisting of twenty-four hours each. Those who receive it of years and months are wretchedly mistaken, and even ridiculous in their calculations."—*Calvin's Commentaries*, vol 13, p. 108.
- 52 Gerhard Hasel's thorough study, documents the first 490 year segment of the 2,300 year prophecy, and conclusively rejects the Antiochus Epiphanes theory. Gerhard F. Hasel, "Interpretations of the Chronology of the Seventy Weeks," in *70 Weeks, Leviticus, Nature of Prophecy*, pp. 3-63.
- 53 William H. Shea, "Unity of Daniel" in *Symposium on Daniel*, p. 197.
- 54 H. H. Rowley, *The Unity of The Book of Daniel* (Cincinnati: off-print from the Hebrew Union College Annual, vol 23, part 1, 1950-51), p. 273.
- 55 *The Book of Daniel*, p. 122.
- 56 J. J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press for Harvard Semitic Museum, 1977), p. 132.
- 57 William H. Shea, "Unity of Daniel" in *Symposium on Daniel*, p. 168.
- 58 It is a tragedy that so many critical scholars by-pass the Christological content of Daniel 9:25-27 and Daniel 7:13.
- 59 Gerhard F. Hasel, *70 Weeks, Leviticus, Nature of Prophecy*, p. 5.
- 60 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*, pp. 387-391.
- 61 "Sacrifice" in the LXX, KJV and NIV; "offering" in Goodspeed and the Amplified OT, and "burnt offering" in the RSV. All of these words are supplied, and have no support in the Hebrew word **tamid** which includes the entire daily ministration.
- 62 See Niels-Erik Andreasen, "Translation of Nisdak/Katharisthesetai in Daniel 8:14" in *Symposium on Daniel*, pp. 475-496. Also Alberto R. Treiyer, "The Day of Atonement as related to the contamination and purification of the sanctuary" in *70 Weeks, Leviticus, Nature of Prophecy*, pp. 198-256.
- 63 Eric W. Heaton, *The Book of Daniel*, Torch Bible Commentary (London: SCM, 1956), p. 47.
- 64 Arthur J. Ferch, *The Son of man in Daniel Seven*, pp. 108-137.
- 65 John E. Goldingay, *Word Biblical Commentary, Daniel* (Dallas, Texas: Word Publishers, 1989), pp. 164-167.
- 66 Joyce G. Baldwin, *Tyndale OT Commentary, Daniel* (Downer's Grove, Ill: IVP, 1978), p. 141.
- 67 The Son of Man is Jesus (cf Dan. 7:13 with Christ's own words in Matt. 26:64). The Gospels record Jesus applying this term to Himself more than forty times.
- 68 Joyce G. Baldwin, *Daniel*, p. 146.

- 69 C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, *Commentary on the OT in Ten Volumes*, Vol 9, trans of Daniel, M. G. Easton, (W. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1986), p. 244.
- 70 *Patriarchs and Prophets*, p. 540.
- 71 *Issues in the Book of Hebrews*, p. 90.
- 72 See where the present writer has developed this. Norman R. Gulley, "Toward Understanding the Atonement," *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society*, 1, (Spring 1990), 57-89.
- 73 William G. Johnsson, *Issues in the Book of Hebrews*, p. 96 (parenthesis supplied).
- 74 *Ibid.*, pp. 112-114.
- 75 *Ibid.*, p. 99.
- 76 *Issues in the Book of Hebrews*, p.184 (parenthesis supplied).
- 77 George E. Rice, *AUSS* (1985), 23, pp. 34, 35.
- 78 Johnsson, op. cit., p. 119.
- 79 *Ibid.*, p. 118.
- 80 *Ibid.*, p. 119 (parenthesis supplied).
- 81 *Issues*, p.154. (See pp. 123-154.) See also Davidson, *Typology in Scripture*.
- 82 *Issues*, pp. 178, 179.
- 83 *Issues*, pp. 171-186.
- 84 For example in Hebrews 2:1; 3:12-15; 4:1, 7, 11, 14; 5:6, 12; 10:26, 35-37; 12:1-6, 12-16, 25; 13:1,2, 7-17, 22.
- 85 Hebrews 6:9; 7:7, 19, 22; 8:6 (twice); 9:23; 10:34; 11:16, 35, 40; 12:24.
- 86 R.C.H. Lenski, *Hebrews* (Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg Pub. House, 1966), pp. 359, 360.
- 87 See Richard M. Davidson, "Typology in the Book of Hebrews," in *Issues*, pp. 121-186.
- 88 F. F. Bruce, *Hebrews (NICCNT)* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: W. B. Eerdmans, 1984), p. xii (parenthesis supplied).
- 89 *Issues*, p. 184.
- 90 *The S.D.A. Bible Commentary*, vol. 7, pp. 766-771 supports this view, but C. Mervyn Maxwell, in *God Cares*, vol. 2 (Boise, Idaho: Pacific Press Pub. Assn., 1985, pp. 170-173), calls it in question. Maxwell believes the throne of Revelation 4, 5 is in the holy place, placed where the table of shewbread was situated, and later moves (cf Ezekiel's moveable throne) to the most holy place as shown in Daniel 7.
- 91 Ellen White notes that the decision to crucify Jesus by the Jewish leaders was registered in the book John saw in Revelation 4, 5. (See *Christ's Object Lessons*, p. 294). According to this reference, the opening of the book of Revelation 4, 5 is still future. Therefore that act is later than the opening of the books of judgment of Daniel 7 in 1844.
- 92 Concerning the decision of the Jewish leaders to crucify Christ, Ellen White comments, "In all its vindictiveness this decision will appear before them in the day when this book is unsealed by the Lion of the tribe of Judah." *Christ's Object Lessons*, p. 294.
- 93 Kenneth A. Strand, "The Eight Basic Visions in the Book of Revelation," *AUSS*, 25, (1987), pp. 107-121; "The 'Victorious-Introduction' Scenes in the Visions in the Book of Revelation," *AUSS*, 25, (1987), pp. 267-288.
- 94 Like Daniel, Revelation is divided into historical (1-14) and eschatological (15-21) chapters.

95 Gregory K. Beale, *The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and in the Revelation of St. John* (New York: University Press of America, 1984), p. 247.

96 The pre-advent battle is to be understood as beginning prior to the advent and culminating with the advent (see Rev. 17-19).

97 The unholy triumvirate of dragon, beast and false prophet oppose the Trinity (Rev. 16:12-16, 19:11-20).

98 Hans LaRondelle, *Chariots of Salvation, The Biblical Drama of Armageddon* (Washington D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1987), pp. 67, 68.

99 T. Longman, "The Divine Warrior: The New Testament Use of an Old Testament Motif," *The Westminster Theological Journal* 44, (1982), pp. 290-307, see page 297.

100 These are the other three angels of Revelation 14. Their mission is to execute judgment on Babylon, whereas the three angel's messages (Rev. 14:6-13) are to gather people out of Babylon.

101 Revelation says all the world wonders after this beast (Rev. 13:3) and this includes the false prophet and dragon (Rev. 16:13, 19:20).

102 Keil-Delitzsch, *Commentary on the OT*, vol 10, p. 252.

103 Compare Deut. 28:36-64, 29:25-28.

104 Ellen G. White, , vol 5, p. 472.

105 The "angel of the Lord" (Zech.) 3:1-3 is Michael of Daniel 12:1, or Jesus Christ (cf Jude 9, Rev 12:7-11).

106 Compare Ellen G. White's first vision in which she saw that only those who kept their eyes on Jesus made it up the path to heaven. Those taking their gaze away from Him fell to the world below (*Early Writings*, p. 14).

107 *Testimonies*, vol 5, p. 471.

108 All non-human created beings plus the few human representatives in heaven (of whom are Enoch, Elijah, Moses, and 24 elders of Revelation 4, 5) witness the pre-advent investigation, all the redeemed witness the millennial investigation and all the lost witness the post-millennial judgment. In this way all intelligent created beings participate in the evaluation of God's judgments, and find Him to be just (Rev. 15:3). The issue in the great controversy, calling in question the justice of God, is thus answered.

109 This involves clinging not only to Calvary but to the Crucified's continuing intercession, which is a result of the cross.

110 If the judgment is merely looking at what men have done, and the scriptural principle "by beholding we become changed" is applied (2 Cor. 3:18), then a millennium of pouring over bad works would be dangerous. I believe that the judgments have far more to do with observing how patiently Christ has worked for each person, where each turned Him down, and so is far more Christ-centered than man-centered. Such an investigation is uplifting—it tells us more about the character of Christ than about the characters of fallen humans. To behold Christ's working will change us for the better, whereas to wallow in the morass of human sin would have the opposite effect.

111 *Early Writings*, p. 14.

Journal of the Adventist Theological Society, 2/2 (1991):67-80.

Article copyright © 1991 by Jack J. Blanco.

THE HISTORICIST INTERPRETATION OF PROPHECY: ITS PRESENT RELEVANCE IN THE LIGHT OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

By Jack J. Blanco

Southern College of Seventh-day Adventists

It is difficult for anyone today to avoid the truth of John's statement that, "The dragon was wroth with the woman and went to make war with the remnant of her seed which keep the commandments of God and have the testimony of Jesus Christ" (Rev. 12:17).

The Seventh-day Adventist Church in North America increasingly is being assailed from without and from within, from the left and from the right. What Paul said to the Apostolic church certainly is true today. "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood. For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them" (Acts 20:28-30).

As a church we have had our defectors, our accusers, and our prognosticators who claim to know from the prophecies exactly what will happen and when. In recent years we have had an increasing number of each of these, particularly in North America, who are undermining the pillars of our historic position on the