



*"Watchman,
what of the night?"*

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

APOSTASY IN PROPHETIC — INTERPRETATION — HAUSER and WHEELING Follow FORD

THE ODESSEY OF APOSTASY WITHIN THE ADVENTIST COMMUNITY HAS NOT ONLY INCLUDED DEVIATIONS IN HISTORICAL THEOLOGICAL CONCEPTS, BUT ALSO FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES IN THE INTERPRETATION OF PROPHECY ARE BEING ALTERED. Theological compromise surfaced in the book - Questions on Doctrine - as a result of the Seventh-day Adventist-Evangelical Conferences in 1955-1956. In the documents now available, it is established that the Church's conferees compromised the faith given in trust to the Adventist Church in the areas of the atonement and the incarnation. It was stated to Barnhouse and Martin by these men "that they do not believe, as some of their earlier teachers taught, that Jesus' atoning work was not completed on Calvary but instead that He is carrying on a second ministering work since 1844." The idea "was totally repudiated," according to Barnhouse and Martin. These Evangelicals perceived that the Adventists now "believe that since His ascension Christ has been ministering the benefits of the atonement which He completed on Calvary." (Eternity, September, 1956) This assessment of what the Adventist leaders said, has never been denied. As for the teaching on the incarnation, the book - Questions on Doctrine - specifically stated - "Although born in the flesh, [Jesus] was nevertheless God, and was exempt from the inherited passions and pollutions that corrupt the natural descendants of Adam." (p. 383, emphasis supplied)

What is not generally known is that the book also contained a section - "Questions on Prophecy." In this section, the Adventist conferees were solid on the basic principles of prophetic interpretation which underlie Reformation and Adventist understanding of the books of Daniel and Revelation. They showed clearly that Antiochus Epiphanes could not be "the little horn" of Daniel 8. They forcibly set forth the connection between Chapters 8 & 9 of Daniel. The year for a day concept as applied to the time prophecies was ably defended. One could find little, if any, to question in the defense, as found in the book, of our historic understanding of the principles of prophetic interpretation, or the prophecies discussed in the section.

However, when "the chickens" of the theological apostasy "came home to roost" in Ford's attack on the sanctuary teaching, he also brought into the open a deviate concept by which the prophecies of God's word were to be interpreted. When given a leave to prepare a defense of his allegations, he produced a large manuscript, which was later published under the title - Daniel 8:14; The Day of Atonement, and the Investigative Judgment.

In this manuscript, Ford defined what he meant by his use of the "apotelesmatic principle." He wrote - "The apotelesmatic principle is a convenient term for referring to the concept that a particular prophecy in outline or as regards a dominant feature may have more than one application in time." (p. 302) Note, and keep in mind the phrase - "more than one application in time." What Ford is saying is simply that a given prophecy, for example, "the little horn" of Daniel 8 could have been fulfilled in Antiochus Epiphanes in 167 B.C., and again this same prophecy could find another application in New Testament times in the Papacy, and again it could apply to a future antichrist to appear near the end of time. He even suggests that "Seventh-day Adventists are no strangers to the apotelesmatic principle though the term is not common in their literature and only rarely has it been used in connection with the prophecies of Daniel." (p. 303) Ford is suggesting that our use of the term - "dual application" - is synonymous with what he calls "the apotelesmatic principle."

We freely admit that some prophecies do have a "dual application" but they are general in nature. For example, Jesus told His disciples on the Mount of Olives that "nation shall arise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom: and great earthquakes shall be in divers places, and famines, and pestilences; and fearful sights and great signs shall there be from heaven." (Luke 21:10-11) This prophecy of Jesus could have multiple applications; but it is a general prophecy. The same night Jesus also informed the disciples that Jerusalem would be "compassed with armies." By this they would "then know that the desolation thereof was nigh." (21:20) This is a specific prophecy, and finds only one fulfillment in all history. If it were to have a multiple application, how then would the ones for whom the prophecy was given, know when to do what Jesus instructed them to do when the event occurred?

Prior to the time of his leave from Pacific Union College, Ford had written a commentary on the book of Daniel which was published by the now closed Southern Publishing Association. This book - Daniel,

with a foreword by F. F. Bruce of the University of Manchester, England - contains a chapter on "Contemporary Systems of Interpretation." Ford defines four systems. One, the Preteristic, views all the prophecies as having been fulfilled prior to, or soon after the beginnings of the Christian era. It was developed by the Jesuit Alcazar as part of the Catholic Counter Reformation. The second, Futuristic, developed also by a Jesuit, Ribera, from the writings of the Church Fathers, sought to project most, if not all prophecy as being fulfilled at some distant date beyond "the noon day of the Papacy." This, too, was a part of the Counter Reformation of the Roman Catholic Church. This view - the Futuristic - has become basic in apostate Protestantism. The other major system is known as Historicism which teaches that history is but the response to the voice of prophecy. This system was used during the great Protestant Reformation, and is the basis for the understanding of prophecy in the Advent Movement.

Ford's comments on three of these major systems of interpretation are most revealing. He wrote: "It must be said that each of the systems is right in what it affirms and wrong in what it denies." (p. 68, emphasis his) After explaining the reason for his emphasis, he concludes - "If the apotelesmatic principle were to be widely understood, some differences between the systems would be automatically resolved." (p. 69) This is simply suggesting that by the adoption of his so-called "principle" there could be worked out a compromise between Jesuitical interpretations of prophecy and the historical understanding applied to the prophecies during the Protestant Reformation. The bottom line is an attempt to adulterate the historic Advent faith which was built upon the prophecies of God's word by which the events of history were seen as the unfolding of the scroll of prophecy.

Robert W. Hauser - Give Him the Glory

Few perhaps who have read this book by Dr. Hauser, or who have listened to him speak, have taken time to seriously consider what he has written in the "Introduction." Hauser wrote:- "The historical

approach has served us well in the past, but like the horse and buggy, no longer fits our needs. This is not to discard the historical approach as untrue. It is, like the horse and buggy, no longer relevant." (p. 2) This is simply double-talk. If the historical approach is still true, then it is still applicable! Truth is truth and fits any age and all peoples. But what does Hauser feel is relevant to the computer age? In a footnote - in fine print, and one needs to read the label carefully before buying a product - Hauser explains:

"Kenneth Strand points out that there are three main approaches to the interpretation of Revelation: preterist, futurist and continuous-historical. (Kenneth A. Strand, Interpreting the Book of Revelation, Hermeneutical Guidelines with brief introduction to literary analysis, Ann Arbor Publishers, 1979) The analysis in this book may be categorized as belonging to a variant of the continuous historical interpretation. More specifically it is also a variant of a subdivision Strand refers to as straight-line, as opposed to recapitulationist. However, in significant ways it differs from the straight-line approach by identifying two areas with dual historical and future applications within the main outline. Therefore the approach used herein does not fit any of the previous models but is a combination." (p. 3, one word emphasis his)

This is plain Fordian, and a candid admission that he is using "the apotelesmatic" concept as the basis for his interpretation of the prophecies of Revelation. A "combination" of the "historical and future applications" is exactly what Dr. Desmond Ford suggests is the real merit of the "apotelesmatic principle."

The Biblical Research Institute of the General Conference and the Ellen G. White Estate joined in a Critique of Give Glory to Him. While the "Critique" contains 18 pages, in reality one need not read beyond the first page. It is all said there in two sentences:

"From their inception Seventh-day Adventists have followed the historical method of prophetic interpretation. . .

"A change of methodology inevitably leads

to a change in one's conclusions."

If a man builds a house on an octagonal foundation, can I question the way he has to construct his rooms, possibly their odd shapes, just because I have built my house on a rectangular base? No! Thus, in the area of prophetic interpretation, one must consider what is the right base. Once that is determined, he need not spend his time measuring, or analyzing the other man's interpretations built on what he has determined to be a false base. This resolves into some very simple questions. Were the Reformers right in their principles of prophetic interpretation? These were the principles used by our spiritual forefathers in determining how the books of Daniel and Revelation were to be understood. Or is Ford correct in advocating a compromise - a combination - between the Jesuitical concepts and the Protestant methodology by the "application" of the "apotelesmatic principle"? Hauser concludes that Ford is to be followed. They may arrange their "rooms" differently, but the base is the same.

Charles Wheeling

In August, 1984, Charles Wheeling gave a week-end series of studies in the Gentry Seventh-day Adventist Church here in Arkansas. From a transcript of the taped recording, we quote his position. In the study "Common Ground" [Who with?] (Tape #1, side 2) - Wheeling stated:

"Let us go back into the book of Daniel. I want you to go to chapter seven of Daniel with me. Now I am going to say some things here, and I hope you won't misunderstand me."

In discussing the four kingdoms represented there, he asked:

"Can you name them? Babylon, Medo-Persia, [Greece], and Rome. But we have some problems, and you need to be aware of them. Before I share the problems with you, I want to tell you that I subscribe to the historical application, and I preach it. However, I am also aware that the passage very likely has another application. And I think that you need to be aware of that."

Then further in the presentation in a

discussion of Daniel 7:9, Wheeling stated: "I am going to suggest that the historical application, as good as it is and has been, does not satisfy the passage entirely."

This is just plain double-talk! It is nothing more than a barefaced recommendation of Ford's "apotelesmatic principle," which as quoted above states that "a particular prophecy in outline, or as regards a dominant feature may have more than one application in time."

Not only does Wheeling seek to set before the professed people of God right in their own sanctuaries, the apostate suggestion of Ford, but he also derides what he has assumed to be the source of our Adventist heritage in the understanding of the prophecy of Daniel 7. He stated in the same setting:

"Now historically, Uriah Smith, and I want to underscore that, because it was Uriah Smith who offers the interpretation that is so familiar to all of us. Historically Uriah Smith said, 'These four beast, doubtless, represent four great world empires. Doubtless,' he said, 'they correspond to the four kingdoms of the past.'"

Then Wheeling concluded:- "It is a mere assumption on Uriah Smith's part, and your part and mine, that those four beast represent Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome. There are some difficulties here, and I want you to be aware of them."

No question - "There are some difficulties here" - but it is not with what Uriah Smith wrote, nor with what Seventh-day Adventists have believed in regard to Daniel 7. The difficulty is with Charles Wheeling, and his deliberate attempt to denigrate Uriah Smith, and extol the "apotelesmatic principle" of Desmond Ford.

There are two points that need to be noted in regards to Wheeling's comments on Uriah Smith: (1) In reading what Uriah Smith said about Daniel 7, I cannot find anything close to the term, "doubtless, which is a term of speech suggesting mere assumption without an authoritative basis. Smith in the 1897 edition of Thoughts on Daniel wrote:

"Now, from the time of Daniel to the end of this world's history, there

were to be but four universal kingdoms, as we learn from Nebuchadnezzar's dream of the great image in Daniel 2. Daniel was still living under the same kingdom which he had declared, in his interpretation of the king's dream, about sixty-five years before, to be the head of gold. The first beast of this vision must therefore denote the same as the head of gold of the great image, namely, the kingdom of Babylon, and the other beasts the succeeding kingdoms shown by that image." (p. 127)

Not until the revised 1944 edition - Uriah Smith died in 1903 - of The Prophecies of Daniel and Revelation do we find a suggestion that would warrant Wheeling's insinuation in the use of the word - "doubtless." The revised text reads:

"The first beast of this vision [Daniel 7] must therefore denote the same kingdom as the head of gold of the great image, namely, Babylon. The other beasts no doubt represent the succeeding kingdoms portrayed by that image." (p. 106)

(2) Wheeling would have the professed followers of the Advent faith believe that Uriah Smith's historical application was unique. In this Wheeling either did not do his home work, or if he did, he purposefully sought to deceive his listeners. James White taught the same thing in regard to the meaning of the beast-symbols of Daniel 7. In an editorial, in the Review & Herald, Nov. 29, 1877, which discussed the "Eastern Question," he wrote:

"Let us take a brief view of the line of prophecy four times spanned in the book of Daniel. It will be admitted that the same ground is passed over in chapters two, seven, eight, and eleven, with this exception that Babylon is left out of chapters eight and eleven. We first pass down the great image of chapter two where Babylon, Persia, Greece, and Rome are represented by the gold, the silver, the brass, the iron. All agree that these feet are not Turkish but Roman. As we pass down, the lion, the bear, the leopard, and the beast with the ten horns, representing the same as the great image, again all will agree that it is not Turkey that is cast into the burning flame, but the Roman beast." (p. 172)

Further, as one checks back into the writings of the men of the Pre- and Post-Reformation Period, as well as during the time of the Reformation itself, he will find that the following men taught and believed the four beasts to be just as Uriah Smith identified the first three - the lion = Babylon; the bear = Medo-Persia; and the leopard = Grecia. This list includes such venerable scholars as John Wycliff, Martin Luther, Philip Melancthon, Hugh Latimer, John Knox, Joseph Mede, Sir Isaac Newton, and Thomas Newton. (See Charts, The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers, pp. 156-157, 528-528, 786-787) Thus the interpretation given by Uriah Smith to the beasts of Daniel 7 couldn't have been "a mere assumption" on his part. Why such deceptive tactics?

In seeking to apply Ford's "apotelesmatic concept" to Daniel 7, and show that there is a second "application," Wheeling asked his listeners - "Would you go to verse 17 in that chapter [7] with me. Daniel wanted to know the truth and the angel said to him - 'These four beasts are four kings which' - what does it say? - 'shall arise. . .'. Tell me, is that past tense, present tense, or future tense? That is future tense!"

Now I want to ask Brother Wheeling something. "Brother Wheeling take your Bible, and please turn to Daniel 7:10, and read with me - 'A fiery stream issued and came forth from before Him: thousand thousand thousands ministered unto Him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before Him.' Tell me, is that word, "stood," past tense, present tense, or future tense? As translated into the English, it is past tense, but Brother Wheeling, in the Aramaic, the same identical word is used for 'stood' as is translated, 'shall arise' in Daniel 7:17." In other words, Daniel 7:17 could be translated - "These great beasts, which are four, are four kings which stood out of the earth." Some study in depth before one goes forth as a teacher would be most helpful, so that God's professed children would not be deceived. Borrowing the words from the book of Hebrews, when for the time ye ought to be a teacher, ye have need that someone teach you. (See Heb. 5:12)

So that all the readers might know the principles of grammar that are involved

here, let me cite what is stated in Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar: - "In moods and tenses it [the Hebrew verb] is very poor, having only two tenses (Perfect and Imperfect.), . . ." (p. 81, 1858 edition) A footnote explains that "the corresponding terms in the Hebrew lexicon of Gesenius (translated by Dr. Robinson, 5th ed., 1854) are Proeter for Perfect, and Future for Imperfect." The difference between the "Perfect" and the "Imperfect" of the Hebrew verb is explained in the Grammar. It reads:

"The name Imperfect is used in direct contrast with Perfect; in a wider sense, therefore, than in the Latin and Greek grammar. The Hebrew Perfect denotes, in general, the finished and past, what is come to pass or is gone into effect; but at the same time, that which is represented as perfected, whether still into the present, or in reality yet future. The Imperfect, on the contrary, denotes the unfinished and continuing, that which is being done, or coming to pass, and is future (hence called also Future); but also that which is in progress and in connected succession, in past time." (p.88)

The Aramaic word, koom, as used in both Daniel 7:10 & 17 is in the imperfect tense and in Daniel 7:17 carries the force of that which is being done, in progress, extending from a point in past time into the future.

The position taken by the pioneers of the Advent Movement was not unique, nor "a mere assumption" in regard to Daniel 7; but rather the true position based on sound principles of prophetic interpretation. What is unique is the application of the "apotelesmatic" concept of Dr. Ford by Charles Wheeling to Daniel 7, and the fanciful expositions which result.

TWO SEMINARS FOR 1985

The dates of these two Seminars have been set for June 16-22, and August 4-10. A change has been made in the subject to be studied. Instead of Romans 1 thru 8, we believed that a ground work could be laid for a study in Romans by first giving attention to the book of Galatians which has been called the Magna Charta of the

THE APOTELESOMATIC PRINCIPLE

by Ralph Larson

(All Emphasis His)

Definition: The concept that a Bible prophecy may have more than one application or fulfillment.

Bible scholars work with two tools, exegesis and hermeneutics. The term exegesis is applied to that process whereby a scholar endeavors to establish a precise meaning to a certain passage in scripture. The term hermeneutics is applied to the process of looking beyond the single passage to its context, the chapter, the book, and the entire Bible, comparing scripture with scripture.

Bible scholars unless they are inspired, have nothing more to work with than these two tools. We may have a degree of confidence in conclusions that are reached by careful use of exegesis and hermeneutics. But when the scholar steps beyond the boundaries of these two disciplines, it is immediately apparent that he is speculating or guessing, and his guesses might be right or they may be hopelessly mistaken. In any case, let it be clearly established that by the very nature of the case, conclusions that cannot be verified through exegesis and hermeneutics must be classified as guesses.

With inspired writers there is a decided difference. An inspired writer may be instructed by the Holy Spirit to apply a certain passage of scripture in a manner that could never be verified by exegesis or hermeneutics. For example, in Matthew 2:15 the inspired writer applies to the return of the child Jesus from Egypt the words of Hosea 11:1: "Out of Egypt have I called my Son." But in its context, this verse refers to the exodus of Israel from Egypt in the days of Moses. The application of this passage to the experience of the child Jesus could never be established by either exegesis or hermeneutics nor by any combined exercise of those two disciplines.

Why then do we accept it with confidence? Because the application is made by an inspired writer. The inspired writer is not guessing, but is being guided by the

Holy Spirit.

Is the apotelesmatic principle valid? Yes, in the hands of an inspired writer. In the hands of an un-inspired writer, the conclusions reached through the application of the apotelesmatic principle must be placed in the same category as palm reading, horoscopes, the inspection of tea leaves, or predictions based upon the examination of the entrails of chickens.

(Reproduced from a copy published by the Final Century Research Foundation, Central Point, OR 97502)

Editor's Note: Dr. Larson is commenting on the Apotelesmatic concept as if synonymous to the concept of Dual Fulfillment. However, Dr. Ford takes the principle in a much broader aspect, setting it forth as a compromise to lessen the distance between the Jesuitical systems of prophetic interpretation and the continual historical.

#

SUMMARY REPORT - 2

This is the second report from the Complaint filed by Americans United in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania at Philadelphia.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

"As early as 1779 John Adams wrote the Continental Congress that it was his desire that it would 'never send a minister to His Holiness' or receive a Catholic nuncio to this country. On December 15, 1784, the Papal Nuncio, at Paris, France, contacted the American Commissioners informing the American Commissioners that his government, the Papal States, had agreed to open the ports of Civita Vecchia on the Tyrrhenian Sea and Ancono on the Adriatic to American vessels. The Papal Nuncio expressed interest at that time that commercial relations be established between the Papal States and the new American nation.

"On June 26, 1797, Giovanni Batista Sartori of Rome was commissioned as the first consul to represent the United States in the papal dominions. The Papal States, whose center was Rome and whose monarch was the Pope, were comprised of Romagna,

To page 7 +

SEMINARS

(Continued from p. 5)

Christian faith. Written by Paul himself rather than being dictated to a "secretary" as some of the other Epistles, it gives deep insights into his thinking and character, and lays a firm base for an understanding of the plan of salvation. The issues which this book addresses are current in the present crisis in the SDA community over righteousness by faith.

These seminars will be held here on the campus, and will be restricted as to the number attending at either time. It will be necessary to fit the people who desire to come into the facilities available. If you wish to be considered for inclusion into one of these Seminars, write immediately for details, indicating which time is best for you. We can accommodate a limited number of RV's, and possibly a tent or two. The total cost will be \$75., per adult. This will cover all facilities and meals for the week.

To those who respond, we will send an application form, and a schedule of the program which will be followed. When writing be sure to indicate whether June or August. Do not delay for when the applications are returned, we will begin filling the available spaces.

‡

SUMMARY REPORT - 2

(Continued from page 6)

the Marches, Umbria, and Rome, bounded on the north by the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom, on the east by the kingdom of Naples, on the southwest by the Mediterranean Sea, and on the West by Tuscany and the Duchy of Modena. The territory covered an area of approximately 16,000 square miles and had a population of more than three million. The American consuls were paid by fees charged by the consul. The American representatives to the Papal States were explicitly restricted to

"civil relations" and to the extension of commerce between the two countries. No representatives of the Papal States were correspondingly sent to the United States.

"On December 7, 1847, President Polk, in a message to Congress, recommended the opening of formal diplomatic relations with the Papal States. This recommendation was included in a deficiency bill containing the financial provisions for a new chargé d'affaires. The proposal was vehemently debated in both houses of Congress, primarily on the grounds that there was no political or commercial need for such representation, and the President was pandering to the Catholic vote. However, the appropriation passed the House of Representatives 137 to 15 and the Senate 36 to 7. The first chargé d'affaires to the Papal States was appointed in 1848 with Congress having exercised its powers of advice and consent as well as its funding powers under Article I, section 8 of the Constitution. The United States diplomat was instructed by Secretary of State James Buchanan to "carefully avoid even the appearance of interfering in ecclesiastical questions." In 1854 Lewis Cass, Jr., the second chargé was raised to the rank of minister. In 1867 a question of religious liberty arose between the United States and the Papal States. The controversy stemmed from the laws of Rome which prohibited any other form of public worship than such as conformed to the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church. Certain Protestant churches were required to maintain their churches outside of Rome."

To Be Continued

"Let the year be given to God in its every moment! The year is made up of minutes: let these be watched as having been dedicated to God! It is in the sanctification of the small that hallowing of the large is secure."

G. Campbell Morgan

++++

"Watchman, What of the Night?" is published monthly by the Adventist Laymen's Foundation of Mississippi, Inc., P. O. Box 178, Lamar, AR 72846, USA. It is sent free upon request. For Canada write - The Adventist Laymen's Foundation of Ontario, P. O. Box 117, Thorne, Ontario, POH 2J0.