

*"Watchman,
what of the night?"*

*The hour has come, the hour is striking, and striking at you,
the hour and the end!*

Eze. 7:6 (Moffatt)



The "Sanctuary Doctrine"

Asset or Liability?

Editor's Preface

The first issues of *WMN* for this year carried articles on the Sanctuary doctrine written from the viewpoint of the counsel given to the Church in 1892 which indicated that "we have many lessons to learn, and many, many to unlearn. God and heaven alone are infallible. Those who think that they will never have to give up a cherished view, never have occasion to change an opinion, will be disappointed." In February, the San Diego Chapter of the AAF featured the reading of a paper by Dr. Raymond Cottrell attacking a very foundational text of the "sanctuary doctrine" - Daniel 8:14. While it needs to be admitted that there are things to learn, and things to unlearn in regard to this basic doctrine of Adventism, one does not tear up the foundation to correct errors in the edifice structured on that foundation.

There is, however, more involved than merely the doctrine itself. The question of hermeneutics - the proper method by which to interpret the Scriptures - is introduced by Cottrell. Cottrell's "adversary", the late Dr. Gerhard F. Hasel in his book, *Biblical Interpretation Today*, wrote: "The history of any church body is ... the history of its interpretation of Scripture. By implication a shift or change in the method used for the interpretation of Scripture by a church, its scholars, or others within it, inevitably would be accompanied by a shift or change in its course, doctrines, self-understanding, purpose, and mission." (p.1).

There is no question - this Cottrell made very clear - he has approached a key text of the sanctuary doctrine from a different hermeneutic than did the pioneers of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. This led him to his conclusion that the doctrine is a "liability." Is it?

The "Sanctuary Doctrine" -- Asset or Liability?

This is a borrowed title from a paper presented at the meeting of the San Diego Chapter of the Association of Adventist Forums, February 2, 2002, in the Tierrasanta Seventh-day Adventist Church. It had been written by Dr. Raymond F. Cottrell, but an abbreviated form was read by Larry Christoffel, associate pastor of the Loma Linda Campus Hill Church. This paper and presentation were highlighted in an editorial in the Spring edition of *Spectrum* (p. 79). From the San Diego Chapter, we received a copy.

As to be expected, the answer, given by Cottrell and the writer of the editorial, Gordon M. Rick, AAF vice president, was, Yes, the "Sanctuary Doctrine" is a liability to Adventism. This was based on two factors, not only the interpretation of certain key texts which are used to support the Sanctuary teaching, but also the methodology used in the interpretation of those texts. It is useless to argue the force and meaning of certain texts of Scripture if those disputing the meaning of the verses each use a different method of interpretation.

In his presentation, Dr. Cottrell lists three methods of Bible Study: 1) The proof-text method, 2) the historical method, and 3) "a hybrid of these two methods known as the historical-grammatical method" (p. 17, Cottrell's paper). Concerning the "proof text" method, Cottrell claims that it is followed "by a majority of untutored Bible readers" and that from its beginning "most Adventists have followed this method;" but he concluded that "no reputable Bible scholar follows it today" (p. 17). Evidently, the Spirit of God, when sent forth on the Day of Pentecost, was unaware of how untutored He would make the early Christians appear in their use of the Sacred Scriptures available to them.

To the first Christians, who were Jews, the Law and the Prophets were already sacred. Their national sacred writings were to them the oracles of God, though they could no longer be regarded as containing the whole truth of God. The coming of the Messiah had revealed God with a completeness that had not been discovered in the Old Testament.

The word of the Lord was authoritative as even Moses and the prophets were not. Yet since all the

hopes of the Old Testament seemed to these Jewish Christians to be fulfilled in Jesus Christ, they more than ever were convinced that their national sacred books were divinely inspired. From this source they drew, if not the articles of their creed, at least proofs and supports of their doctrines. Christ died and arose again, according to the scriptures.

All the writings of the Old Testament spoke of Christ to them. Legal enactments, prophetic utterances, simple historic record, and more emotional psalm, - all alike could be covered by the phrase, "the scripture says," all were treated as of one piece, and by diligent use of type and allegory single passages torn from any context could be used as proof-texts to commend or defend belief in Christ. (*Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Vol. 3, p. 499, col. 2; 1958 edition)

These early Christian Jews, spearheaded by the Apostle Paul, "turned the world upside down" (Acts 17:6), and in one generation established the Christian faith as a world religion. Anyone with only an elementary knowledge of the New Testament, knows how Paul interpreted and applied references from the Old Testament. (For an example, see I Cor. 9:8-10.)

Dr. Cottrell chooses to use "the historical method" because of its "objectivity." He writes that "this method requires either special training in biblical languages and the history and milieu of antiquity, or reliance on source material prepared by persons with such training," adding that "since about 1940 most Adventist scholars have followed this method" (p. 17). Where then is the Spirit of God? Does not the New Testament teach that "holy men of God" in Old Testament times spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit, and that "the Spirit of Christ which was in them" testified "beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow"? (II Peter 1:21; I Peter 1:11).

There is no question that the prophets of the Old Testament served as God's voice to convey His attitude toward Israel's apostasy from Him, and the judgments to come if they did not repent. True then, in an historical sense, these messages must be considered, yet studded in the midst of these prophecies are gems of truth which describe events which were to come in the life of the promised Messiah. Consider for example Zechariah 9. As one reads the chapter, there is little which speaks to him apart from the times in which it was written, yet in its midst is the prophecy of the triumphal entry of Jesus

into Jerusalem - verse 9. This is noted by both Matthew and John in their gospels. (Matt. 21:4-5; John 12:14-16). In fact, the Gospel of Matthew would appear to be a ledger tabulating the record of prophecy and its fulfilment in the life of Jesus. In the first three chapters of his gospel, there are six incidents recorded with the notation that "it might be fulfilled that which was written by the prophets." The first such entry - Matt. 1:23 - has been the basis for much discussion because Matthew did not follow the "historical" method advocated by Cottrell.

Another position taken by Cottrell in his prepared paper is that Bible prophecy, "even apocalyptic prophecy, is always conditional" (*ibid.*). While this possibility appears in a comparison between what was revealed to Daniel by Gabriel, and what was shown to John on the Isle of Patmos, this cannot be made a conclusive dictum. It is true, and needs to be noted that the book of Revelation does not mention the 1290, and 1335 days of Daniel 12. It does, however, carry through the 1260 days of Daniel 7 - "a time, and times, and half a time" (Rev. 12:14). The preface to Revelation is specific. The revelation which God gave to Christ which was conveyed to John by "His angel" concerned things "which *must* (δεῖ) shortly come to pass" (1:1). This Greek word carries the force of "it is binding, it is necessary, . . . it is inevitable." Within the revelation itself, the reason is given - the conquering power of the Messiah restored "the kingdom of our God" (12:10).

There are close parallels between the two books, which leads to the reasonable conclusion that even as the prophecies in Revelation are binding, necessary and inevitable, those prophecies in Daniel which are parallel are likewise to be binding and inevitable. Consider the base prophecy given to Daniel as found in Chapter 7 - the four beasts: the lion, bear, leopard, and non-descript. While the first three beast symbols loose their dominion, "yet their lives are prolonged for a season and a time" (v. 12). Revelation tells us that its non-descript beast (13:2) was like unto a leopard, with the feet of a bear, and the mouth of a lion - the same three symbols of Daniel in exact reverse order.

In Daniel 7, the objective of the prophecy focuses on the judgment that is to sit (vs. 9-10). The prophetic context in Revelation of the non-descript beast also calls attention to a judgment. The first angel proclaims, "the hour of [God's] judgment is come" (14:7). Considering that the symbols of Daniel 8 are placed in the same historical sequence as were the symbols of Chapter 7 - Media-Persia followed by

Greece (vs. 20-21) - should not the power which follows Greece, - "a king of fierce countenance" (v. 23) - also represent the power which followed the leopard of Daniel 7? Does not Revelation reveal from whence the "mighty" power, exercised by this king, comes? (Compare Daniel 8:24 with Rev. 13:2)

Further, does not Daniel 8 introduce a sanctuary term, *tamid*, besides introducing the very sanctuary itself in verse 14? What justification can be cited for introducing a different sequence in Daniel 8 when Revelation combines all the symbols of Daniel 7 into one beast, which is clearly the papal phase of Rome and giving it the same prophetic time of operation, as given for the little horn in Daniel 7? There is revealed in Daniel a point of prophetic revelation that dare not be overlooked. The "little horn" of Daniel 7 is never removed from the non-descript beast. It is ever nourished by the beast. When judgment is given against the horn, it is the "beast" that is "given to the burning flame" (7:11; Rev. 19:20). The revelation in Daniel 8 - the little horn - is both pagan and papal Rome in one continuum. One cannot limit his interpretation of a prophecy to a linguistic analysis of a specific passage and impose those conclusions on the whole, but must consider the whole in the broad relationship of what has been revealed by the God in whose power are the times and seasons. (See Acts 1:7).

In the book of Daniel is to be found the descriptive phrase, "the abomination of desolation" in several forms (9:27; 11:31; 12:11). Jesus in His prophetic outline of history stated plainly that this "abomination of desolation" would stand "where it ought not" just prior to the overthrow of Jerusalem and the destruction of the temple. (Mark 13:14; Matt. 24:15). In other words, "the abomination that maketh desolate" as noted by Christ is Rome in its pagan phase, *not* some previous power! In the Revelation of Jesus Christ, the papal phase is symbolized in the non-descript beast which directed its blasphemies against God and "His tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven" (13:6). In Daniel 8, the "little horn" is one continuous power; even as in Chapter 7, the non-descript beast and the little horn are continuous even until the beast is destroyed (7:11). Thus there is prefigured in the prophetic outline of Daniel 8 a transition between the destruction of the earthly type, and the blasphemy against the heavenly antitype. The "little horn" of Daniel 8 "cast down" the place of His sanctuary (v. 11), causing the *tamid* to cease. It was to continue its desolating warfare casting "the truth to the ground" (v. 12). From the physical, under pagan

Rome, it moved to the spiritual under papal Rome. Daniel then heard a conversation between "holy ones" obviously in heaven. A compound question was asked - "How long the vision, the *tamid*, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot?" (v. 13).

Cottrell argues heavily that the 2300 "evening-mornings" represent not only literal time, but also half days. He says that the Hebrew word for day - *yom* - is not used, yet in verse 26, speaking of the same "vision" (*chazon*) [second use of the word, "vision"], Daniel was instructed to close "up the vision; for it shall be for many days (*yamim*)."¹ In Daniel 8 and 9, there are two different words used for "vision" - *mar'eh* and *chazon*. The latter word is used in reference to the vision as a whole (8:2), while the first word is applied to "the vision of the evening and the morning" (8:26, first use). After receiving the vision (*chazon*), Daniel sought for a meaning (v. 15). To his request one with the appearance of a man stood before him, and a voice was heard saying, "Gabriel, make this man to understand the *mar'eh*." (v. 16). The first thing in explanation that Gabriel said was, "Understand, O son of man: for at the time of the end shall be the *chazon*" (v. 17).

The explanation begins with a clear identification of the ram and he-goat Daniel had seen (vs. 20-22). Neither Medo-Persia, nor Greece with its divided dominions extend even close to the Biblical time of the end. Then Gabriel explains the "little horn" as "a king of fierce countenance" with mighty power, who stands up against "the Prince of princes" (vs. 23-25). This was to be followed by the explanation of the 2300 evening mornings; but Daniel "fainted, and was sick certain days" (v. 27). However, when Gabriel returned after eleven years in response to Daniel's prayer, the first thing Gabriel advised Daniel was to "understand the matter, and consider the *mar'eh*" (9:23). That part of the vision - the evening-mornings - included "weeks" of prophetic years (9:24-26). There is no way that one can condense these "weeks" of years into 1150 literal days.

"Justified" or "Cleansed" - Which Word?

The KJV gives the answer of the "wonderful numberer" as "unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed" (8:13-14). The word translated "cleansed" is *nitsdaq*, a passive form of *tsadaq* (justified), which can be translated, as in the RSV, "shall be restored to its rightful state." If

"shall be cleansed" had been meant, the Hebrew word would have been, *taher*. While the RSV follows the Hebrew Massoretic Text, the KJV reflects the LXX and the Vulgate. It is also of interest to note that the NKJV still retains the translation, "shall be cleansed."

The ancient Hebrew alphabet was composed of only consonants. It was in this form that the part of the Old Testament in Hebrew was written. The form in which the Hebrew text of the Old Testament is now presented to us is, in all manuscripts that of the Massoretic text, "the date of which is placed somewhere between the 6th and 8th centuries. It is probable that the present text became fixed as early as the 2nd century A.D., but even this earlier date leaves long intervals between the original autographs of the Old Testament writers and our present text."

"The Massoretic text was the work of a special guild of trained scholars whose objective was to not only preserve and transmit the consonantal text which had been handed down to them, but also to ensure its proper pronunciation. To this end they provided the text with a complete system of vowel points and accents."

Several centuries earlier than the Massoretic text was the Septuagint (LXX) which evidently had access to earlier manuscripts for Daniel than used by the Massoretic scholars. The LXX reads for Daniel 8:14 - "shall be cleansed" - καθαρισθησεται - the same word as is used in Leviticus 16:30 in stating the ceremonial objective of the typical Day of Atonement. Jerome, centuries later, appears to have followed the LXX in the Vulgate translation of the Old Testament rather than the Hebrew text, using the Latin word, *mundabitur* - "shall be cleansed."

There are Jewish scholars of the past century who maintain that the Hebrew portions of Daniel are translations from the Aramaic originals. (Aramaic was the official language of the Persian Empire, and was widely used in the Babylonian period.) Based on that assumption, H. Louis Ginsberg, Sabato Morais Professor of Bible at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America cites evidences of faulty translations from the Aramaic to the Hebrew including Daniel 8:14. He holds the Aramaic would have read - "the sanctuary will become cleansed." (*Studies in Daniel*, pp. 41-42). Thus in three languages - the Aramaic, Greek, and the Ecclesiastical Latin, the word in Daniel 8:14 is "cleansed" and when properly associated with *tamid*, can only be linked to the symbolical services of the sanctuary.

[The factual data on the Massoretic Text quoted and summarized above is taken from the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, article, "Bible."]

537 BC or 457 BC

When Gabriel returns to fulfil his commission, to "make this man to understand the vision (*mar'eh*)" (8:15), he notes as the beginning date for the 2300 prophetic days, "the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem" (9:25). Cottrell comments:

It is of crucial importance to note that Gabriel explicitly identifies the "word" that "went out to restore and build Jerusalem" at the commencement of the seventy weeks of years as "the word" that "went out" - in heaven - while Daniel was praying. That "word" was obviously one that only God Himself (and not an earthly monarch) could possibly have issued! On the authority of no less a person than the angel Gabriel, the "seventy weeks" of years thus began in 537 BC, not eighty years later in 457 BC! (pp. 18-19).

Cottrell identifies, the "first year of Darius" (9:1), the time Daniel was praying as exactly 70 years from the destruction of Jerusalem, which would be the exact time that Jeremiah had prophesied to be the period of Judah's captivity (Jer. 25:11). With this there is no question, but is Cottrell's conclusion justified in the light of other Scriptures on this same "commandment to restore and build Jerusalem"? The Bible does teach a comparative approach to the interpretation of the Word of God. (This we will note later.) In Ezra, the same "commandment of the God of Israel" as Gabriel revealed to Daniel is noted; however, there is an "and" added. The text reads:

And the elders of the Jews . . . builded and finished (the city of Jerusalem), according to the commandment of the God of Israel, and according to the commandment of Cyrus, and Darius, and Artaxerxes king of Persia. (6:14; emphasis supplied)

Ezra clearly understood that while the God of heaven gave the "word," to accomplish the objective, the decrees of three Persian kings were required to accomplish the Divine intent. It is also of interest to note that the decree of Artaxerxes in 457 BC is copied in full in the sacred text. (7:11-26). This decree restored complete judicial power to be

exercised by Ezra with authority to appoint judges and magistrates. Ezra also received the power of taxation to sustain the restored priestly state of Israel "according to the law of God" as interpreted and ministered by him. With the date of this decree, in 457 BC, the "seventy weeks" of the word given to Daniel by Gabriel begin.

Biblical Hermeneutics

Peter tells us that we should first know, "that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation" (II. 1:20). We dare not impose on the Word of God our own concepts of how they are to be interpreted. The Bible itself contains instructions as to its interpretation. Paul told the church at Corinth that he did not speak "in words taught by human reason, but in the words taught by the Holy Spirit, with spiritual things spiritual things comparing" (I. 2:13, Young's Literal Translation). This hermeneutical tool could be called the Comparison Method. Any book on the Harmony of the Gospels follows this method. The simplest of illustrations can be noted by comparing Luke 21:5-7; Matthew 24:3-4, and Mark 13:3-4. Luke tells us that "some" called Jesus' attention to the adornment of the temple building, to which Jesus replied that not one stone would be left upon another in its destruction. "They" then asked Him when these things would occur. Who were the "they"? Mathew tells us the "they" were "the disciples." But which ones? Mark says that Peter, James, John, and Andrew were the questioners.

By following this same Biblical method, Cottrell would not have blundered by suggesting a different date for the beginning of the 70 weeks in the place of the established 457 BC. When we seek to impose our own interpretative method on the Word of God instead of what the "Spirit of Christ" intended in giving the revelation, we wander far from truth.

It was God's objective for the priests to be instruments through which He could teach the laity of Israel, His will and purposes. Malachi stated it well, when he wrote:

For the priest's lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at His mouth: for he is the messenger of the Lord of hosts. (2:7).

In the days of Isaiah, the priests and prophets had corrupted the services of the Lord. Because of

unrestrained drunkenness, they erred "in vision and stumble(d) in judgment." The prophet described the filthiness of their debauchery, and then asked a question: "Whom shall He teach knowledge? and whom shall He make to understand doctrine?" In the answer given, it is clear that God would choose mature persons who are capable of understanding more than elementary concepts. (28:7-9) This same concept between "milk" and "strong meat" is found in the book of Hebrews (5:12-14). In giving the "strong meat" God outlines to Isaiah the methodology. He writes:

For precept must be upon precept, precept upon precept; line upon line, line upon line; here a little and there a little. (28:10)

Paul used this interpretative method in proving the doctrine that all men are under sin (Rom. 3:9). He gathers together eight verses in six different chapters from three books of the Old Testament (3:10-18). One can check the location for each reference by using the marginal notations on these verses. I find no evidence where Paul in quoting from the Old Testament, which he did frequently, used the "historical" method in interpreting the Scripture as advocated by Dr. Cottrell. One example of Paul's interpretation of Scripture, cited on page 2, col. 2, reveals some of his methodology. He lifted from "the law of Moses" a regulation, and gave it a spiritual application. He used the experiences from the wilderness wanderings of Israel as types "for our admonition upon whom the ends of the world are come" (I Cor. 10:11).

Paul, in writing to Timothy, advised him to show himself "approved unto God," by "rightly dividing the word of truth" (II. 2:15). This careful interpreting of the Word of God by recognizing the time element within a given text, is well illustrated in the way Jesus Christ Himself used the Old Testament as He taught the people. Being given the scroll of the prophet Isaiah one Sabbath morning in Nazareth, He selected what is now identified as 61:1-2. What He did not say is as important as what He did say. He did not give the "historical" setting of the text that He read, but singled out the verses and declared, "This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears" (Luke 4:21). He lifted this passage of Scripture direct from its context and declared that at that very moment it had significance and meaning. Was the context of these verses also in fulfillment? No, Jesus divided the word of truth. The present format of our Bibles indicates that He stopped reading in the middle of verse 2. And rightly

so, as the remainder reads - "and the day of vengeance of our God; to comfort all that mourn."

These Biblical methods - comparing one text with another; compiling, bringing texts of kindred thought together for a determination of truth; dividing rightly within a single text that which is meaningful in its application for a given time - makes the Bible a living book, and not just a dead letter as the Old Testament had become to the scribes of Christ's day. See Matt. 7:28-29.

Obscurantism and Historicism

Cottrell, after quoting a dictionary definition of obscurantism gives, his use of the word in relationship to the "sanctuary doctrine." He alleges that men in high places have made "presumably authoritative decisions" regarding the doctrine "without first weighing all the available evidence on the basis of sound, recognized principles of exegesis, and basing conclusions exclusively" on that evidence. (p. 31). He names three of them, and charges that they led the church into a Decade of Obscurantism from 1969-1979. He maintains that it is still alive today. Intermingled with his review of recent church history and men connected with it, is his insistence on the application of the *sola Scriptura* principle to all Biblical exegesis. This is as it should be in determining doctrinal truth, but his inference that it is not being done is not clearly defined.

The "sanctuary doctrine" rests on a firm Biblical foundation. God asked Moses to make a sanctuary "after [the] pattern, which was shewed [him] in the mount" (Ex. 25:40). The book of Hebrews declares that the priests who ministered in this sanctuary, "serve(d) unto the example and shadow of heavenly things" (Heb. 8:5), and then the verse from Exodus is quoted. It is simply a type and antitype exegesis.

Sanctuary terms are used in Daniel 8. Three times the word, "sanctuary" occurs. Once in verse 11, the word is *miqdash*, the same word as is used in Exodus 25:8. The other two times, Daniel 8:13, 14) the word is *qadesh*, the root of *miqdash*. The question then is: Do these words refer to the same sanctuary, or are two different sanctuaries referred to in the vision, the heavenly as well as the earthly? Another sanctuary word is *tamid*, which is used either as an adjective, or an adverb, but in the book of Daniel it is used as a substantive. The first use of this word as an adjective in the Bible is in connection with the services of the sanctuary. (Ex. 29:42). The question is: Does this

word relate to the sanctuary in Daniel as it is used in Exodus and Leviticus, referring to the daily ministration? Then there is the word, "cleansed" in verse 14, which is definitely sanctuary related - "then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." In the translation of verse 14, both the KJV and NKJV stand on good textual authority in choosing the word, "cleansed" over, "justified," or "restored to its rightful state."

Cottrell in writing of the method of prophetic interpretation used by the Church, - the historicist principle - quotes a source which states that "Seventh-day Adventists stand virtually alone as exponents" of this principle today (p. 39). The reason for this is clearly given by Dr. Kai Arasola in his doctoral dissertation at the University of Uppsala - The End of Historicism. The failure of the Millerite prediction does not invalidate the hermeneutic. The error was not in the method of interpretation, but in the misunderstanding of the meaning of the sanctuary itself. Until Dr. Desmond Ford projected his apotelesmatic principle of interpretation - multiple fulfillment's of the same prophecy - there were three other schools of interpretation beside the historicist method, two by Jesuits, Alcazar and Ribera, the preteristic and futuristic, and an allegorical approach used by Origen one of the Church Fathers.

Following the Glacier View confrontation with Dr. Ford, the General Conference appointed a Daniel and Revelation Committee which functioned under the Biblical Research Institute during the 1980s. In the conclusions of this committee they reaffirmed the historicist principle of prophetic interpretation. Cottrell forthrightly confesses that this "is the crux of the issue to which [his] paper is addressed" (p. 39). This leaves us with but one basic issue - the issue of what method of interpretation is to be used in understanding the Bible - in this instance, the prophecies of the Bible, and the specific prophecy of Daniel 8:14. I choose the time proven principle of historicism in the study of Bible prophecy. For my part, I confess the Biblically based "Sanctuary Doctrine" confirmed by Hebrews 8:5 KJV to be an asset!

Historical Footnote - In the January 1967, issue of the *Ecumenical Review*, official organ of the World Council of Churches, was an article on "The Seventh-day Adventist Church." To this article, Raymond F. Cottrell, then an associate editor of the *Review & Herald*, responded in three editorials, March 23, 30, & April 6. In the last editorial, Cottrell concluded:

It is no small measure of regret that SDA's do not find it possible, as an organization, to be more closely associated with others who profess the name of Christ. On the other hand, if the Secretariat of Faith and Order, for instance, were to invite SDA's to appoint some one competent in that area to meet with their group from time to time and represent the SDA point of view, we could accept such an invitation with a clear conscience.

The invitation was not long in coming. The Central Committee of the WCC, with the approval of the General Conference, appointed Dr. Earle Hilgert of Andrews University to the Commission, and he was able to attend the triennial meeting of the Commission in Bristol, England, July 30 to August 8 of that year.

The stated aim of this Commission is "to proclaim the oneness of the Church of Jesus Christ and to call the churches to the goal of visible unity in one faith, and one eucharistic fellowship, expressed in worship and common life in Christ, in order that the world might believe." (By-Laws) [Paper # 111, p. viii].

#

++++

Comment (Re: XXXV - 5(02) - Your latest rendition on B.B. Beach and his activities was superb. Praise God! I must admit as I read it I shouted a joyous "AMEN," chuckling all the way home. It was a breath of fresh air after suffocating from Roy Adams' piece in the *Review*. Florida

++++

"Watchman, What of the Night?" is published monthly by the Adventist Laymen's Foundation of Mississippi, Inc., P. O. Box 69, Ozone, AR 72854, USA.

Editor, Publications & Research

Elder Wm. H. Grotheer

Regional Contacts:

Australia - P. O. Box 5023, Wodonga Plaza, VIC 3690

Canada - P. O. Box 117, Thorne, ON POH 2J0

The Caribbean - P. O. Box GM 537, Castries, St. Lucia

Any portion of the Thought Paper may be reproduced without further permission by adding the credit line - "Reprinted from WWN, Ozone, Arkansas, USA."

Current copy free upon request; previous and duplicate copies - 50c.

800-4-LAYMEN (800-452-9636)

FAX - (479) 292-3745; Regular Calls - (479) 292-3721