

THE BATTLE FOR BIBLICAL ESCHATOLOGY IN THE END TIME

by Norman R. Gulley
Southern College of Seventh-day Adventists

The nineteenth century, which witnessed the birth of the Seventh-day Adventist church, also saw the beginning of Darwinian evolution, the entrenchment of the historical-critical methodology in Biblical studies, and the rejection of Biblical eschatology. When the time arrived for God to launch His end-time movement, the enemy had his end-time instruments in place, ready to attempt to thwart it. Seventh-day Adventists should remember that (1) the belief in innate human ability to evolve (evolution), (2) subjective judgment over God's Word (historical-critical methodology), and (3) the jettisoning of belief in Christ's second advent, have a common source in Satan's final attack against God and His church (see, e.g., Rev 12:17). Each of these false concepts places human opinion above the Bible's "thus saith the Lord." Together they exalt man as developer, interpreter, and bringer in of Utopia rather than Jesus Christ as Creator, Word, and coming Lord.

These three satanic concepts all provoke the same interrogation: Is Christ Lord over man or is man lord over Christ? The concept of Christ as Lord reveals the nature of the end-time church, while the concept of man as lord unveils the nature of Satan's end-time attack against that church.

Evidently Satan knew well the 2300-year prophecy of Daniel 8:14, for he schemed to thwart God's end-time movement that was to begin in 1844 (at the end of the 2300 years) by raising counterfeits. We think of Joseph Smith and Mormonism, Mary Baker Eddy

and Christian Science, the Fox Sisters and modern spiritualism, and Helena Blavatsky and the Theosophical Society, to name a few. Some of these counterfeits claimed the prophetic gift and all have been channels for the enemy. All have worked as substitute means of revelation, taking the place of God's Word.

Schleiermacher as Judge Over God's Word

The nineteenth century has been called the "greatest century in theology since the fourth";¹ nonetheless, during its course two leading theologians, Friederich Schleiermacher² and Albrecht Ritschl,³ both gave up belief in Biblical eschatology. Schleiermacher longed to communicate with the cultured despisers of Christianity among his university students. His motive was good—but not his method. In order to reach his young skeptics and win them to Christianity, he decided to meet them where they were, beginning the study of God with a study of man. He believed that by looking at man he could prove the existence of God. In the process of attempting to avoid the criticisms of Hume and Kant,⁴ he unwittingly became a critic himself.

Schleiermacher's basic thesis was that God exists because man has a feeling of absolute dependence upon Him.⁵ In drawing this conclusion, Schleiermacher made feelings more authoritative than God's Word. The Word of God he judged by the feelings of man, and not the other way around as he should have.⁶ He jettisoned truths if feelings could not accept them. Thus Schleiermacher rejected the doctrine of the Trinity because He couldn't *feel* three Gods. (How could one feel three?⁷) Because he couldn't feel the second advent of Christ, he dismissed it also.⁸ (But how can one experience something that hasn't yet occurred?)

Scholars today speak of "before and after" Schleiermacher the way philosophers speak of before and after Kant⁹ and scientists discuss before and after Darwin. As James Richmond has observed, Schleiermacher theologically "initiated" and "dominated" the nineteenth century.¹⁰ He was a classic example of man sitting as judge over God's Word—with disastrous results. For half a century or more subjective feelings reigned supreme over God's objective revelation.

No wonder God has cautioned us about depending on our feelings. For example, in messages given through Ellen G. White,¹¹

He has warned us that we are "to base [our] faith not on feeling but upon the evidence and the Word of God."¹²

Ritschl as Judge Over God's Word

Like Schleiermacher, Albrecht Ritschl was also a leading theologian in the nineteenth century. His *The Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation* was for a time considered the greatest dogmatic treatise since Schleiermacher's *The Christian Faith*. Ritschl also looked within, but his gaze was broad enough to include the concept that the kingdom of God would come as a result of man's moral efforts.¹³ Concerning the future kingdom Ritschl said:

Hitherto we have been accustomed to regard the early Christian expectation of the nearness of the world's end as belonging to the shell and not to the kernel. And there the matter will rest, for that anticipation has not acted prejudicially on any of the positive social duties which follow from Christianity.¹⁴

Biblical words and ideas that he regarded as time-related and hence disposable, Ritschl assigned to his category of the "shell" rather than to the kernel of the matter. Rudolph Bultmann later "demythologized" these same words and ideas. Truth, to both Ritschl and Bultmann, was like an onion core. Mere forms, the outer onion layers, must be peeled away if the real truth is to be perceived. But what Ritschl and Bultmann retained, as Hugh Ross Mackintosh has observed, was a "a purely present and mundane commonwealth" and not the real coming kingdom of God.¹⁵

Neither the immanent kingdom of Schleiermacher nor the moral kingdom of Ritschl represented the Biblical view of Christ's coming kingdom. Preoccupation with man rather than with Christ led to a focus on a kingdom *in man* (Schleiermacher) or *by man* (Ritschl) instead of on the kingdom that is coming *to man*, the one the Bible foresees. Both theologies discarded belief in the coming kingdom because they placed their judgment above God's Word.

Twentieth-century Ideas of the End

Albert Schweitzer (1906) and Karl Barth (1918) wrote two books that caused theologians to rediscover eschatology.¹⁶ Yet even in these books, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* and *Romans*,

neither theologian really accepted the Biblical view of the world's end. Both clung to man's judgment over the Word of God.

Albert Schweitzer

Albert Schweitzer pointed to Christ's promise (Matt 10:23) that He would return before the disciples had finished going to all the cities of Israel on their first missionary journey and to His promise (Matt 16:28) that the disciples would actually see Him coming in His kingdom, as promises that Jesus failed to keep.¹⁷ In fact, Schweitzer viewed Christ's going to the cross as involving a promise He failed to keep.

There is silence all around. The Baptist appears, and cries: "Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand." Soon after that comes Jesus, and in the knowledge that He is the coming Son of Man lays hold of the wheel of the world to set it moving on that last revolution which is to bring all ordinary history to a close. It refuses to turn, and He throws Himself upon it. Then it does turn; and crushes Him. Instead of bringing in the eschatological conditions, He has destroyed them. The wheel rolls onward, and the mangled body of the one immeasurably great Man, who was strong enough to think of Himself as the spiritual ruler of mankind and to bend history to His purpose, is hanging up it still. That is His victory and His reign.¹⁸

Schweitzer's subjective judgment of the Word led Him to give up belief in the Living Word. Ultimately, he considered Jesus a deluded man. Indeed, he forsook Christianity and accepted a reverence-for-life philosophy instead. The missionary to Africa came to be without a message. It is ironic that the man who caused scholars to rediscover eschatology himself discarded it.

Karl Barth

Karl Barth's *Romans* fell like a bombshell on the theological world. It continued the shake-up of the nineteenth-century rejection of Biblical eschatology. Yet Barth himself had no true grasp of the Biblical picture either. Because Barth could not believe that Jesus entered human history through the incarnation, he rejected the view that the second advent could ever be an actual event.¹⁹

Coming to the Bible with presuppositions derived from Plato, Overbeck, and Kierkegaard,²⁰ Barth believed that the eternal God was distanced from man by an infinite gulf.

These two theologians, Schweitzer and Barth, who caused other scholars to rediscover eschatology, ended without an eschatology themselves. Both in different ways allowed human wisdom to sit in judgment on God's Word. The result was a too human Jesus for Schweitzer and a too divine Christ for Barth.

Three One-sided Eschatologies

A number of eschatological schools have been spawned in the twentieth century.²¹ We shall briefly consider three of them, all of which grew out of man's judging the Word of God.

C. H. Dodd's "realized eschatology" (1936) reduced salvation-history to the life and death of Jesus Christ, concluding that the goal of history had already been realized. No present or future advent of Christ can be found in Dodd's view.²²

Rudolf Bultmann's "existential" or "timeless" eschatology viewed the second advent as taking place in the everlasting present, as the Holy Spirit repeatedly encounters the Christian.²³ According to Bultmann's concept, this on-going repetition of encounters at the "coming" of the Holy Spirit to individuals is all the second advent there will ever be. Whereas Dodd's view was a one-sided focus on the past, Bultmann's was a one-sided focus on the present. Neither theology had room for a future second coming of Christ.

Jürgen Moltmann's "proleptic eschatology," outlined in his *Theology of Hope*, appears on the surface to be belief in the real second advent. It is at least forward looking. But like other views we've been talking about, it also is one-sided, inasmuch as its future emphasis overlooks appropriate consideration of the present and past.²⁴ Carl F. H. Henry has characterized Moltmann's position as one that "wholly relativizes the past and the present" and, hence, is "remarkably thin" when compared with the wealth of Biblical specifics.²⁵ Thus Moltmann appears to place his own judgment above the revelation that God has given us of end-time events, even telling us that we must be open to the "startlingly new."²⁶ His interpretation leaves him and his followers defenseless against the final delusion that will take place when Satan comes pretending to be Christ—greeting people on earth instead of welcoming them in the air (see Matt 24:5, 23-27, 30; 1 Thess 4:16-18; Rev 1:7). We have to conclude that even Moltmann's theology of hope stands above God's divine revelation of final events.

Satan's purpose in causing people to place their judgment above the Word of God has been to keep them from getting ready for the second advent of Christ, and to prepare them instead for his own counterfeit advent. In view of this, Seventh-day Adventists do well to reassess the historical-critical method of Biblical interpretation, which so effectively places human judgment above God's Word.

Dangers of the Historical-critical Method

It is helpful to note that some scholars who once used the historical-critical method have reassessed it. For example, Michael Green, rector of St. Aldate's in Oxford, after using the historical-critical method for some time, concluded that it caused men in training for the ministry to loose their faith.²⁷ He now takes the position that, unlike modern critics of the New Testament, ancient historians "almost to a man have [i.e., had] a high regard for the New Testament material." He adds:

I see a bondage to the historical-critical method, which very properly seeks to get back to the original text, the original setting and the original meaning. All too often when this is done, the possibility of inspiration is totally discounted. The biblical writers are treated as if they made no claim to inspiration, and displayed no mark of it.²⁸

Gerhard Maier, in his book *The End of the Historical-Critical Method*,²⁹ notes that "the subtle net woven by the higher-critical method resulted in a new Babylonian captivity of the church."³⁰ Commenting on Maier, Carl F. H. Henry observes,

Maier declares rightly that recent applications of the historical-critical method have brought biblical studies to an intolerable impasse through the vast array of conflicting verdicts for which its sanction is claimed. The proper response to divine revelation, he contends, is obedience rather than criticism, which elevates human reason into a judge over revelation.³¹

Karl Barth compared the historical-critical method with the teaching office of the Catholic church, observing that both replace the divine authority of Scripture with human authority. Barth said,

All exegesis may become predominantly an imposition instead of an exposition, and to that extent deteriorate into a dialogue of the Church with itself. And we shall not banish this danger, but only really

begin to conjure it up and render it acute, by making right exposition depend on the verdict of an ultimately decisive Church teaching office, or on the verdict of an historical and critical science, comporting itself with an equal infallibility.³²

C. S. Lewis, of Cambridge University, radically questioned the critics' ability to criticize. He stated:

Whatever these men may be as Biblical critics, I distrust them as critics. They seem to me to lack literary judgment, to be imperceptive about the very quality of the texts they are reading. . . . If he tells me that something in a Gospel is legend or romance, I want to know how many legends and romances he has read, how well his palate is trained in detecting them by the flavour; not how many years he has spent on that Gospel.³³

Being well acquainted with various types of literature, Lewis believed he could discern that the Biblical critics were *not* well acquainted with them:

I have been reading poems, romances, vision-literature, legends, myths all my life. I know what they are like. I know that not one of them is like this. . . . These men ask me to believe they can read between the lines of the old texts; the evidence is their obvious inability to read (in any sense worth discussing) the lines themselves. They claim to see fern-seed and can't see an elephant ten yards away in broad daylight.³⁴

Lewis observed that the critics who try to reconstruct Scripture are like the ones who had tried in vain to trace the genesis of his own writings:

What forearms me against all these reconstructions is the fact that I have seen it all from the other end of the stick. I have watched reviewers reconstructing the genesis of my own books in just this way.³⁵

Lewis added that what Biblical critics were doing had already gone the rounds among critics of non-Biblical literature. Scholars, he said, used to divide Shakespeare's *Henry VI* among half a dozen authors, but they don't do so any more. Homer was once a legend, but no longer. People can now believe in a historical Arthur too. Lewis regretfully concluded:

Everywhere, except in theology, there has been a vigorous growth of skepticism about skepticism itself.³⁶

Biblical Eschatology Is Three-dimensional

The only safe ground for any of us to take is to accept the Bible as it reads and allow it to be the only basis of our beliefs. Seventh-day Adventist eschatology is based solidly on the revelation of God's Word (and is only secondarily corroborated by the writings of Ellen G. White).

Whereas some eschatologies of the twentieth century have been one-sided, focusing primarily on the past (Dodd's "realized eschatology"), the present (Bultmann's "existential eschatology"), or the future (Moltmann's "proleptic eschatology"), the Biblical view is three dimensional, for "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and today and forever" (Heb 13:8). Christ's promises to return have been appropriately fulfilled in the past and in the present, and those that apply to the future only await fulfillment at their proper time. Jesus said He would come again from the dead (see Matt 27:63; Mk 8:31; Lk 18:33), and He fulfilled this astonishing promise on resurrection morning. His promise to return in the present can be understood—as He explained it Himself (see Jn 16:7-16)—as being fulfilled through the coming of the Comforter. Through the Holy Spirit, Christ is now present with His people (see Jn 14:15-18) and will continue to be so, even to the end of the world (see Matt 28:20). These historical fulfillments confirm the dependability of His future coming.

Add to these considerations the fact that the promises of the Messiah's coming in the Old Testament (as in Isa 7:14) were fulfilled in the incarnation (see Matt 1:18-25).

In a qualified, poetic sense, the day of the second advent had a dawn, like any other day. The first luminescence in the eastern sky glowed over the empty tomb on resurrection Sunday. It stretched across the sky at Pentecost. All post-resurrection time can be called the dawn of second-advent day. We cannot stop the coming of the Son anymore than we can stop the rising of the sun. This certainty is trumpeted in more than 300 New Testament texts, an average of one text in every twenty-five. Such certainty must grip the church anew and fire it with expectancy, purpose, and preparation.

Christological Eschatology

The true study of final events begins primarily with Christ and not so much with the events themselves. Of course, everything the

Bible says about Christ, past, present, and future, enriches our knowledge about the Lord Himself. But should we not learn a lesson from the one-sided theologies we have discussed above and be cautious about focusing attention on future events at the cost of minimizing our study of Christ Himself and what the Bible says He has already achieved? If we begin with Christ, we can the more safely, out of an understanding of Who He is, discern earth's final events. Schweitzer and the early Barth began with their own ideas of final events and then tried to fit Christ into them, leaving Schweitzer with a too-human Jesus and Barth with a too-divine Christ. These men arrived at opposite ideas of Jesus partly because they began with end-events. Theirs was an eschatological Christology, whereas the Bible presents a Christological eschatology.

What does the term *Christological eschatology* imply? It implies at least this, that the study of final events should be more concerned with Who is coming than with what is coming. The Biblical focus is Christ-centered rather than crisis-centered. As Carl F. H. Henry once put it, "Not dates and places but Christ stands at the center of the Bible and of biblical eschatology."³⁷ Even for the Old Testament prophets, George E. Ladd reminds us, "their hope was not in the future but in God."³⁸ Much more is this so in the New Testament. As Oscar Cullmann has noted, "The 'end' as the meaning of redemptive history, however, is Jesus Christ, who has already appeared."³⁹

Why the Great Time of Trouble?

Christ, not humanity, is the primary focus of final events. If Satan's strategy has been to place human thought above God's Word through evolution, the historical-critical method and the many human views of eschatology that we have reviewed, we must not let man be placed above God in our study of final events.

As we speed toward the climactic showdown between the two sides in the great controversy, we find Satan working through *three* subversive religious avenues to thwart the *three* angels' messages of Revelation 14:6-12. Says the revelator,

I saw three evil spirits that looked like frogs; they came out of the mouth of the dragon, out of the mouth of the beast and out of the mouth of the false prophet. They are spirits of demons performing miraculous signs, and they go out to the kings of the whole world, to

gather them for the battle on the great day of God Almighty. Behold, I come like a thief [Rev 16:13-15 NIV]!

All the world, excepting only God's true people, will be caught up in the counterfeit. The world will impose decrees forbidding God's people even to buy or sell and will at length issue a decree of execution against them (see Rev 13:3, 14-18).

The essential difference between the two groups of followers concerns their loyalty. God's end-time people will prefer to die rather than give up their confidence in God, an attitude rooted in their confident dependence on His Word. By contrast, the rest of mankind, having placed themselves above God's Word, will appoint themselves judges over His people, even to issuing a death decree.

The controversy revolves around the question, What will you do with the man Jesus? When people reject the Living Word they always reject the written Word; and when men place themselves as judges over the written Word, they inevitably judge the Living Word and His followers. We are soon to see this axiom enacted on a global scale. Seventh-day Adventist Bible teachers must never place *their* reasoning above God's Word, or they will create a Trojan horse with disastrous consequences.

Why is there to be a great "time of trouble" for God's true people in the end time? Partly to reveal to the universe the identity of those who have really been loyal to God. "When the testing time shall come, those who have made God's word their rule of life will be revealed"⁴⁰

When is this testing to take place? After quoting Daniel 12:1, Ellen White commented:

When the third angel's message closes, mercy no longer pleads for the guilty inhabitants of the earth. The people of God have accomplished their work. They have received "the latter rain," "the refreshing from the presence of the Lord," and they are prepared for the trying hour before them. An angel returning from the earth announces that his work is done; the final test has been brought upon the world, and all who have proved themselves loyal to the divine precepts have received "the seal of the living God."⁴¹

God's end-time people will have completed their evangelistic mission and their character preparation, but God does not yet take them up to heaven. He keeps them on earth a little longer to go

through the worst time of trouble ever endured. Why will a God of love do this? He must have a crucial reason.

The group called the 144,000, mentioned only twice in the Bible (Rev 7:1-8 and 14:1-5), are to live through the great time of trouble as a demonstration of ultimate confidence in God alone, when all earthly supports will be gone. They will demonstrate that even under the worst of conditions (see Rev. 13:3, 15), during the worst time of trouble the world ever has seen (see Dan. 12:1), they will remain dependent and trusting in their relation to the Living Word of God because they are dependent and trusting in their relation to the written Word of God. They will also demonstrate that the weakest of the race (after 6000 years of fallen heredity) from every nation, kindred, tongue, and people, during the worst time ever, can by His grace remain true to God and thus disprove Satan's charge that created beings cannot be loyal.⁴²

God will have a people upon the earth to maintain the Bible, and the Bible only, as the standard of all doctrines and the basis of all reforms. . . . Satan is constantly endeavoring to attract attention to man in the place of God. He leads the people to look to bishops, to pastors, to professors of theology, as their guides, instead of searching the Scriptures to learn their duty for themselves.⁴³

God's end-time people will know the Bible for themselves. They will have submitted to be taught of God. They will know that "an understanding of Bible truth depends not so much on the power of intellect brought to the search as on the singleness of purpose, the earnest longing after righteousness."⁴⁴ They will attest to the glorious fact that "it is the office of heavenly angels to prepare the heart so to comprehend God's word that we shall be charmed with its beauty, admonished by its warnings, or animated and strengthened by its promises."⁴⁵ To them, the Bible will not be a textbook to be analyzed but a meeting place with Christ, where He so imprints His Word on the mind that He re-creates the reader after His own image.

God's people will be hidden within the mighty protection, the impregnable fortress, of the Scriptures. To people so hidden God has promised, "I will also keep you from the hour of trial that is going to come upon the whole world to test those who live on the earth" (Rev 3:10 NIV). "For in the day of trouble he will keep me

safe in his dwelling; he will hide me in the shelter of his tabernacle and set me high upon a rock" (Ps 27:5). "'They will be mine,' says the Lord Almighty, 'in the day when I make up my treasured possession. I will spare them, just as in compassion a man spares his son who serves him'" (Mal 3:17).

Christ-centered Demonstration

During the demonstration of Christ-likeness that we have been speaking of, the focus will be far more Christ-centered than Christian-centered. The onlooking universe will see a manifestation of what God can do in people who have surrendered completely to His will, to His Word, and to Him. By contrast, as they see the world moving against God's people to utterly destroy them, they will see manifested the spirit of human judgment against God, His Word, and His people.

The reason God's people will continue to live on earth during the great time of trouble—after they have evangelized the world—is for God to show to the universe what His Word has done in their lives, in response to their choosing to come under its power—people so settled into the truth, both intellectually and spiritually, that they cannot be moved. When all hell breaks loose they stand as firm as the Word itself, for they have chosen to be transformed by it.

Through the Holy Spirit, God's word is a light as it becomes a transforming power in the life of the receiver. By implanting in their hearts the principles of His word, the Holy Spirit develops in men the attributes of God. The light of His glory—His character—is to shine forth in His followers. . . .

The last rays of merciful light, the last message of mercy to be given to the world, is a revelation of His character of love. The children of God are to manifest His glory. In their own life and character they are to reveal what the grace of God has done for them.⁴⁶

Discerning onlookers will realize that any judgment of God's Word by man disqualifies the judge for the final demonstration of God's character. This is where the historical-critical method is so dangerous and why it has already played so disastrous a role in the end time. The function of the Bible is more than to inform. It is to transform. When scholars try to change God's Word, they forfeit being changed by it. Only people who choose to come under the changing power of the Word will be filled by the Spirit Who inspired

it and be sealed and empowered by the latter rain to manifest the light of God to the world and the universe.

The preparation of such people with such a purpose is the supreme goal of Seventh-day Adventist eschatology.

Endnotes

¹ Hugh Ross Mackintosh, *Types of Modern Theology* (London: Collins, 1964), p. 183. Karl Barth, *From Rousseau to Ritschl* (London: SCM Press, 1959), p. 190, noted two lines of theological thought in the nineteenth century, stressing respectively reason and feeling. K. Heim, *Expository Times*, 48 (1936-37): 55-58, 132-135, sees three main lines of development: the moral autonomy of the individual, speculative theology, and that of religious feeling. From whichever of these standpoints the century is viewed, it appears as the century of anthropocentrism. Theologically speaking, Karl Barth, *Die Protestantische Theologie im 19 Jahrhundert* (Zurich: EVZ, 1947), pp. 377, 381, believed that lines from everywhere, both positive and negative, led to Schleiermacher, for it was "his century."

² In 1889, Schleiermacher was viewed as having "almost unequaled veneration" (F. Lichtenberger, *History of German Theology in the Nineteenth Century* [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1889], pp. 47, 48). From 1887 to 1937 he was studied with closer application in continental circles than anyone except Martin Luther (Mackintosh, *Types of Modern Theology*, p. 36). Schleiermacher was the pioneer of thorough-going methodology in Christian humanism. (see D. Emil Brunner, *Die Mystik und das Wort* (Tübingen: Verlag von J.C.B. Mohr, Paul Sibeck, 1924), p. 8. Barth (*Die Protestantische Theologie*, p. 306) said of him, "The first place in the history of theology of the most recent times belongs and will always belong to Schleiermacher and he has no rival."

³ H. R. Mackintosh and A. B. Macaulay, in their "Editors' Preface" to the English translation of Albrecht Ritschl, *The Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1900), called this work not only monumental but also the greatest dogmatic treatise since Schleiermacher, *The Christian Faith*.

⁴ The so-called objective classical evidences for God include the cosmological (cause) and the teleological (design). Hume and Kant questioned these evidences on the basis that a person cannot now see God at work creating. Kant turned to the subjective, to man's morality, as evidence. Schleiermacher followed suit, looking within man in an attempt to escape the criticism leveled against the objective evidences.

⁵ Rather than the rational or moral proofs for God's existence, he maintained that God is given in and with the feeling of absolute dependence.

⁶ To discover doctrines, Schleiermacher looked to human nature rather than to God's Word. Note the following insights from his *The Christian Faith*. The starting point in dogmatics is the self-consciousness of the individual (p. 501), which is the God-consciousness of the redeemed person (pp. 541, 542), or the religious self-consciousness (pp. 231, 232). Thus dogmatics is an articulation of the sphere of the inner life of Christian piety (pp. 428, 485), because doctrines are but religious affections set forth in speech (pp. 66, 67). Dogmatics explains the feeling of absolute dependence (p. 198) as it argues from the redeemed to the Redeemer (p. 65).

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 144.

⁸ Affirmation of self-consciousness relative to the consummation of the

church are, Schleiermacher says, "most unreliable" (*ibid.*, p. 529), for the Christian consciousness has nothing to say regarding a "condition so entirely outside our ken" (*ibid.*, p. 697).

⁹ Brunner, *Die Mystik und das Wort*, p. 8.

¹⁰ James Richmond, *Faith and Philosophy* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1966), pp. 54, 55.

¹¹ Ellen G. White, *Testimonies for the Church*, 3:108, notes that one can strengthen "unbelief by dwelling upon poor feelings." "Feelings are not always true guides" (*ibid.*, 1:160). "It is not safe for you to trust to impressions and feelings" (*ibid.*, 3:418).

¹² Ellen G. White, in *The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, 7:928.

¹³ *Justification and Reconciliation* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1900), p. 11.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 613.

¹⁵ Mackintosh, *Types of Modern Theology*, p. 149.

¹⁶ Schweitzer forced the world of New Testament scholarship to consider the problem of the kingdom of God in the teaching of Jesus Christ; see Norman Perrin, *The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus* (London: SCM Press, 1963), p. 28. Schweitzer also insisted that Jesus and the early Christians expected the appearance of the Messiah in glory and the consequent end of the world in a future very near to their own day. Barth's commentary, with its rediscovery of the eschatological nature of the kingdom of God, marks the great turning point in the modern understanding of eschatology after Schweitzer. Cf. Thomas F. Torrance, *Karl Barth: An Introduction to his Early Theology, 1910-1931* (London: SCM Press, 1962), p. 78.

¹⁷ See Albert Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, (reprint; London: Adam and Charles Black, 1954), p. 358.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 368, 369.

¹⁹ Barth revolted against the immanentism of Schleiermacher (God in man), but he went to the other extreme of positing a God who is "Wholly Other" (*Ganz Anderer*). Said he, "If I have a system, it is limited to a recognition of what Kierkegaard called the 'infinite qualitative distinction' between time and eternity, and to my regarding this as possessing negative as well as positive significance. 'God is in heaven, and thou art on earth.'" (*Romans*, p. 10).

²⁰ Barth gives credit also to Kant and Dostoevsky.

²¹ These include Schweitzer's "thorough-going eschatology," C. H. Dodd's "realized eschatology," John A. T. Robinson's "fully inaugurated eschatology," William Manson's "spiritualized apocalyptic eschatology," Rudolph Bultmann's "existential eschatology," and Jürgen Moltmann's "proleptic eschatology."

²² Dodd believed that the parables of Christ must be understood in the context of the life situation of Jesus (*Sitz im Leben Jesu*). He therefore argued that, with the ministry, death, and resurrection of Jesus, we have the eschatological event, the climax of all history, the coming of the kingdom—in the absolute and not provisional sense—so that the new age is inaugurated. Cf. his *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1936), pp. 7, 128.

²³ In this context Bultmann suggests, "The meaning of history lies always in the present, and when the present is conceived as the eschatological present by Christian faith the meaning in history is realized. . . . In every moment slumbers the possibility of being the eschatological moment. You must awaken to it." See his *History and Eschatology* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1957), p. 155.

²⁴ Jürgen Moltmann, *Theology of Hope* (London: SCM Press, 1967), p. 16, says, "From first to last, and not merely in the epilogue, Christianity is eschatology."

Theology begins with eschatology, so that everything is thought out from that future (ibid.). In fact, the medium of theology is eschatology (ibid., p.41). Future focus overlooks the past and present (ibid., pp. 283-288).

25 Carl F. H. Henry, *God, Revelation and Authority*, vol. 2 (Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1983), pp. 283-305.

26 See Moltmann, *Theology of Hope*, pp. 17, 25, 204, 110, 111.

27 See Michael Green, *The Empty Cross of Jesus* (Downer's Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1984), p. 158.

28 Ibid., p. 157.

29 Trans. E.W. Leverenz and R. F. Norden (St. Louis: Concordia, 1977).

30 Ibid., p. 48.

31 Carl F. H. Henry, *God, Revelation and Authority*, vol. 4 (Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1979), p. 387. Henry notes that Maier has returned to the doctrine of verbal inspiration, which seems a swing of the pendulum to another extreme, the opposite of the historical-critical method.

32 Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, 1/1, trans. G. T. Thomson (Edinburgh: T & T. Clark, 1963), p. 119. In citing Barth we are not supportive of his equally devastating use of Scripture through theological presuppositions that impose on the objective Word.

33 C. S. Lewis, *Fern-Seed and Elephants and Other Essays on Christianity*, ed. Walter Hooper (Glasgow: Fontana/Collins, 1975), pp. 106, 107.

34 Ibid., pp. 108, 111.

35 Ibid., p. 114.

36 Ibid., p. 119.

37 Carl F. H. Henry, *God, Revelation and Authority*, vol. 6 (Waco, Texas: Word Publications, 1983), p. 498.

38 George E. Ladd, *Jesus and the Kingdom: The Eschatology of Biblical Realism* (London: S.P.C.K., 1966), p. 61.

39 Oscar Cullmann, *Christ and Time*, trans. Floyd V. Filson (London: SCM Press, 1967), p. 140.

40 Ellen G. White, *The Great Controversy*, p. 602.

41 Ibid., p. 613.

42 God's true people demonstrate loyalty to the Sabbath in the face of coercive international Sunday observance. In heaven Satan "began to insinuate doubts concerning the laws that governed heavenly beings, intimating that though laws might be necessary for the inhabitants of worlds, angels, being more exalted, needed no such restraint, for their own wisdom was a sufficient guide" (Ellen G. White, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, p. 37). "To every soul will come the searching test: Shall I obey God rather than men? The decisive hour is even now at hand. Are our feet planted on the rock of God's immutable word? Are we prepared to stand firm in defense of the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus?" (White, *The Great Controversy*, p. 594).

43 White, *The Great Controversy*, p. 595.

44 Ibid., p. 599.

45 Ibid., p. 600.

46 Ellen G. White, *Christ's Object Lessons*, pp. 414-416

Journal of the Adventist Theological Society, 1/2 (1990): 37-49.
Article copyright © 1990, by Gerhard F. Hasel.

THE BOOK OF DANIEL CONFIRMED BY THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

By Gerhard F. Hasel
Andrews University

Two articles of sensational interest have been published recently by Professor Eugene Ulrich dealing with the Hebrew and Aramaic texts¹ of the Daniel manuscripts found among the Dead Sea Scrolls in Cave 4 at Qumran. These articles, entitled "Daniel Manuscripts from Qumran,"² provide rich insight into these pivotal manuscripts.

From Discovery to Publication

Let me first allude briefly to the outrageous delay which has occurred in the publication of many of the Dead Sea Scrolls, discovery of which commenced as long ago as 1947. In the past few years certain scholars have begun to complain that the few privileged researchers who control access to the Dead Sea Scrolls have been sitting on them, delaying their publication all these years. During the past four years, and especially in 1989 and 1990, *Biblical Archaeology Review (BAR)*³ has played a major role in pushing for the publication of these manuscripts, pointing to the scandal that approximately "400 separate unpublished texts arranged on 1,200 different [photographic] plates" have been hidden for some 40 years from the scrutiny of the scholarly world. Hershel Shanks, the editor of *BAR*, says that "a reasonable guess is that 100 of these [unpublished texts] are Biblical texts on 200 plates."⁴

The accusations regarding the non-publication of these Dead Sea Scroll texts were taken up in the summer of 1989 by the public press, reinforcing the outcry raised by the *BAR* article. For example,