


1844

MADE SIMPLE

101

By the best-selling author of
The "Saving" of America.



CLIFFORD GOLDSTEIN



CLIFFORD GOLDSTEIN



Pacific Press® Publishing Association
Nampa, Idaho
Oshawa, Ontario, Canada

Edited by Randy Maxwell/Lincoln Steed
Designed by Tim Larson
Cover by Lars Justinen
Prophetic charts by Mark Winchester
Type set in 10/12 Century Schoolbook

Copyright © 1988 by
Pacific Press® Publishing Association
Printed in United States of America
All Rights Reserved

The author assumes full responsibility for the accuracy of all
facts and quotations cited in this book.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 88-61586

ISBN 0-8163-0798-9

To David Mills,
wherever he is.

Table of Contents

Part One: *1844 Made Simple*

Chapter One	7
Chapter Two	14
Chapter Three	17
Chapter Four	20
Chapter Five	30
Chapter Six	43

Part Two: *Answers to Objections*

Chapter Seven	57
Chapter Eight	65
Chapter Nine	74

Part Three: *Investigating the Judgment*

Chapter Ten	81
Chapter Eleven	88

Part One: *1844 Made Simple*

Chapter One

I'll never forget the thrill of emerging from the darkness of agnosticism, skepticism—even spiritualism—into the light of the three angels' messages. The Lord lifted me from sin, from death, from the alienation and emptiness that suffuses a life estranged from God—and elevated me not only into a knowledge of Jesus, but into Adventism, into present truth, into the most important movement since the Protestant Reformation.

Yet all was not well in Zion. I joined Adventism amidst rumblings, rumors, and rebellion—though, in my newborn innocence, most of it passed me by. Oblivious, I was a smiling baby unaware of the bitter lessons of life.

I had been an Adventist three months when a friend told me about an SDA professor out West who denied the 1844 investigative judgment.

"Who cares?" I replied.

I had seen the charts, had read about 1844, and believed it because Ellen White believed it, and I believed in what she believed. But who cared? All I ever talked about my first six months as an Adventist was the mark of the beast, anyway. I gave dozens of studies on the mark of the beast. I told everyone about the mark of the beast. I even wrote graffiti on bathroom walls about the mark of the beast. 1844? It seemed irrelevant.

In early 1981, I arrived in my first Adventist community.

Here, the rumors about 1844 and the sanctuary controversy did more than rumble—they roared! It was the conversation at breakfast, lunch, dinner, and between meals. Though I didn't understand what the hoopla was about, I knew one thing: *Nothing would shake me.*

But then people confronted me with questions: How do you get an 1844 investigative judgment out of Daniel 8:14? How do you know that the day-year principle is valid? And if valid, why apply it to the 2300 days? How do you tie Daniel 8 and 9 together? Why is there no verbal link between the word for *cleansed* (which only the KJV uses) in Daniel 8, with the word for *cleansed* in Leviticus 16, which has a different Hebrew root? How do you know that the 2300 evenings and mornings of Daniel 8 aren't 1150 days, not 2300 days, as at least one translation has it? Can't you see how the book of Hebrews puts Christ in the second apartment long before 1844? Is not Antiochus Epiphanes the little horn of Daniel 8? And by the way, did you know how much Ellen White really copied?

I had no answers, and those whom I expected to have them—didn't either! People everywhere attacked the doctrine, or at least expressed skepticism about it. I felt like the doctor in *The Invasion of the Body Snatchers*, a TV movie I had seen as a child. Aliens descended upon a town and took over the people's minds. Though the people looked and talked the same, they had become aliens. The doctor's family, friends, almost the whole town, had been taken over. Everywhere the doctor turned, one after another, the people were "converted." He didn't know whom to trust, where to turn. He was the only one who escaped.

But I didn't escape! I became one of them. I no longer believed in the 1844 investigative judgment. I just couldn't get it out of the Bible, and the implications of that conclusion staggered me! I never realized, until then, just how much of our message is linked to 1844. Instantly, my faith in the Adventist message crumbled.

The first thing that absolutely had to go was Ellen White. If 1844 is not biblical, Ellen White belonged in the same class as

Mary Baker Eddy and Joseph Smith.

I questioned the idea of Adventism as the remnant church. If 1844 wasn't biblical, the church wasn't either.

I began to wonder about just how important the law, particularly the Sabbath, really was.

I started to question—even the mark of the beast!

Was my whole experience with God a fluke too?

I poured out my soul in prayer, pleading for truth. If this message was not true, I wanted out. I hadn't been an Adventist that long, the church didn't mean that much to me then, plus I never really liked being a vegetarian either. My aggressive search for truth led me to Adventism, but if the search was to lead me somewhere else—I was ready.

I went back to where the problem started—this 1844 thing. If I couldn't get it out of the Bible—without any Ellen White (at that point she had become about as authoritative to me as was the *Tibetan Book of the Dead*)—I would pack my bags and go back to Israel, where I was living when I first became a believer in Jesus. Simple logic told me that if 1844 is not biblical, Adventism was a cult.

So I prayed, I studied, I buried myself in my Bible. I sought for an understanding of truth, because I knew the direction of my whole life, possibly even my eternal life, was at stake. And I used no Ellen White.

A few weeks later, I finished. My conclusion: *If you were to use the Old Testament—without the New—you would have as much evidence for an 1844 investigative judgment as you would for Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah!*

Before, when I had read Daniel 8, I couldn't imagine how anyone could see the judgment; but now, after my study, when I looked at Daniel 8, I couldn't imagine how anyone could *not* see the judgment!

I had suddenly been born again—*again!* The doubt, the uncertainty, the heaviness lifted. I felt as if I had been cured from a disease. I was more convicted of Adventism than I had been when I first came to the Adventist community, and only now did I realize just how weak my grounding had been.

Instantly, all the doubt about Ellen White vanished. I

thought, "Surely, that old woman knew exactly what she was talking about!" Since that time, I have never questioned Ellen White as a prophet; instead, my confidence in the 1844 truth has allowed me to see her as one of the greatest prophets of them all!

My understanding of 1844 gave me a new experience with Jesus, with Adventism, and with the spirit of prophecy. Once I saw just how biblical 1844 was, I knew that this church was everything it claimed to be, and all the doubts about the law, the Sabbath, everything—were obliterated.

Despite apostasies, despite our Laodicean malaise, despite scandals, despite anything and everything that happens within the church itself, the 1844 teaching proves beyond question that the Seventh-day Adventist Church is the remnant church of Bible prophecy and our message is present truth. The 1844 judgment—more than the state of the dead, the Sabbath, the second coming—establishes the validity of Adventism. All those other doctrines are accepted by some other people, but Adventists are the only people who have the 1844 investigative judgment truth. Until you see the truth of 1844, realizing that Adventists are the only ones who teach it, you will never fully understand our calling, our purpose, or our mission.

I had been forced to learn the message—or leave it. For me, there was no middle ground. And how thankful I am that the same God who took me from not even believing in God, to believing in God; who took me from all the world religions, to Christianity; and from all the denominations within Christianity, to Adventism—how thankful I am that He saved me from that apostasy.

Yet, I soon noticed that almost every Adventist I met—young or old, converts or lifers, male or female, white or black, in the East or the West, liberal or conservative—almost none could get 1844 out of the Bible. And most didn't care, either! They didn't think it was important.

I have stood in front of churches of 300 people and asked, "How many of you here could give a Bible study to someone on 1844 and the investigative judgment without using Ellen

White?" Time and again, maybe two or three hands would go up. The mass of American Adventism couldn't give an intelligent study on that doctrine if their eternal destiny depended upon it. Chances are that you reading this book couldn't give a study on 1844, or give clear answers to the arguments brought against it. You probably haven't heard a sermon on it or read about it in years.

You can be converted. You can be a loyal tithe-paying, Vegelink-eating Adventist. You can give Bible studies, win souls, be a loving and lovable Christian. But if you are not grounded in the 1844 doctrine—if you don't have at least a rudimentary understanding of that teaching—then you are *ill*-prepared for the time of trouble and the shaking. Had I, with my superficial understanding of 1844, faced the time of trouble, I would have been swept away like a leaf in a tornado.

I'm not talking salvation by theology. The date 1844, or an understanding of it, does not save us. But if 1844 is not biblical, our message is false—we are a false church teaching a false message and leading people down a false path. Either 1844 is true and we have truth, or it's false and we have inherited and peddled lies.

Perhaps you have never been confronted with this issue or have never thought it out. You will one day. We have been warned that *everything that can be shaken will be shaken*, and as a people, we don't even begin to comprehend what that shaking will entail. Sooner or later our faith will be stretched to the limits. Everything we believe will be scrutinized. We must be able to give answers for the hope that is within us, or we won't have any hope to answer for.

The devil will come at us from all directions, seeking any opening, attacking any weak area, all in an effort to turn us away from this truth. And you can be sure that 1844 will be a prime target. It will be hard enough to stay faithful when you lose your job, your home, when you can't buy food—if you believe the message. But imagine all this external pressure, even threats against your life, while you seriously doubt the truth of Adventism to begin with! If someone can shake your faith in 1844, you will doubt the whole message; and if you

doubt the message, how will you be able to stand?

Who would die, or even greatly suffer, for a message that they doubt? Who would allow their children to go hungry or be taken away for a belief whose basic foundation they seriously question or can't prove from the Bible? You don't have to be a theologian, but people do perish for a lack of knowledge, and with all this truth within our grasp, we will have no excuses for not understanding it.

The 1844 investigative judgment, the theological pillar of our movement, sits as a dusty relic in the Adventist family closet. We know it's there, we all know about it, but nobody bothers with it. We're not sure what to do with 1844. We're not sure what it means or if we really want it. And we're not even sure if it's all that important (as the paucity of sermons, articles, and books about it reveals). Yet once it goes, Adventism goes too. How clever of the devil to have us set aside our most basic doctrine. He knows that once he kicks it out from under us, we crumble and crash. He's just waiting for the right moment to take out as many Adventists as he can.

I'm not talking theory or speculation—but experience. I know what will happen to those who are not grounded in this message because it happened to me—under circumstances that were pathetically easy compared to what the church will soon face. No one threatened me with death or economic boycotts or jail because of my beliefs, and yet I almost abandoned them anyway.

But now, I have seen how much confidence, strength, and surety an understanding of this truth has given me. The 1844 teaching gives irrefutable assurance that Adventism is the truth for this time, which is why the enemy has gone to such great lengths to minimize it—and why I panic over his blatant success.

In 1986, I did a series of tapes for American Cassette Ministries entitled "1844 Made Simple." I used research from the best theologians in Adventism—men who have made mincemeat of most, if not all, of the arguments against 1844. Yet most Adventists have never heard of their works or their books, much less read them. Plus, the material is deep and

theological, and many of us would rather sit in front of the TV than study our message. I took their material (mostly from volumes 1, 2, and 3 of the Daniel and Revelation Committee series), simplified it, and have given seminars in churches and camp meetings.

This book is based on those tapes. It has been written to present the doctrine of the 1844 investigative judgment in the simplest and clearest manner possible, in the belief that an understanding of that doctrine is crucial not only to an understanding of Adventism, but crucial for our people to be prepared to meet the coming crisis.

The book is divided into three sections. The first is the study of how to get the date out of the Bible; the second answers many of the arguments used against the investigative judgment; the third section answers the question, What does the investigative judgment really mean?

One final note. I use *no* Ellen White. Some argue that Ellen White was not a theologian, and therefore no good for theology. I suppose, in the classical sense of the word, she wasn't a theologian—*she was a prophet!* and I would take the word of a prophet over any theologian, any time. Yet we must not base our understanding of 1844 on her. Don't use Ellen White to get solid on the Bible. Get solid on the Bible, and you'll get solid on her. Base 1844 on the Bible, and you'll stand unmovable on Ellen White. Use her as your base for 1844, and both will crumble.

I know.

Chapter Two

Did the investigative judgment occur in A.D. 31, or after? The answer makes or breaks Adventism. If, as some within our ranks have claimed, the judgment occurred in A.D. 31—with the ascension of Jesus to the “right hand of God” in heaven—then the doctrine of the 1844 investigative judgment is what our opponents have been saying for over a century: nothing but a face-saving gimmick concocted by disgruntled Millerites who had to weasel their way out of the great disappointment.

Did, then, the judgment occur in A.D. 31? Read the following texts:

“He hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man who he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead.” Acts 17:31.

“He reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come.” Acts 24:25.

“God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel.” Romans 2:16.

“Why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ. For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God. So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God.” Romans 14:10-12.

"The Lord shall judge his people." Hebrews 10:30.

These few texts have a number of things in common. The first, and most obvious, is that they are from the New Testament: Hebrews, Acts, Romans.

They are also talking about judgment.

But where in time do they place this judgment? In the past, or the future? "The Lord *shall* judge his people." "We *shall* all stand before the judgment seat of Christ." Obviously, these texts are referring to some type of future judgment, and a few deal directly with a judgment of God's people.

So what do we have? New Testament texts, some of which refer to a *future* judgment of *Christians*. And because the books of the New Testament were written ten, twenty, thirty years after the cross, and because these texts point to a judgment that is to occur after they themselves were written, then—obviously—this judgment must occur sometime after A.D. 31.

This point, though simple, is crucial—for the crux of the heresy that has undermined Adventism places the judgment at the cross. These texts, however, show the fallacy of placing the *judgment of believers* in A.D. 31. While they don't give the date, they at least show that A.D. 31 is not it.

What about the text, "Now is the judgment of this world" (John 12:31), which Jesus spoke in reference to His impending death? Do not those words indicate that the judgment occurred at the cross?

Certainly, in one sense, a judgment did occur at the death of Jesus on the cross. Here the spotless Son of God came to the earth in human flesh, poured out all the love of heaven upon humanity, only to be rejected and despised of men. The whole world stands condemned for the death of Jesus. In this sense, yes, a judgment occurred at the cross—but not the *investigative* judgment.

The Bible talks of various types of judgments. The earth came under judgment after Adam's sin. The flood was a judgment against mankind. Ancient Israel faced numerous judgments. Men will face a judgment when Jesus returns to the earth. We will be involved in a millennial judgment, when we

“shall judge angels.” 1 Corinthians 6:3. There will be the executive judgment, when the wicked are consumed forever: “Whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire.” Revelation 20:15.

But what type of judgment were some of the texts quoted above referring to? Paul said that “we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ.” Paul included himself in that judgment. Paul was a believer. To whom was he writing? To other believers. They all, including Paul, were to be judged by God. Indeed, “The Lord shall judge his people.”

When, then, are believers judged? According to the few texts we just read, believers must face some type of judgment, and that judgment must occur sometime after A.D. 31. And this judgment is what Adventists refer to as the investigative judgment.

Chapter Three

Though we can see that the judgment of God's people occurs after A.D. 31, we're still a long way off from narrowing it down to 1844. To do so, we go to the book of Daniel, starting in chapter 2.

Most Adventists are familiar with Daniel 2. King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon had a dream, yet he couldn't remember (much less interpret) it. The magicians, astrologers, sorcerers, and Chaldeans of Babylon offered to interpret it, if the king would just tell them the dream. The king, however, wanted them not only to interpret the dream, but to tell him the contents. "There is not a man upon the earth," exclaimed the Chaldeans, "that can shew the king's matter: therefore there is no king, lord, nor ruler, that asked such things at any magician, or astrologer, or Chaldean." Verse 10.

Angry, the king planned to do away with the whole lot of them, including Daniel. Soon, however, the answer that the king sought was given to Daniel in a "night vision," and he recounted it to the king.

The dream, of course, was of the "great image." The head was of gold, the breast and arms of silver, belly and thighs of brass, the legs of iron, and the feet part iron and part clay. Eventually, a huge stone "smote the image upon his feet that were of iron and clay, and brake them to pieces. Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold, broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing floors; and the wind carried them away, that no

place was found for them: and the stone that smote the image became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth." Verses 34, 35.

Daniel, then, interprets the dream. He tells the king that his kingdom, Babylon, is the head of gold. Afterward another kingdom shall arise (silver), then another (brass), and then another (iron). The iron kingdom will break apart (part iron and part clay) into small powers that will "not cleave one to another, even as iron is not mixed with clay." Verse 43. The stone cut out without hands is the kingdom that God will set up, and it will stand forever.

We know that the first kingdom was Babylon. Daniel names it as such. History reveals that the next kingdom is Media-Persia, the third Greece, and the iron is Rome. The iron and clay mingled is the breakup of the Roman Empire into the nations of Europe (some have interpreted the iron and clay as church and state attempting to mix, which certainly happened during most of European history). These kingdoms came to power in this exact order—even though Daniel prophesied hundreds of years before the events took place. The kingdom that God will set up comes after the second coming of Jesus.

Daniel 2, therefore, looks like this:

Gold	Babylon
Silver	Media-Persia
Brass	Greece
Iron	Pagan Rome
Iron/Clay	Europe
Stone	Christ's second coming

Two important points must be noted. First, Daniel 2 forms the basic outline for the rest of the apocalyptic (end of the world) prophecies that we will study in Daniel. In other words, the rest of the apocalyptic prophecies elaborate on what is found in Daniel 2. Daniel 2 is the base; the other prophetic chapters, adding detail, fit within the basic time frame of

CHAPTER THREE 19

Daniel 2, which starts with Babylon and ends at the second coming of Jesus. The nations described in later chapters are, as we will see, basically the same ones described in Daniel 2.

The other important point deals with the various metals in the dream. Babylon was gold, Media-Persia was silver, Greece bronze, and Rome iron. Each succeeding kingdom had a different metal to describe it. Yet Rome, symbolized by the iron, goes all the way through until the end of time. The iron of Rome comes up immediately after Greece, moves down until it mixes with clay, yet it is still iron, just in a different form. "His legs of iron, his feet part of iron and part of clay." Verse 33. The point is that the iron, which symbolizes Rome, extends from the fall of Greece until the stone crushes everything at the second coming of Jesus. At first, the iron was pure; later it becomes mixed with clay. Nevertheless it is still iron. The significance of this point will be seen later.

Let's review:

We have seen that the judgment of God's people occurs sometime *after* A.D. 31.

Daniel 2, with its succession of kingdoms—Babylon, Media-Persia, Greece, and Rome (two phases), precedes the second coming of Jesus and forms the basic prophetic outline for the rest of the apocalyptic prophecies of Daniel.

And finally, we have seen that the iron of Rome, which comes up after Greece, extends until the end of time, though at some point, it changes form.

Chapter Four

Which chapter in Daniel gives the most information concerning the investigative judgment?

Most people would answer, Daniel 8. Here we have the crucial text: "He said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." Daniel 8:14.

Yet that answer is wrong. Though Daniel 8 does reveal important information, it's crucial only because it is needed to give the date of the judgment. Actually, the most information in Daniel about the investigative judgment is found in Daniel 7. If all we had was Daniel 7 alone, we would be able to prove a preadvent judgment of believers, as well as give the approximate time of that judgment.

Daniel 7 repeats Daniel 2, only more details are given. In this chapter, Daniel himself dreams of four great beasts coming out of the sea. The first beast was like a lion; the second beast was like a bear; the third beast was like a leopard, though it had four wings and four heads; and the fourth beast was "dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly; and it had great iron teeth: it devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it: and it was diverse from all the beasts that were before it; and it had ten horns." Verses 4-7.

Who are these beasts? In the explanation of the vision, Daniel is told that they represent four kings, or kingdoms, that will arise, and that the "fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon the earth." Verse 23. The first beast—the lion—

we know is Babylon. The second beast—the bear—symbolizes Media-Persia. Being lopsided (“it raised up itself on one side”) shows the imbalance of power between the two nations of that empire. The “three ribs in the mouth of it between the teeth of it” (verse 5) are seen as Lydia, Babylon, and Egypt—three nations crushed by the Media-Persian power. The leopard was the next great world empire, symbolizing the Greeks under Alexander the Great. The fourth beast, of course, was the last great empire: the Roman.

For centuries, numerous Bible expositors, Jewish and Christian, have agreed on this exact sequence of nations symbolized by these beasts. This interpretation is *not* exclusively Adventist.

Notice, too, that the prophecy of Daniel 7 is similar to Daniel 2. Daniel 7 gives more details than Daniel 2, which is the foundation of the rest of the prophecies that we will study.

In both Daniel 2 and 7, emphasis is placed on the fourth kingdom. And in both chapters, the fourth kingdom—though symbolized by different things—share similarities. The first, of course, is that they are the fourth power in succession in each vision. Both also come up after Greece. Both are described as “strong.” Daniel 2:40; 7:7. Both have the word *iron* used in their descriptions. See Daniel 2:40; 7:7, 19. Both kingdoms are described as breaking in pieces other powers. See Daniel 2:40; 7:19, 23. And both powers become divided by “kings,” or kingdoms. Daniel 2:41, 44; 7:24. Clearly, they describe the same power.

Yet in Daniel 7, another power appears. This power is not separate from the fourth beast, pagan Rome; instead, it comes directly from among the ten horns that are part of the fourth beast. This power is the little horn. “I considered the horns, and, behold, there came up among them another little horn, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots: and, behold, in this horn were eyes like the eyes of man, and a mouth speaking great things.” Verse 8.

This little horn power is mentioned again as coming up out of the fourth beast. “Of the ten horns that were in his head, and of the other which came up, and before whom three fell;

even of that horn that had eyes, and a mouth that spake great things, whose look was more stout than his fellows. I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them." Verses 20, 21.

A few verses later, the fourth beast and the little horn are interpreted. "The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth, which shall be diverse from all kingdoms, and shall devour the whole earth, and shall tread it down, and break it in pieces. And the ten horns out of this kingdom are ten kings that shall arise: and another shall rise after them; and he shall be diverse from the first, and he shall subdue three kings. And he shall speak great words against the most High, and shall wear out the saints of the most High, and think to change times and laws: and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time." Verses 23-25.

In Daniel we saw that the iron was the power that came up after Greece, and though it changed form, it was still iron until the end. It was still the same power. In Daniel 7, we had a separate beast for Babylon, a separate beast for Media-Persia, a separate beast for Greece, and a separate beast for Rome. The little horn power was *part* of the fourth beast that came up right after Greece, yet it moves down toward the end of time in the little horn phase. The point is that in Daniel 7, just as in Daniel 2, the power that comes up after Greece remains until the time of the end, though in a different form. The importance of this point will be seen in the next chapter.

We see that the fourth beast, and the horn coming out of it, occupy a central place in Daniel 7. More time is spent on them than on the rest of the beasts combined, and more detail is given to the little horn itself than to any other beast, even the fourth. Obviously, the identification of the little horn power is crucial.

For centuries, Bible expositors have proved, beyond question, that the little horn symbolizes the papal power. And with good reason—it fits perfectly.

Most Adventists are familiar with this identification. Without going into detail here (much material is available on

the prophecy), let's review:

- First, the little horn power came up from pagan Rome. The papacy, of course, came up from pagan Rome.
- The little horn came up among the ten barbarian tribes that picked apart the pagan Roman Empire. The papacy came up among the ten tribes, uprooting three of them, just as verse 24 said it would ("he shall subdue three kings").
- The little horn power was described as "diverse" from the other little horns, and beyond question, the papacy—a unique power—differed from those barbarian tribes.
- The little horn power was to be "more stout" than the other horns, and certainly the papacy was more powerful than the barbarian tribes; otherwise it couldn't have uprooted three.
- The little horn power "shall speak great words against the most High." Papal claims regarding the role and power of the Pope are "great words" against God.
- The little horn power "made war with the saints," and history shows just how much war the papacy waged against God's people.
- The power shall "think to change times and laws." When I first studied this prophecy, I went to a Catholic school, asked for a catechism, and opened to the Ten Commandments. Just as I was taught—the commandment forbidding idol worship was deleted. Talk about changing a law! And, of course, all Adventists are familiar with the numerous papal claims about changing the Sabbath day from Saturday to Sunday, such as: "The Catholic Church for over one thousand years before the existence of a Protestant, by virtue of her divine mission, changed the day from Saturday to Sunday."—*The Catholic Mirror*, September 23, 1893.

The final identification mark, perhaps the most important, is that a time prophecy is given concerning the activity of the papacy. The saints shall be given into its hand "until a time and times and the dividing of time." Verse 25. In the description of the little horn, we have the *first apocalyptic time*

prophecy in the book of Daniel.

"Time and times and the dividing of time" is universally recognized by Jewish and Gentile scholars as meaning three and a half years. A time equals one year, times equals two years, and dividing of time is half a year. In Revelation 12, this same time period is given regarding the same power, and it is equated with "one thousand two hundred and threescore days" (verses 6, and 14), or 1260 days. In prophetic reckoning, three and half years equals 1260 days.

Daniel 7, then, marks off a time period of this little horn for three and a half years or 1260 days. For years, Adventists and others have applied the day-year principle to this prophecy. I don't want to get into the day-year principle now. In part two of this book I will show not only the validity of the day-year principle, but also how this principle must be applied in order for the prophecies of Daniel 7, 8, and 9 to make sense.

Anyway, if we apply the day-year principle to the 1260 days, we get 1260 years. Does it fit a time period for the papacy?

In 1698, Drue Cressner, a British Bible expositor studying the prophecies of Daniel 7 and Revelation, concluded: the little horn of Daniel referred to the papacy; the day-year principle needed to be applied to these prophecies; and something drastic was going to happen to the papacy about the year 1800. Or, in his own words, "The time of the beast does end about the year 1800" (quoted in LeRoy Froom, *The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers*, vol. II, p. 595).

We know that in A.D. 538, the last Arian power (one of the three uprooted horns) was run out of Rome, giving the papacy complete rule in the city. Exactly 1260 years later, in 1798, French General Berthier took the pope captive. You can read about the event in Catholic literature, describing the captivity of the pope, who died in exile at the hands of the French. (We know that although the papacy received a mortal blow, it later revived. Daniel 7, covering thousands of years in about a dozen verses, doesn't have time for details. Later, in the Revelation, especially chapter 13, we are given a closer look at what happened regarding the end of the 1260-year period and the papacy's revival.)

Drue Cressner, applying the prophecies to the papacy, predicted something would happen to it "*about the year 1800*"! *His prediction would be like someone in 1888 predicting who the president of the United States will be in 1988!*

The reason that he was so accurate, of course, is that the papacy fits this prophecy perfectly. For centuries, Protestants unanimously applied this prophecy to the papacy. Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, Melanchthon, all the Reformers for the next three centuries applied the little horn of Daniel 7 to the papacy. (For a quick study on why few Protestants apply this prophecy to the papacy today, see my booklet *Hands Across the Gulf*, Pacific Press, 1987.) Even prior to the Reformation, a Jewish scholar named Isaac Abravanel, having studied Daniel 7, wrote: "I have come to the inner conclusion that the little horn was the rule of the pope" (quoted in LeRoy Froom, *The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers*, vol. II, p. 228).

So far we have seen, in chronological order, Babylon, Media-Persia, Greece, pagan Rome and papal Rome. This is the exact sequence in Daniel 7:

Babylon

Media-Persia

Greece

Pagan Rome

Papal Rome

But what comes *after* papal Rome in the prophecy?

"I considered the horns, and, behold, there came up among them another little horn, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots: and, behold, in this horn were eyes like the eyes of man, and a mouth speaking great things. *I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool: his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire. A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him: thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand*

stood before him: the judgment was set, and the books were opened. . . . There was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." Verses 8-14.

Verse 8 describes the little horn power. What comes immediately after in verses 9 and 10? We see thrones "cast down" (or, better, "set up"). We see the "Ancient of days," who is recognized as God. We see fiery streams; we see "ten thousand times ten thousand" beings before Him, and finally—"the judgment was set, and the books were opened." Indeed, this scene depicts a judgment in heaven!

Read verses 8 through 10 again! Clearly, we see some type of divine judgment scene and, obviously, considering the description of what is happening, this judgment occurs in heaven.

And what follows this heavenly judgment scene? God sets up His kingdom—a kingdom "which shall not pass away." Verse 14. When does God ultimately set up this kingdom? At the second coming of Jesus.

Look at the specific *order* of events in these few verses. This part is crucial. We have this little horn power (which in all three descriptions comes up out of the fourth beast), then a judgment scene in heaven, and God sets up His kingdom last.

Little horn. Judgment in heaven. God sets up His kingdom. Read these verses again and again until you can see this sequence. It must be understood.

This sequence is so important that it is repeated again in the same chapter. "I beheld, and the same horn [Papacy] made war with the saints, and prevailed against them; *until the Ancient of days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the most High [judgment]; and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom [God's Kingdom].*" Verses 21, 22.

Again, in the exact chronological order as before: little horn (papacy), the judgment, and God's kingdom.

So important is this sequence that we have it a third time in the same chapter. "He shall speak great words against the

most High, and shall wear out the saints of the most High, and think to change times and laws: and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time. *But the judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion, to consume and to destroy it unto the end. And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the most high, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him.*" Verses 25-27.

Here we have a description of the little horn power, ending with the first apocalyptic time prophecy in Daniel, which delineates a phase of this little horn power. After the little horn we have the judgment. And, finally, God sets up His kingdom.

This sequence, found three times in Daniel 7, goes like this:

1. Papal Rome (little horn),
2. Judgment in heaven,
3. God's kingdom set up.

Let's look at the sequence that we have in all of chapter 7 paralleled to Chapter 2.

DANIEL 2

Babylon

Media-Persia

Greece

Rome (pagan)

Rome (Europe/papal)

God's kingdom

DANIEL 7

Babylon

Media-Persia

Greece

Rome (pagan)

Rome (papal)

Judgment in heaven

God's kingdom

We see from the above chart that everything happening in both Daniel 2 and Daniel 7 is chronological. It moves along a linear time line from past to future. Where does this order lo-

cate the judgment in heaven?

First was Babylon. After Babylon was Media-Persia. After Media-Persia was Greece. After Greece was Rome—pagan and papal. *After pagan and papal Rome comes the judgment in heaven.* And finally, God sets up His kingdom.

Clearly, the judgment occurs *after* this final phase of the little horn power depicted in the “time and times and the dividing of time” prophecy in Daniel 7—the first apocalyptic time prophecy in the book. When did this phase of the little horn power end?

Babylon ended in 539 B.C. *After* Babylon—*after* 539 B.C.—came Media-Persia. Media-Persia ended in 331 B.C. *After* Media-Persia—*after* 331 B.C.—came Greece. Greece ended in 168 B.C. *After* Greece—*after* 168 B.C.—came pagan and papal Rome. The end of that second phase of Rome ended in A.D. 1798. *After* Rome—*after* A.D. 1798—*comes the judgment scene in heaven!*

Can you see this point? After Babylon (539 B.C.) came Media-Persia. After Media-Persia (331 B.C.) came Greece. After Greece (168 B.C.) came Rome. After Rome (A.D. 1798) came the judgment in heaven. And after that judgment in heaven, God will set up His kingdom!

Babylon (539 B.C.)

Media-Persia (331 B.C.)

Greece (168 B.C.)

Pagan/Papal Rome (A.D. 1798)

Judgment in heaven

God's kingdom

I repeat for emphasis: after the “time and times and dividing of time” prophecy of the little horn, which ended in 1798, we have the judgment scene in heaven. The judgment, therefore, must occur *after* 1798!

We can see from Daniel 7 alone, that a judgment in heaven occurs after 1798, yet *before* the second coming of Jesus. And

these criteria fit our understanding of the 1844 investigative judgment, or what we sometimes call the preadvent judgment. Indeed, they fit perfectly.

Who is involved in this judgment? Verse 22 reads that "judgment was given to the saints of the most High." Other versions read that judgment was given "in behalf" of the saints, or "in favor" of the saints. Obviously, then, this judgment involves the saints; otherwise how could judgment be given in their behalf or in their favor? They are involved. How? They can't be doing the judging, because they are not yet in heaven (Christ hasn't returned yet). We saw in the first chapter that God's people will be judged sometime after A.D. 31 (the judgment of Daniel 7 fits that criterion). We see that this judgment is in their favor, and as a result of this judgment they get the kingdom. It seems that they themselves are being judged before the onlooking universe. And the outcome of that judgment is in their behalf.

Sound familiar? A judgment in heaven of believers, before the onlooking universe, that occurs near the end of time (after 1798). It should, because this scene describes the investigative judgment.

What have we learned so far? That—

1. Judgment of God's people occurs after A.D. 31;
2. Judgment of God's people occurs after 1798;
3. Judgment of God's people occurs before the second coming.

And while 1798 narrows the date down, we still need to lock it into 1844. Chapters 8 and 9 of Daniel will accomplish that goal for us.

Chapter Five

Daniel 8, we will see, repeats Daniel 7. Though some aspects of Daniel 7 are missing in Daniel 8, other aspects are elaborated upon. Nevertheless, the scenario for both chapters is similar.

Like Daniel 2 and 7, Daniel 8 is divided into two major sections: a prophetic dream or vision, then an explanation of that dream or vision. In Daniel 8, the first fourteen verses deal with a vision of a ram, a goat, a little horn, and then the cleansing of the sanctuary. The second half of the chapter—verses 15 to 27—explain the meaning of the ram, the goat, and the little horn. The cleansing of the sanctuary is not explained.

Let's look at the vision of Daniel 8.

"In the third year of the reign of king Belshazzar a vision appeared unto me, even unto me Daniel, after that which appeared unto me at the first." Verse 1.

Daniel has a vision during the reign of Belshazzar, who was king of Babylon. This vision, then, was given during the time of Babylon. What did Daniel see?

"I lifted up mine eyes, and saw, and, behold, there stood before the river a ram which had two horns: and the two horns were high; but one was higher than the other, and the higher came up last. I saw the ram pushing westward, and northward, and southward; so that no beasts might stand before him, neither was there any that could deliver out of his hand; but he did according to his will, and became great." Verses 3, 4.

Daniel, in vision, sees a ram with two horns. This ram moves in three directions, and no beast can stop it. The ram becomes "great."

The first part of Daniel's vision, then, is of a ram.

What next?

"And as I was considering, behold, an he goat came from the west on the face of the whole earth, and touched not the ground: and the goat had a notable horn between his eyes. And he came to the ram that had two horns, which I had seen standing before the river, and ran unto him in the fury of his power." Verses 5, 6.

Daniel saw next in the vision a he-goat that attacked the ram.

"And I saw him come close unto the ram, and he was moved with choler against him, and smote the ram, and brake his two horns: and there was no power in the ram to stand before him, but he cast him down to the ground, and stamped upon him: and there was none that could deliver the ram out of his hand. Therefore the he goat waxed very great: and when he was strong, the great horn was broken; and for it came up four notable ones toward the four winds of heaven." Verses 7, 8.

The he-goat, which had a notable horn between his eyes, destroys the ram that preceded him. This he-goat became "very great," yet the great horn is later broken and four "notable ones" appear in its place.

After the demise of the he-goat's horn, another power appears out of one of the four winds of heaven. "Out of one of them came forth a little horn, which waxed exceeding great, toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land. And it waxed great, even to the host of heaven; and it cast down some of the host and of the stars to the ground, and stamped upon them. Yea, he magnified himself even to the prince of the host, and by him the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down. And an host was given him against the daily sacrifice by reason of transgression, and it cast down the truth to the ground; and it practised, and prospered." Verses 9-12.

After the he-goat, this little horn appears. It moves in

various directions along the earth, but then it extends upward, "even to the host of heaven." It casts truth toward the ground, and it becomes "exceeding great."

So far, Daniel saw a ram, a he-goat, and then a little horn power.

What happens next in vision is that he hears two saints speaking, one asking the other about all the things that Daniel had seen. "How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot?" Verse 13. The reply is: "And he said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred days [or 2300 evenings and mornings]; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." Verse 14.

The vision ends with the sanctuary being cleansed! That is the last thing that happens in Daniel's vision—the time given for the cleansing of the sanctuary. After that, the vision is over. The important point here is that the vision ends with the sanctuary being cleansed.

Daniel's vision, then, could be shown like this:

Ram

He-goat

Little horn

Sanctuary cleansed

Read Daniel 8:1-14 *repeatedly* until you can see this sequence of events: *ram, he-goat, little horn, sanctuary cleansed*. It must be understood.

The first half of Daniel 8 gave the vision; the second half explains it. In Daniel 8:15-18, the angel Gabriel—after being told to "make this man to understand the vision"—comes to Daniel and says, "Understand, O son of man: for at the time of the end shall be the vision." Notice, Gabriel says that the vision shall be for "the time of the end"—a point so important that he tells him that same thing again in verse 19. "He said, Behold, I will make thee know what shall be in the last end of the indignation: for at the time appointed the end shall be."

Who were those beasts?

"The ram which thou sawest having two horns," says Gabriel, "are the kings of Media and Persia." Verse 20.

Media and Persia!

Haven't we seen that kingdom before? Was it not the silver of the statue in Daniel 2 and the bear of Daniel 7? Here we have it again, now symbolized as a ram. You don't have to take my word, or the word of history. The Bible names it for us!

Notice, too, a few parallels between the Media-Persian bear of Daniel 7 and the Media-Persian ram of chapter 8. Both beasts were asymmetrical: the bear was raised up on one side (7:5); correspondingly, the ram's horns were not of equal size, one being higher than the other (8:3). Also, the bear had three ribs in its mouth, believed to be Babylon, Egypt, and Lydia—three nations crushed by Media-Persia. The ram in Daniel 8 conquers in three directions: westward (Babylon), southward (Egypt), and northward (Lydia).

Now, the logical question: Where is Babylon? We have Babylon in Daniel 2 and 7, but what about 8? Though the vision of Daniel 8 starts out in the reign of Babylon, that nation is not mentioned in this prophecy. A common explanation is that Babylon was at the end of its time when the vision of Daniel 8 was given. Because it was soon to leave the scene of action, no need existed to delineate it. Though that answer has validity, a better answer exists. I will give that in the next chapter.

Anyway, the vision of Daniel 8 starts out with the ram, which symbolized the Media-Persian Empire. What about the he-goat that came next?

Says Gabriel: "The rough goat is the king of Grecia: and the great horn that is between his eyes is the first king. Now that being broken, whereas four stood up for it, four kingdoms shall stand up out of the nation, but not in his power." Verses 21, 22.

Greece!

Haven't we seen that kingdom before? Was it not the bronze of the statue in Daniel 2 and the leopard in chapter 7? The first king is obviously Alexander the Great, who brought

the empire to its apogee, and the four kings are the four generals who divided the empire after Alexander died ("that being broken"). Again, no speculation is needed to identify the kingdom. The Bible names it for us!

Notice, too, parallels between the he-goat of chapter 8 and the leopard of chapter 7. Both come up after Media-Persia. The leopard had four wings of a bird on its back (7:6), while the he-goat "flew" across the face of the earth without touching the ground (8:5). Also, the leopard had four heads (7:6), while the he-goat produced four horns after the chief horn was broken (8:8).

So, the ram represents Media-Persia; the he-goat represents Greece. What about that little horn power that followed?

"In the latter time of their kingdom [the four generals (the horns) of Alexander's divided empire], when the transgressors are come to the full, a king of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences, shall stand up. And his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power: and he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper, and practise, and shall destroy the mighty and the holy people. And through his policy also he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand; and he shall magnify himself in his heart, and by peace shall destroy many: he shall stand up against the Prince of princes; but he shall be broken without hand." Verses 23-25.

Clearly, the little horn represents a terrible power that comes up after the breakup of Greece—a prosperous power that destroys God's people. Before we identify this power (which should be obvious already), notice that the ram, which symbolized Media-Persia, was described as "great." Verse 4. The he-goat, which symbolized Greece, was described as "very great." Verse 8. Yet the little horn power, which follows, is described as "exceeding great." Verse 9. Whatever nation it represented, it was greater than the two preceding ones.

In Daniel 2, after Media-Persia and Greece, the next power was Rome (pagan and papal, though the emphasis here is more political than religious), symbolized by the hardest of all the metals, iron. In Daniel 7, after Media-Persia and Greece,

came pagan and papal Rome, symbolized by the fiercest of all the beasts. In Daniel 8, after Media-Persia and Greece, another power appears, one that is greater than either of the first two.

That power, of course, must be Rome!

Earlier, we saw that there were various metals for the powers in Daniel 2: gold for Babylon, silver for Media-Persia, and bronze for Greece. We saw another metal for Rome: iron. That iron, which began after Greece (in the legs), extended to the toes—to the end of time when God would set up His kingdom—even though by the time it reached the feet it was mixed with clay. The point is that Rome comes up after Greece and extends down until the time of the end, though in a different phase.

In Daniel 7, different beasts are used to represent the kingdoms, including the fourth beast—symbol of pagan Rome. Yet the little horn power—symbol of papal Rome—was still part of the fourth beast. It was not a separate power. So the fourth beast, like the iron in Daniel 2, arises after Greece and extends until the time of the end, though in another phase.

The same principle exists with the little horn power of Daniel 8. It comes up after Greece (see verse 23), yet it extends down until the end, when it shall be “broken without hand,” just as the stone representing God’s kingdom was cut out “without hands”—a symbol of divine intervention. Like the powers in the previous prophecies, this little horn comes up after Greece and extends until the end of time.

The little horn, then, symbolizes both pagan and papal Rome because the pagan phase began after Greece, while the papal phase will extend to the end. The different phases in Daniel 8 are harder to see than in the previous chapters, but they exist. Dr. William Shea of the Biblical Research Institute at the General Conference, and Dr. Gerhard Hasel of the Andrews University seminary—in volume 2 of the Daniel and Revelation Committee series—both have written about the pagan and papal phases of the little horn of Daniel 8. Without getting into details now, they show how the first verses describe the horizontal expansion of the little horn: it moved

over the face of the earth. See verse 9. This earthly expansion, they believe, deals with the pagan phase of Rome as it spread its empire across the face of the globe. Later verses, however, describe a religious attack, as the little horn power magnifies himself upward—heavenward—against the “prince of the host” and the sanctuary in heaven. This describes the papal phase of Rome as its system usurps the prerogatives that belong only to God. The little horn has two phases: horizontal attack (pagan), vertical attack (papal). We will look at this more closely in the next section of the book.

The important point here is that the little horn power, which comes after the ram and the he-goat, symbolizes Rome in its pagan and papal phases, though the emphasis here, as in Daniel 7, is on the papal phase.

Indeed, notice some parallels between the little horn of Daniel 7 and the little horn of Daniel 8, parallels that prove we are dealing with the same power.

1. Both are described by the same symbol: a horn.
2. Both are persecuting powers. See 7:21, 25; 8:10, 24.
3. Both are self-exalting and blasphemous. See 7:8, 20, 25; 8:10, 11, 25.
4. Both target God's people. See 7:25; 8:24.
5. Both have aspects of their activity delineated by prophetic time. See 7:25; 8:13, 14.
6. Both extend until the time of the end. See 7:25, 26; 8:17, 19.
7. Both are to be supernaturally destroyed. See 7:11, 26; 8:25.

Clearly, the little horn of Daniel 8 is Rome.

So far, in the explanation of Daniel 8, we have seen that the ram is Media-Persia, the he-goat is Greece, and the little horn is Rome. The order is like this:

Media-Persia (ram)

Greece (goat)

Rome (little horn)

In the vision itself, what followed the little horn was the sanctuary being cleansed. In the explanation of the vision, the little horn is followed by a reference to the cleansing of the sanctuary as well.

"The vision of the evening and the morning which was told is true: wherefore shut thou up the vision; for it shall be for many days. And I Daniel fainted, and was sick certain days; afterward I rose up, and did the king's business; and I was astonished at the vision, but none understood it." Verses 26, 27. At this point, chapter 8 ends.

At first glance, these verses don't seem to have anything to do with the sanctuary of verse 14 being cleansed. Yet the literal rendition for Daniel 8:14 is, "Until 2300 *evening morning*; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." The "vision of the evening and the morning" (verse 26) therefore refers to the sanctuary being cleansed. In the explanation, just as in the regular vision, the reference to the sanctuary being cleansed comes *after* Rome. Unfortunately, the part of the vision concerning the sanctuary being cleansed was not explained, for Daniel 8 ends with his saying that he didn't understand it. Obviously, because everything else in the vision of Daniel 8 (the ram, the he-goat, the little horn) was clearly explained, then the part of the vision that he didn't understand dealt with the sanctuary being cleansed—the vision of the evenings and mornings. He apparently understood everything else.

The point is that the explanation of Daniel 8 is given in the exact order that the vision itself was given:

Vision of Daniel 8	Explanation of Vision
Ram (verses 3, 4)	Media-Persia (verse 20)
He-goat (verses 5-8)	Greece (verse 21)
Little horn (verses 9-12)	Pagan/Papal Rome (verses 23-25)
"Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall	"The vision of the evening and the morning (not explained)

the sanctuary be
cleansed." Daniel 8:14 "... is true."
Daniel 8:26

In the seventh chapter we have these three nations—Media-Persia, Greece, Rome—in that sequence followed by the judgment in heaven. In Daniel 8, we have—in the same sequence as Daniel 7 (Media-Persia, Greece, Rome)—these same nations followed by the cleansing of the sanctuary in heaven. Just as the beasts that parallel each other in the visions represent the same powers, the parallels between the judgment of Daniel 7 and the cleansing of the sanctuary in Daniel 8 prove that they are the same event!

Daniel 7	Daniel 8
Babylon (lion)	_____
Media-Persia (bear)	Media-Persia (ram)
Greece (leopard)	Greece (he-goat)
Pagan Rome (fourth beast)	Pagan Rome (horn's earthly moves)
Papal Rome (little horn)	Papal Rome (horn's religious moves)
JUDGMENT IN HEAVEN	SANCTUARY CLEANSED
God's kingdom established	_____

The bear (Media-Persia) in Daniel 7 parallels the ram (Media-Persia) in Daniel 8 because they deal with the same thing.

The leopard (Greece) in Daniel 7 parallels the he-goat (Greece) in Daniel 8 because they deal with the same thing.

The fourth beast and its horn (Rome) in Daniel 7 parallel the little horn (Rome) in Daniel 8 because they deal with the same thing.

And the judgment in Daniel 7 parallels the cleansing of the sanctuary in Daniel 8 because they deal with the same thing! The judgment and the cleansing of the sanctuary are syn-

onymous, appearing in both prophecies after Rome!

Study these two chapters until you can clearly see the parallel between the judgment of Daniel 7 and the cleansing of the sanctuary in Daniel 8. It is a crucial point.

These parallels alone prove that the judgment and the cleansing are the same events, but does more evidence exist? The previous powers, besides being parallel to their counterparts in the prophetic scheme, also share some similarities. Does the idea of the judgment have any similarities with the cleansing of the sanctuary?

Of course! The cleansing of the sanctuary on the earth was the yearly day of judgment. For thousands of years, from the times of the tabernacle in the wilderness until today, the Jews celebrated the cleansing of the sanctuary (Yom Kippur)—the Day of Atonement—as the great judgment day. Judgment, repentance, confession of sin, are the essence of Yom Kippur, the Day of Atonement.

Read the following account from an ancient Jewish source concerning the Day of Atonement, when the sanctuary was cleansed:

God, seated on His *throne* to *judge* the world, at the same time Judge, Pleader, Expert, and Witness, openeth the *Books of Records*; it is read, every man's *signature* being found therein. The great trumpet is sounded; a still, small voice is heard; angels shudder, saying, this is *the day of judgment*: for His very ministers are not pure before God. As a shepherd mustereth his flock, causing them to pass under his rod, so doth God cause every living soul to pass before Him to fix the limit of every creature's life and to foreordain its destiny. . . . On the Day of Atonement it is *sealed* who shall live and who are to die.

—Quoted in the Jewish Encyclopedia, "Day of Atonement."

Though the Adventist understanding of the investigative judgment is not *exactly* like this account, it is similar. Don't

we also believe it is a time of judgment involving books with people's names (or signatures) in them, a time when cases are decided for life or death? Plus, look how this account shares some of the same imagery of the judgment scene in Daniel 7, which is the investigative judgment: Both talk about God, or as Daniel 7 says, the "Ancient of days." Verse 22. They both mention thrones. This account talks about "Books of Records"; Daniel 7 has "books" being opened. Both deal with judgment. See verses 10, 22, 26. Both have angelic beings involved in the judgment scene. Daniel 7 dealt with some type of ultimate reckoning, and this account obviously does too.

In Jewish thought, the Day of Atonement is a person's last chance to repent of sin. Rabbi Yechiel Eckstein describes Yom Kippur as "our final opportunity to come before God to plead for merciful judgment" (*Jews and Judaism* [Word Books: Waco, Texas, 1984], p. 125).

On the Day of Atonement the Jews greet each other with a Hebrew phrase that basically means "May you be sealed in the Book of Life for good."

I have in my office a Day of Atonement prayerbook, which is filled with prayers devout Jews pray during the High Holy Days of Yom Kippur. What are some of the prayers they pray during this time? "Justify us in the judgment. . . . O silence the accuser [Satan], and suffer the advocate to take his place . . . and in consequence of his pleading, declare, I have pardoned. . . . O blot out the transgressions of the people that have been saved [Israel]. . . . He, the Ancient of Days, sits as Judge. . . . In the book of life, blessing, peace, and good sustenance may we be remembered and sealed by Thee."

Sealed! Book of life! Final opportunity to repent! Who shall live and who shall die! Day of judgment! Books of records! Justify us in the judgment! Silence the accuser! Blot out the transgression!

This concept of the Day of Atonement fits exactly what Adventists have been teaching about the investigative judgment for years. No wonder, then, that the judgment in Daniel 7 and the cleansing of the sanctuary in Daniel 8 parallel each other. They are the same thing.

Also, we saw in our study of Daniel 7 that Media-Persia ended about 331 B.C. If it ended in 331 B.C. in Daniel 7, then obviously the same power would end at the same time in Daniel 8—331 B.C. Next came Greece, which in Daniel 7 ended in 168 B.C. Obviously, Greece in Daniel 8 ended in 168 B.C. too. After Greece came Rome, which in Daniel 7 was depicted until 1798. Obviously, the same power, now depicted in Daniel 8, is shown until 1798 too. After 1798 in Daniel 7 came the judgment in heaven, which is the same thing as the cleansing of the sanctuary in Daniel 8. Both of these events—judgment and cleansing of the sanctuary—appearing after this phase of Rome, must have occurred after 1798.

Indeed, because the judgment in heaven occurred after 1798, then the cleansing of the sanctuary must have too. Obviously, they started at the same time because they are the same thing. Therefore the cleansing of the sanctuary occurs after 1798!

Notice the chart:

Daniel 7	Daniel 8
Babylon	539 B.C.
Media-Persia (bear)	Media-Persia (ram) 331 B.C.
Greece (leopard)	Greece (he-goat) 168 B.C.
Rome (beast/horn)	Rome (little horn) A.D. 1798
JUDGMENT IN HEAVEN	SANCTUARY CLEANSED

After Media-Persia (331 B.C.) came Greece. After Greece (168 B.C.) came Rome. After this last phase of Rome (A.D. 1798) comes the sanctuary being cleansed!

We saw that the vision of Daniel 8 was for the “time of the end,” and the sanctuary being cleansed came at the end of the vision. Obviously, the only sanctuary that it could be referring to is the sanctuary in heaven (so vividly portrayed in the book of Hebrews) because no other sanctuary existed. The last one was destroyed over 1700 years before the ending of that phase of Rome in 1798, and the cleansing had to come after that date.

It is interesting to note that centuries before Adventism,

the Jews believed in a sanctuary in heaven. The Talmud, Midrash, and other ancient Jewish sources talked about “the heavenly sanctuary” and “the temple in heaven.” They even believed that Michael was the High Priest ministering in that heavenly sanctuary, interceding in behalf of God’s people against the accusations of the devil! Says the *Jewish Encyclopedia*: “The rabbis speak of Michael (Metatron) as the captain of the heavenly host, as the high priest that offers sacrifice in the upper temple.” (s.v. “Angelology.”) One ancient Jewish source writes: “Michael and Samael [Satan] stand before the Divine Presence; Satan accuses, while Michael points out Israel’s virtues” (Midrash Rabbah on Exodus, Soncino ed., vol. I, p. 222).

Study carefully the parallel events of Daniel 7 and 8. Read the chapters in this book repeatedly, along with Daniel 7 and 8, until you see how the powers in Daniel 7 and 8 line up, that the judgment of Daniel 7 and the cleansing of the sanctuary of Daniel 8 are synonymous, and that it must occur after 1798.

Let’s review:

1. Judgment of God’s people occurs after the cross but before the second coming.
2. Judgment of God’s people, depicted in Daniel 7, occurs after 1798.
3. The judgment of God’s people in Daniel 7 parallels the cleansing of the sanctuary in Daniel 8. They are the same event.
4. The cleansing of the sanctuary, therefore, must occur after 1798.

We have narrowed down the cleansing of the sanctuary of Daniel 8:14 to after the year 1798. And though we are closer to 1844, Daniel 7 and 8 don’t yet give the exact date.

Daniel 9 does.

Chapter Six

Before we tackle Daniel 9, remember that Daniel 2 consisted of a prophetic dream and a full explanation of that dream, that Daniel 7 consisted of a prophetic vision and a full explanation of that vision; and that Daniel 8 consisted of a vision, but only a *partial* explanation of that vision. The ram, the he-goat, and the little horn were explained quite well. The only part not explained was the vision of the 2300 evenings and mornings concerning the cleansing of the sanctuary.

Daniel 9, however, has no vision, but only an explanation given at the end of the chapter.

So we have Daniel 2—dream, full explanation. Daniel 7—vision, full explanation. Daniel 8—vision, partial explanation. Daniel 9—just an explanation.

What did Daniel 9 explain?

The bulk of Daniel 9 consists of Daniel's prayer for the deliverance of Israel. The prayer is of confession, repentance, and call for forgiveness. "O, Lord, the great and dreadful God, keeping the covenant and mercy to them that love him, and to them that keep his commandments; we have sinned, and have committed iniquity, and have done wickedly, and have rebelled, even by departing from thy precepts and from thy judgments." Verses 4, 5. The prayer is a request for God to "let thine anger and thy fury be turned away from thy city Jerusalem, thy holy mountain." Verse 16.

The important point about this prayer is that Daniel *never* asks for any explanation. Nowhere is he asking God, Why did

this happen? or Why did that happen? Daniel knows why everything has happened: "because for our sins, and for the iniquities of our fathers, Jerusalem and thy people are become a reproach to all that are about us." Verse 16.

He asked no questions in the prayer. He sought for no explanations. The last time we see Daniel not understanding something was at the end of chapter 8, concerning the vision of the cleansing of the sanctuary.

What happens next?

"Yea, whiles I was speaking in prayer, even the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning, being caused to fly swiftly, touched me about the time of the evening oblation." Verse 21.

Who comes? Gabriel. Last time we saw Gabriel was in Daniel 8. Indeed, Daniel is referring back to the vision where he had seen Gabriel, who was told to "make this man to understand the vision." Daniel 8:16. Gabriel, though, didn't finish explaining the vision in Daniel 8.

At this point a quick look at the Hebrew is immensely helpful. In the Hebrew of Daniel 8 and 9, two different words are used for the word translated as *vision*.

"In the third year of the reign of king Belshazzar a vision [*hazon*] appeared unto me." Daniel 8:1. The next verse says, "I saw in a vision [*hazon*]." The word *hazon* refers to the entire vision of Daniel 8.

Yet when Daniel referred specifically to the part dealing with the 2300 days and the cleansing of the sanctuary, another word for *vision* is used.

"And the vision [*mareh*] of the evening and the morning which was told is true. . . . And I was astonished at the vision [*mareh*], but none understood it." Verses 26, 27.

The word *mareh* comes from the Hebrew root, *ra'ah*, which means "to see." Sometimes it has been translated as *appearance*.

Anyway, two different words for vision appear in Daniel 8—*hazon*, referring to the entire vision of the chapter; and *mareh*, referring specifically to the 2300 days. These two words appear also in Daniel 9.

"Yea, whiles I was speaking in prayer, even the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision [*hazon*] at the beginning . . . informed me, and talked with me, and said, O Daniel, I am now come forth to give thee skill and understanding." Verses 21, 22.

Here, Daniel refers back to Gabriel, the angel he had seen in the *hazon*, or the whole vision, of the previous chapter. Remember, too, that nowhere in Daniel's prayer did he seek for "skill and understanding." The last time he needed understanding was regarding the 2300 days of Daniel 8, and in Daniel 9 now Gabriel promises to give him "skill and understanding."

Now, notice the specific part of the vision of Daniel 8 that Gabriel points him to in this verse. "At the beginning of thy supplications, the commandment came forth, and I am come to shew thee, for thou art greatly beloved: therefore understand the matter, and consider the vision [*mareh*]." Verse 23.

What *mareh*? Obviously, the *mareh* of the 2300 days that he didn't understand in the previous chapter. It could be nothing else but a reference to the *mareh* of the 2300 days!

We have the same angel interpreter as in the vision of Daniel 8, which Daniel himself refers back to when Gabriel appears. Gabriel then promises to give Daniel understanding, and the only point on which Daniel didn't have understanding concerned the *mareh* of the 2300 days. And then the angel specifically points him back to the *mareh* and tells Daniel to "understand . . . and consider" it.

Clearly, Gabriel has come to give the explanation of the 2300 days not given in the previous chapter.

Also, what type of prophecy was the *mareh* of Daniel 8:14? "Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." It was a *time prophecy*.

In Daniel 9, after Gabriel points Daniel back to the 2300-day prophecy, what is the next thing he says?

"Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people." Verse 24. Seventy weeks? What kind of prophecy is that? Of course, just like the *mareh* it refers to, it also is a *time prophecy*!

Even more links exist between the two chapters, and we

will look at them in part two of the book. The crucial point now is to see that the explanation of Daniel 9 is really an explanation of the 2300 days—the *mareh* of Daniel 8 that Gabriel hadn't explained previously.

Let's now look at the explanation itself. The first line starts out: "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people." Those opposed to our message argue that the translation here is correct—that the seventy weeks are "determined." Adventists claim that the literal meaning of the root word there, *chatak*, means to "cut off," and therefore the seventy weeks are cut off from the 2300 days. Which translation is the most accurate?

Unfortunately, the word *chatak* is not used anywhere else in the Bible, so we can't compare usage. However, other more common words for *decree* or *determined* exist, yet for some reason Daniel used none of them, instead picking this more obscure word.

Though *chatak* doesn't appear elsewhere in the Bible, the word appears numerous times in the Mishnah, a Jewish Bible commentary compiled in the first few centuries A.D. Though not identical to biblical Hebrew, Mishnaic Hebrew is similar, and of the twelve times the verb *chatak* is used—ten times it refers to the *cutting off* of parts of the animals according to dietary laws. Of the nineteen times it is used in the noun form, only once is it used with the idea of a decree. The other eighteen times it means "that which is cut off."

Strong's Concordance gives its primary root as "to cut off." Whiting's translation has it as "cut off." Gesenius, the standard Hebrew lexicographer, defines it as "to cut off." The Chaldeo-Rabbinic dictionary of Stocius defines it as "to cut, to cut away, to cut in pieces, to cut or engrave, to cut off." The earliest version of the Vulgate and the Septuagint define the verb as "cutting off." Theodotian's Greek version of Daniel renders it "cut off." Even more versions use "cut off," but you should get the point: "cut off" is the accurate translation.

The time prophecy of the seventy weeks, then, is cut off. Now it must be cut off from something, and the only thing possible must be the larger time prophecy of the 2300 days of the


previous vision, which Gabriel pointed Daniel back to.

Let's take a quick look at the seventy-week prophecy. Much has been written about this within Adventism, and we all should be familiar with it.

Seventy weeks are [cut off] upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy. Verse 24.

The explanation starts out with a seventy-week period given to Israel in order to accomplish certain goals. Here, too, we apply the day-year principle, and in the next section I will show why the day-year principle *must* be operating here, or else the prophecy would make no sense at all. Applying a day for a year, seventy weeks comes out to 490 days, or years. So the Jews here have been given 490 years to get their act together. See chart below.

70 weeks or 490 years
"cut off" upon thy people




But the question is, 490 years from when?

Know therefore and understand that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks: the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times. Verse 25.


This next verse gives the starting point of the prophecy. It

says that from the "command to restore and to build Jerusalem until the Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks," or 69 weeks. Here we have 69 of the 70 weeks accounted for. So, from the time of the command to restore and rebuild Jerusalem, which had been destroyed by the Babylonians, until the coming of the Messiah, whom we know is Jesus, would be 69 prophetic weeks, or 483 years, using the day-year principle. What that verse says, then, is that from the command to restore and rebuild Jerusalem until Jesus the Messiah will be 483 years (see chart below).



What about the command to restore and rebuild Jerusalem? Many Bible expositors, including non-Adventists, have placed that decree "in the seventh year of Artaxerxes the king" (Ezra 7:7).

That date is agreed upon, and it begins in the reign of Media-Persia, just as the visions of Daniel 8 begin with Media-Persia too. Here is another reason why Daniel 8 didn't start with Babylon: God wanted to emphasize Media-Persia as the starting point of the prophecies of *both* Daniel 8 and Daniel 9.




What year did Artaxerxes' reign begin?

The big debate in the scholarly world over his seventh year is between 457 or 458 B.C. Some say 457, some say 458, depending upon which type of calendar they believe that the Jews used. *The Chronology of Ezra 7*, by Horn and Wood, proved—using numerous ancient sources—that the Jews used a fall-to-fall calendar in counting the years of the reign of Artaxerxes, thus putting his seventh year in 457. Indeed, they have locked down that date. Even today, many non-Adventists accept 457 as the seventh year of Artaxerxes, utilizing a fall-to-fall calendar for the Jews.

If we then add 483 years to 457 B.C. we come to 27 A.D. (Remember you are using a calendar that has no zero year, the way a regular set of number does, i.e., -3, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, 3. Instead a calendar goes -3, -2, -1, 1, 2, 3. This will bring you on a calendar to A.D. 27, not 26, as you would get if you included that extra zero year.)

Therefore, from the command to restore and rebuild Jerusalem (457 B.C.) until the first advent of Jesus, would be 483 years, or to A.D. 27. We know that in A.D. 27, Jesus was baptized. He then began his ministry.




The next verse reads:

After threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself: and the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end therefore shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined. Verse 26.

In the Hebrew it reads that after "the threescore and two

50 1844 MADE SIMPLE


weeks," the Messiah will be cut off. That period ends in A.D. 27. Sometime after A.D. 27—during the seven years that make up the seventieth week—the Messiah would be cut off, which we know happened.



The last verse of the chapter deals specifically with the seven years of the seventieth week of the prophecy:

He shall confirm the covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the over-spreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate. Verse 27.


It says that in the midst of that last week, or seven years, He shall cause the sacrifices and oblations to cease. In the midst of that last week, which is three and a half years—A.D. 31—we know that Jesus was crucified (see chart opposite). At that point the whole sacrificial system ceased to have any significance. Though the Jews continued for forty more years to offer sacrifices, the sacrifices meant nothing to God. When the leaders killed Stephen in A.D. 34, that ended the confirming of "the covenant with many for one week." Indeed, that death sealed Israel's official rejection of Jesus, thus ending the covenant relationship with God that the nation as a whole had for centuries. That end came in A.D. 34, the last year of the seventy-week prophecy (see chart opposite).



Again, go back and study the seventy-week prophecy in detail. The church has produced numerous studies on Daniel 9. We should all be familiar with it. The important point now, however, is to see that the seventy-week prophecy, unlike the 2300-day prophecy as discussed so far, has a beginning and an end point. That beginning was in 457 B.C.; the end was in A.D. 34.

Let's review: we saw that the 2300 days of Daniel 8 was the only part not explained by Gabriel. In Daniel 9, there is no vision, just an explanation. Gabriel, the same angel interpreter in Daniel 8, comes to him to offer him an explanation, and the only place we last saw Daniel needing an explanation was in the 2300 days of Daniel 8. Gabriel then points him back specifically to the *mareh* of the 2300 days, a time prophecy, and then gives him *another* time prophecy, the seventy weeks, which he says is "cut off." Obviously, it must be cut off from the 2300 days.


We are dealing here with two time elements: the longer 2300 days, which by itself has no beginning and end point—and the shorter 70 weeks, which had a definite beginning and end point.



The seventy weeks, which begins in 457 B.C., is cut off from the larger 2300 days. Someone once said to me, "I see how the 70 weeks are cut off from the 2300 days, but why don't we cut it off from the *end* of the 2300 days, not the beginning?"

52 1844 MADE SIMPLE


The chart below shows what happens if we cut it off from the end, rather than the beginning:



Two major problems arise with this interpretation: the 2300 days would end in 34 A.D., placing the start of the time period in the year 2267 B.C., a date far out of the picture from anything else we have studied so far. We saw that Babylon is the beginning nation in our prophetic studies. If we cut off the seventy weeks from the end, the beginning of the 2300 days would begin 1600 years before Babylon—clearly out of the time frame of anything we are dealing with in these prophecies.

But more important, cutting it off from the end would place the cleansing of the sanctuary in A.D. 34. And we saw from our previous studies, the cleansing of the sanctuary must come after the 1260-year period of the little horn, which ended in 1798. The date A.D. 34 for the cleansing of the sanctuary does not fit. Plus, three times Daniel says that the vision in Daniel 8 is for the time of the end, and A.D. 34 is not near the time of the end.


The only other alternative, then, is to cut it off from the logical place: the beginning of the 2300 days (see the following chart).



Look what you get! If you start with the first 490 years of

the 2300 years (again using day-year principle) and come to A.D. 34, and then add the remaining 1810 years left from the 2300, *you get 1844!*

Or if you add 2300 years directly to 457 B.C. (remember to delete the zero calendar year), you get 1844 too!



Either way you do it, the date comes to 1844!

Notice, too, how 1844 fits our criteria for the judgment:

(1) Comes after the cross; (2) Comes after 1798; (3) Comes before the second coming.

Understand, too, that Adventists weren't the only ones who connected the 2300 days of Daniel 8 and the seventy weeks of Daniel 9. Numerous Bible expositors have linked them together for years. For instance, Bishop Daniel Wilson (1778-1858) in 1836 wrote: "Therefore the seventy weeks commencing with the given [giving] forth of this commandment; the 2300 days of the preceding vision, commence also at the same time, for *the visions are one*" (quoted in LeRoy Froom, *The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers*, vol. III, p. 620). Wilson put the end of the 2300 days at 1847.

Even if people were to debate the 457 B.C. date, they can't take it too far off because this prophecy is based on Jesus. If someone were to use numbers off by just a few years, as did Wilson, he would still have to come up with the cleansing of the sanctuary in the 1840s! If someone were to make the starting date of the 70-week prophecy thirty, fifty, or a hundred years different from 457 B.C., he would have to place the life of Jesus either thirty, fifty, or a hundred years from the dates He is known to have lived. The life of Jesus is our assurance that the prophecy is correct. He forms the base for it. The prophecy stands as sure as Jesus Himself.

Go back to the beginning of this book and, along with your Bible, study the sequence of kingdoms in Daniel 2. Then study the chapter on Daniel 7 and the sequence of events there. Study the identity of the little horn. See how the judgment in heaven comes after the little horn power, which is depicted until the year 1798. See how the judgment, then, in Daniel 7 must be after 1798 because it comes after the little horn.

Review the sequence of events in Daniel 8, including the cleansing of the sanctuary, which comes after the little horn. Review the chart (pg. 38) that shows how the judgment in heaven and the cleansing of the sanctuary are parallel events and that they must occur after 1798. That parallel is crucial.

See how in Daniel 8 the *mareh* of the 2300 “evening and morning” are not explained, and then review the links between chapters 8 and 9. The same angel interpreter points him back to the previous vision, especially to the *mareh* of the 2300 days—a time prophecy—and promises to give him understanding. He then gives him another time prophecy, a smaller one, and says that it is “cut off.” Review until you see that the only place it could be cut off from is the beginning of the 2300 days.

Study the seventy weeks. See how it begins the 2300-day prophecy, and then study until you see that the 2300 days must end in 1844. Read this first section of *1844 Made Simple* repeatedly, along with your Bible, until you can give this study yourself. Not until you can give it, can you really understand it.

One final point. The seventy-week prophecy is unquestionably the most powerful messianic prediction in the Bible. Beyond question it proves the messiahship of Jesus. No other prophecy has been so studied, so debated, so controversial. Clearly—more than any other prophecy—it proves Jesus is the Messiah.

Yet the seventy weeks—the most powerful and important messianic prediction—is just part of the 2300-day prophecy! Obviously, then, the 2300 days must be crucial, or else they wouldn’t be so closely linked to such an important prophecy as the seventy weeks.

Remember, too, that ancient Israel was not prepared for Jesus' first coming because, among other reasons, they didn't understand the first part of the 2300-day prophecy: the 70 weeks, which was present truth for their time. We ourselves might not be prepared for Jesus' second coming because, among other things, we don't understand the second part of that 2300-day prophecy: the cleansing of the sanctuary—present truth for our time.

Part Two: ***Answers to Objections***

Chapter Seven

At this point, if you have read and reread the material, you should be able to *give* a study on 1844. Sooner or later, however, you will encounter common arguments against the 1844 investigative judgment. This section deals with the major ones.

One argument against the Adventist understanding of Daniel 8:14 involves chapter eight's link to the Levitical sanctuary. People argue that we are wrong to link Daniel 8 to the sanctuary service, wrong to see the cleansing of the sanctuary in Daniel 8 as a fulfillment of the typical cleansing of the sanctuary in Leviticus.

Is this argument valid, or do links exist between Daniel 8 and the Levitical sanctuary?

Daniel 7 refers to a lion, a bear, a leopard, as well as a fourth beast—all unclean animals. What kind of animals are in Daniel 8? A ram and goat. Not only are they clean animals, they are sanctuary animals. And not only are they sanctuary animals, they are animals used in the Day of Atonement service. See Leviticus 16!

Though these sanctuary animals don't prove Daniel 8 refers to Leviticus, it hints at a connection.

The crucial links between Daniel 8 and Leviticus are found in the language of Daniel 8, which contains words that relate to the sanctuary service.

Daniel 8:11, for example, has sanctuary imagery. "He magnified himself even to the prince of the host, and by him the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down."

The Hebrew word for *place*, *makon* (also translated *foundation*) is used in the Old Testament seventeen times, fourteen of which directly relate to the sanctuary. In two of the other three, it is related to the throne of God, suggesting a link to the sanctuary. See Exodus 15:17; 1 Kings 8:13; 2 Chronicles 6:2; Isaiah 18:4.

Then there's the word *sanctuary* itself! That term alone links this chapter to Leviticus. In verse 11, the word is translated from *miqdash*, a common term for the earthly sanctuary throughout the Old Testament. In some passages, it refers to God's heavenly abode as well. See Psalms 68:35; 96:6.

In Daniel 8:14—"Unto two thousand three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed"—the word for *sanctuary*, *qodesh*, also links the chapter to the Levitical service. That word can refer to the whole sanctuary, the holy place, or the most holy place. *Qodesh* is used throughout Leviticus 16, where the *qodesh*, the sanctuary, is to be cleansed.

Host, found in verses 11 and 12, comes from *saba*, which means "an army," though in the context of the sanctuary, the word has been used in relation to the work of the Levites, those who ministered in the earthly sanctuary (sometimes translated "service"). See Numbers 4:3, 23, 30; 8:24.

The word for *daily* in verse 11, *tamid*, has strong links to the sanctuary. Most translations call it "the daily sacrifice" because the word *tamid*, in reference to the sanctuary service, is used with the daily sacrifice (though the word *sacrifice* is not in the original text) offered each morning and evening. See Exodus 29:38, 42. Sometimes it is translated *continual* or *always*. One section of the Talmud is called *Tamid*, and it deals with "all the regulations for the offering of the regular daily sacrifices."

The word *tamid* is used also in reference to the daily shewbread (see Exodus 25:30) in the first apartment of the

sanctuary. It is used in reference to the lamps in the first apartment, which burned (*tamid*) always before the Lord. See Exodus 27:20. *Tamid* refers to the use of the incense in the first apartment. See Exodus 30:8. In Leviticus 6:13, *tamid* refers to the fire on the altar of burnt offering—a fire that was to continually burn upon the altar and never go out.

Clearly, the word *tamid* has links to the sanctuary. Yet notice that the word is used only in regard to the *first* apartment ministry. It is never used in regard to the second apartment, where the judgment takes place. *Tamid* is talking about the *first* apartment only. The significance of this point will be seen shortly.

The word for “taken away” in verse 11, from the root *rum*, is used in connection to the sanctuary. Though *rum* itself (as a root) means to “lift up,” in the context of the sanctuary, especially when it is used in the causative verb form (as it is in Daniel 8:11), it means to “take away.” In a few places in Leviticus, *rum*, often in the causative form, is translated, “taken away,” as translated in Daniel 8:11. See Leviticus 2:9; 4:8, 10, 19. It is used in reference to the “taking away” of the carcasses of the animals in the sacrificial service.

At this point, we’ve proved that linguistically Daniel 8 can be linked to the sanctuary service. But by looking at exactly what is happening in some of these verses, we can establish even greater links.

We saw previously that Daniel 8 dealt with Media-Persia and Greece. The little horn power, which appears next in verse 9, starts out as pagan Rome, “which waxed exceeding great, toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land.” Here we see a horizontal expansion across the earth, which pagan Rome did, thus fitting perfectly the prophecy.

In verses 10 to 12, the little horn’s actions move upward and take on a religious thrust. It magnifies itself to the “prince of the host,” takes away the “daily,” casts down “truth,” even casts down “the place of his sanctuary.” Here is the papal phase of the little horn and its attack on the gospel.

But how, for instance, could the papacy “cast down” the

place, or foundation, of the heavenly sanctuary (it must be the heavenly because the papacy didn't exist in the days of the earthly)? Obviously, the papacy didn't get into heaven and physically attack the sanctuary. Instead, through its system of the mass, the priesthood, confession, mediation, etc.—which is a counterfeit of the life, death, and high priestly ministry of Jesus (“the prince of the host”)—the foundation of Christ's work in heaven was lost or, in a sense, “cast down.”

Imagine Radio Free Europe beaming “It Is Written” into the Eastern European bloc. The radio waves pulse through the air, but before they reach the receivers, the governments send up jamming signals that block out the beams. The people on the ground receive nothing, hear nothing, and know nothing of the truths that the program had for them. In a sense, the foundation—the essence—of the message is lost, taken away, or “cast down.” This same principle holds regarding papal interference with Christ's high priestly ministry.

We are obviously dealing with symbolic actions because “truth” itself cannot literally be cast down. The papacy could no more *physically* “cast down” God's sanctuary, than it could *physically* “cast down the truth to the ground.” Verse 12. But through its counterfeit intercession and mediation, the papacy was able to destroy the truth of Christ's work in the sanctuary, thus it “cast down the truth.”

Verse 10 says that the papacy “waxed great, even to the host of heaven” and that it “cast down some of the host and of the stars to the ground.” Whom do we think of as the “host of heaven”? Angels, of course. Revelation 13:6, talking about the papacy's same religious attack, says that it “opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name, and his tabernacle [sanctuary], and *them that dwell in heaven.*” Emphasis supplied. Who dwells in heaven? The angels, the host of heaven. Revelation 12:4 talks about the fall of Lucifer and the angels, which are called, “the stars of heaven.” In verse 10, the papacy cast down some of the host of the “stars” that were in heaven.

Again, we are not dealing with a physical casting down, but

a spiritual one. Through papal claims and prerogatives, such as claiming superiority over angels, claiming control over them, or any other way that it historically blasphemed "them that dwell in heaven," the papacy was able to wax great, "even to the host of heaven" and cast them down, just as it spiritually cast down the truth.

Look at verse 11 and its description of the little horn power. A Jewish Bible translates it: "Yea, it magnified himself, even to the prince of the host; and from him the continual burnt offering [the *tamid*] was taken away, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down."

The Hebrew literally reads that "from him," that is, from the prince of the host, the "daily" or the "continual" was taken away. The "prince of the host" obviously refers to Jesus: "Messiah the Prince" (Daniel 9:25); "at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince" (Daniel 12:1). The book of Hebrews also places Jesus as our high priest in the heavenly sanctuary.

The little horn—the papacy—magnifies itself even to Jesus. Anyone claiming the functions of divinity, as the popes have done, is magnifying himself to God. The taking away of the daily, or Christ's ministry in the sanctuary, comes from the apostate system of mediation, intercession, etc.—prerogatives that belong to Christ in the sanctuary in heaven, but were usurped by the papacy. In this sense, the "truth" about the "place of his sanctuary was cast down."

Verse 12, talking about the little horn, says that "an host was given him against the daily sacrifice by reason of transgression."

Who is this "host" given to the little horn—a host that works "against the daily sacrifice by reason of transgression"? Dr. Hasel writes that it "could possibly refer to the clergy." Indeed, the work of the papal priesthood—through its transgression of God's truth—usurped the ongoing "mediatorial ministry of the heavenly prince of the host. Intercession, mediation, and other benefits associated with the *tamid* are fully in control of the little horn's 'host.'"—Daniel and Revelation Committee, vol. 2, pp. 416, 417.

The sacrifice of the mass, confession to priests, mediation of

the priests, praying to saints, indeed the whole papal system usurped the truth of the sanctuary until it was lost, cast down, and "taken away."

Now we come to a crucial point. Why was just the "daily"—the *tamid*—taken away? See verse 11. *Tamid* refers to the first-apartment ministry of the sanctuary only. Why was the first-apartment aspect alone taken away by the papacy? Why just the "daily?" Why not the second-apartment work?

Because the second-apartment ministry, the yearly, which occurred when the sanctuary was cleansed, wasn't in operation then!

Not until the end of the 2300 days, in 1844, did the second apartment ministry even begin! It could not be taken away during the little horn's reign because it was *not* operating during that time. "Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed!" Or, unto 2300 days; then shall the yearly begin!

In Daniel 8, we have *both* phases of Christ's high priestly ministry in heaven: the daily, which comes under attack by the papacy; and the yearly, the second-apartment ministry, which commences at the end of the 2300 "evenings and mornings," when the sanctuary is cleansed!

Talk about links to the sanctuary service!

Indeed, you can't begin to understand the essence of Daniel 8 without linking it to Leviticus.

Also, in Daniel 7, 8, and 9, we see Jesus. Daniel 9 emphasizes His role as the lamb, dealing specifically with Christ as sacrifice, when He was "cut off, but not for himself." Verse 26. Daniel 9, like Daniel 8, also uses sanctuary language. It talks about the sanctuary, about sacrifices, about atonement for sin—all of which establish another link between the two chapters. Daniel 9, however, emphasizes Jesus as the lamb—an emphasis not found in chapters 7 and 8.

In Daniel 8, we see Jesus as the high priest—"the prince of the host." His role here is as the mediator in the sanctuary in heaven, an emphasis not found in chapters 7 and 9. "We have such an high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne

of the Majesty in the heavens; a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man." Hebrews 8:1, 2. In chapter 8, Jesus is in this role as high priest.

In Daniel 7, another emphasis is found: that of a kingdom. Numerous times it talks about the "kingdom"—"the saints possessed the kingdom" (verse 22); the saints shall "possess the kingdom" (verse 18); "and the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom" (verse 27). Here we see Jesus as the head of that kingdom. He is King, a role not given in chapters 8 and 9.

We can go further. Daniel 9 talks about anointing the "most Holy." The Hebrew words used here for "most Holy" can refer only to the sanctuary. But what sanctuary was to be anointed within the time frame of the seventy-week prophecy, 457 B.C. to A.D. 34? Not the sanctuary in the wilderness, which was anointed over one thousand years earlier. The "most Holy" can't be Solomon's temple, which was anointed in the tenth century B.C. The second temple was anointed in 516 B.C. almost sixty years before the beginning of the seventy-week period. The only other "most Holy" of significance, then, is the "most Holy" in heaven, the "true tabernacle" where Jesus is now ministering.

In Daniel 9, Jesus sheds His blood, and that blood is then used to anoint the "most Holy"—the sanctuary in heaven. In Daniel 8, we see Jesus initially in His first-apartment ministry—the daily—and then in the second-apartment ministry, when the sanctuary is cleansed. And, ultimately, Daniel 7 consummates the sequence with Him establishing His kingdom and reigning as king!

In these chapters exists the sequence found in the earthly sanctuary: sacrifice, anointing (Daniel 9), first-apartment ministry, then second-apartment ministry (Daniel 8), and finally the end of the age (Daniel 7)—all centered on Jesus.

Why, though, must the chapters in Daniel be reversed to get the sequence? Dr. Shea explains that the ancient Hebrew mind worked from effect to cause, rather than from cause to effect, the way the modern Western mind does. It was only

natural to start this sequence with the effect, which was the kingdom being established, and end with the cause, which was the sacrifice of Jesus.

“Thus,” writes Shea (vol. 2, p. 239), “these three prophecies in Daniel form an interlocking chain of explanations about the work of this one figure who is common to them all. In chapter 9 He is the sacrifice. In chapter 8 He is the priest. In chapter 7 He is the king. Because these different phases of the work are linked together by a common thread, the figure involved in all of them should be identified as the same. The first two phases have been fulfilled in Jesus Christ, and we await the conclusion of the third when the saints will be ushered into God’s eternal kingdom.”

Indeed, we see not only more links between Daniel 7, 8, and 9, but we can see how these chapters, particularly 8 and 9, are linked to the sanctuary service—a link that Adventists have been proclaiming since the mid-1800s.

Chapter Eight

Another argument against our understanding of the investigative judgment is that the KJV translation “cleansed” in Daniel 8:14 is not accurate. “Cleansed,” it is asserted, is not the proper translation, and the root word for “cleansed,” *tsadaq*, has no relationship to the root word for “cleanse” in Leviticus 16, *taher*. Thus, they claim, Daniel 8 is not talking about the cleansing of the sanctuary, and it has nothing to do with any type of divine judgment as typified in Leviticus.

Though most modern translations have veered away from “cleansed” for Daniel 8:14, in favor of such renditions as “will be justified,” “cleansed” has been used historically for *tsadaq* in Daniel 8:14. The Bishop’s Bible (1568), Geneva Bible (1560), Taverner Bible (1551), Great Bible (1539), Matthew Bible (1537), Coverdale Bible (1537), and the Wycliff Bible (1382)—all translated it “cleansed.”

Dr. Hasel quotes a non-Adventist theologian who argues for purified or cleansed in Daniel 8:14 because “will be justified” or the like, said this non-Adventist, “can hardly be said of the sanctuary.” Indeed, in the context of the sanctuary service, which is the context of Daniel 8, the sanctuary itself is never “justified.” It is cleansed. See Leviticus 16.

Also, the words with the *tsdq*-root are used in parallel constructions with words that clearly mean “cleansed,” including *taher*.

Imagine a poem that says: “I have a cat/the cat is fat.” *Fat* and *cat* are related to each other, not by meaning, but by

sound. They rhyme. They parallel each other phonetically (sound), not semantically (meaning). If a poem reads: "I have a house/the house is my home" *house* and *home* are related, not by sound (they don't rhyme), but by meaning. They parallel each other semantically because their meanings are similar.

Hebrew poetry uses this type of semantic relationship, a relationship of meanings, and in numerous places words with the *tsdq*-root parallel words that clearly mean "clean" or "pure." Various scholars, even non-Adventists, have noted these connections. In Job 4:17, for example, we see *taher* and *tsadaq* in parallel constructions:

Shall mortal man be more *just* [*tsadaq*] than God?
Shall a man be more *pure* [*taher*] than his maker?

Just as *house* and *home* are related, we can see how *just* and *pure* parallel each other in these lines of poetry—not by sound, but by meaning.

Many ancient translations of the Bible rendered Daniel 8:14 "cleansed/purified." The Septuagint renders it "cleansed." The Theodotion renders it "cleansed." The Latin Vulgate translates it "purified/cleansed." The Syriac Peshitta renders it "purified/cleansed." The Coptic renders it "purified/cleansed."

Also, in the Septuagint—the first Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible—the same root word used for "cleansed" (*katharizo*) in Daniel 8:14 was used for "cleanse" in its translation of Leviticus 16! Clearly, the translators of the Septuagint saw a link between the *taher* and *tsadaq*!

And that same Greek root word is used in Hebrews, talking about the need to clean the heavenly sanctuary: "It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified (*katharizo* again is the root) with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these." Hebrews 9:23.

Strong's Concordance gives one of the meanings of *tsadaq* as "to cleanse."

Dr. Hasel explains that the root word *tsadaq* is often used

in the Old Testament in the context of a judicial setting. The word here has been translated “to justify” or “vindicate,” often referring to people. Various derivatives of the root *tsadaq* have been used in the context of courts and legal judgment procedures. For this reason, Hasel speculates that Daniel “chose the term *nisdaq* [passive form of *tsadaq*—a word from a root with rich and broad connotations, widely employed in judgment settings and legal procedures—in order to communicate effectively the interrelated aspects of the ‘cleansing’ of the heavenly sanctuary in the cosmic setting of the end-time judgment.”—Daniel and Revelation Committee, vol. 2, p. 453, 454.

In other words, he specifically used that word to express the idea of judgment, as well as the cleansing of the sanctuary.

In the context of Daniel 8, “shall be cleansed” is the best translation of *tsadaq*, which has strong links to *taher* in Leviticus 16.

Another argument deals with the activity of the little horn in Daniel 8. Some claim that the cleansing of the sanctuary in verse 14 comes *only* because the little horn “cast down” the sanctuary. See verses 11-13. Therefore, Daniel 8 deals only with the casting down of the sanctuary by the little horn and has nothing to do with the judgment of God’s people.

The key here is to understand that Daniel 8 is an expansion of Daniel 7. Daniel 8 complements, or adds another dimension to, Daniel 7. We saw how the cleansing of the sanctuary in chapter 8 describes the great heavenly judgment scene of chapter 7, where God’s people were judged favorably and ultimately given dominion. Daniel 8, however, brings in the idea of the sanctuary, a priesthood, and a heavenly ministration—ideas not mentioned in Daniel 7. They both deal with the same thing, but from different perspectives.

Both chapters (Daniel 7:21, 25; Daniel 8:24) deal also with God’s people, who are persecuted by an apostate religious system. Daniel 7 ends with the demise of that apostate power when dominion is given to “the saints of the most High.” An emphasis in Daniel 7 not found in Daniel 8 is the idea of a

kingdom and dominion being given to God's people. See 7:26, 27. This dominion comes about as a *result* of the judgment, which brings the demise of the blasphemous, persecuting little horn power.

The emphasis on the papacy in Daniel 8 is not so much its persecution as its apostasy. The little horn has set up a rival priesthood, mediation, and plan of salvation. In Daniel 8, too, the little horn meets its demise: it shall "be broken without hand." Verse 25. And though it is not mentioned in Daniel 8, God's people will ultimately be given the kingdom shown in the parallel vision of Daniel 7. In Daniel 8, it is the result of the cleansing of the sanctuary that ultimately brings the demise of the little horn power. In Daniel 7 it was the judgment in heaven that brought the same end to the little horn.

Obviously, then, the activity of the little horn was linked to the cleansing of the sanctuary because, as in the judgment in Daniel 7, the *result* of that cleansing ultimately will lead to the horn's destruction. Daniel 7 and 8 end with the salvation and vindication of God's people, as well as the eradication of the little horn. This demise is a *result* of the judgment and the cleansing of the sanctuary. In this sense, therefore, the activity of the little horn does relate to the cleansing of the sanctuary, though the cleansing involves more than just the little horn's apostate activity—a perspective that is unique to that chapter.

Also, the little horn claimed to be a Christian power. For about a millennium, almost all of Christendom followed the little horn. God had millions professing His name and claiming to follow Him—people whose names were written in the books of heaven in the sanctuary. Many, however, though professing to follow Jesus, weren't His followers; indeed, they often were His enemies. Their names will be blotted out in the judgment, when the sanctuary is cleansed. See Revelation 3:5. The determination of just who was and wasn't faithful doesn't come until the cleansing of the sanctuary, when either the record of the sins of those who professed to follow Jesus are wiped out, or their names themselves are wiped out. In that sense, too, the little horn "defiled" the sanctuary because the record of the sins of its followers were recorded in it.

Another possible aspect, though certainly not primary, is that the little horn casts down the place of the sanctuary, not physically, but by covering up the truth concerning it. Some suggest that one fulfillment of the cleansing of the sanctuary could be that the truth regarding the sanctuary was finally revealed after being lost for so long. In that sense, too, the sanctuary was cleansed from the activity of the little horn.

The important point is that the cleansing of the sanctuary involved *more* than the activity of the little horn, *more* than a vindication of truth. We see from Daniel 7, and from the earthly type, that the cleansing of the sanctuary involved a judgment of people professing to serve God (which included those who were part of the little horn), a judgment that would ultimately separate the wheat from the chaff, and that would bring about the demise of evil in the world and the establishment of God's kingdom.

Because Daniel 8:14 reads literally: "Until 2300 evening morning; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed," it has been argued that the 2300 days are not really 2300 days, but 1150 days. Why? Because the evening and morning supposedly represent the two sacrifices offered each day. Therefore, two sacrifices a day would make 2300 "evening and morning" sacrifices offered over 1150 full days. The Today's English Version Bible even translates it as such.

If this interpretation were correct, then the sanctuary would be cleansed, not in A.D. 1844, but in A.D. 694.

Do the 2300 evenings and mornings represent only 1150 days?

Numerous arguments have been given, even by non-Adventists, that prove it does not. First, the sequence "evening and morning" in Daniel 8:14 is the opposite of the sequence used in the Bible to designate the two daily sacrifices. Burnt offerings *morning and evening* is the sequence that the Bible consistently uses. See Exodus 29:39; Numbers 28:4. It is never "evening and morning," as found in Daniel 8:14. "Evening and morning" has nothing to do with the sacrifices.

Instead, the evening and morning sequence of Daniel is

found in Genesis 1, which uses them to delineate a *full* day. When the Jews wished to designate the day and night separately, they mentioned the number of both, as in “forty days and forty nights.” See Genesis 7:4, 12. But even here, the expression “forty days and forty nights” meant forty full days, not twenty.

The reason some try to convert the 2300 days into 1150 is to make Antiochus Epiphanes, a Seleucid king who persecuted the Jews in the second century B.C., fit the description of the little horn in Daniel 8. If Antiochus—who desecrated the temple in Jerusalem—was the little horn, then the prophecies of Daniel 8 would have been fulfilled even before the birth of Jesus, thus making 1844 a nonevent.

Yet Antiochus’s profanation of the temple lasted only 1,080 days. So even if the 2300 days were just 1150 literal days, they would still be 70 days off the mark of 1150 days—much less 2300! The time frame is grossly inaccurate.

Other reasons exist why Antiochus cannot be the little horn power. We saw earlier that the Media-Persian ram became “great” (Daniel 8:4) and that the Grecian he-goat became “very great” (verse 8). Yet the little horn power, which came next, was greater than both: it became “exceeding great” (verse 9). Antiochus, therefore, should have been greater than either the Media-Persian and the Greek Empire. Obviously, he didn’t come close. Instead, he ruled only one portion of the Grecian Empire, did that with little success and for a short time only.

The rise of the little horn was dated in relation to the four kingdoms that came from the breakup of Alexander the Great’s empire. It was to come up “in the latter time of their kingdom.” Daniel 8:23. One of those four kingdoms—the Seleucid dynasty, from which Antiochus arose—consisted of more than twenty kings who ruled from 311 to 65 B.C. Antiochus was eighth in line, ruling from 175-164/3 B.C. Obviously, because a dozen kings came after him, and only seven came before him, he didn’t arise “in the latter time of their kingdom.”

Daniel 8 talks about being for “the time of the end.” See

verse 17. Somehow Antiochus's death over 150 years before Jesus doesn't qualify him to be placed in that time frame.

Also, the little horn took away the "daily," or just the first-apartment ministry. Antiochus—forbidding temple sacrifices—took away more than the "daily." He forbade them to offer the yearly too. Though the prophecy itself specifies that *just* the first-apartment ministry would be taken away, Antiochus took away even more. Here, too, Antiochus does not fit.

Numerous other arguments mitigate against Antiochus being the fulfillment of Daniel 8. In volume 1 of the Daniel Revelation Committee Series, Dr. Shea has a chapter titled "Why Antiochus IV Is Not the Little Horn of Daniel 8," which demolishes the Antiochus interpretation.

Finally, no discourse on opposition against 1844 would be complete without discussing Hebrews. Opponents claim that Hebrews puts Christ directly into the second apartment—the most holy place—after His ascension. Using the New International Version, with verses such as Hebrews 9:12 ("He did not enter by means of the blood of goats and calves; but he entered the *Most Holy Place* once for all by his own blood" [emphasis supplied*]), they claim that Christ has been in the second apartment since A.D. 31, thus making our belief that He entered the second apartment in 1844 an error. Is this argument valid?

Hebrews is a study of Jesus Christ's superiority in comparison to anything or anyone before Him. It teaches that Jesus initiated a new and better era, and a new and better order of religious things.

Says the Talmud: "The world is to exist for six thousand years; the first two thousand are void [of the Torah, or the law]; the next two thousand are the period of the Torah; and the following two thousand years are the period of the Messiah."—*Avodah Zarah 9a*. Hebrews appears to be introducing

* Emphasis in biblical quotations is supplied by the author.

these ancient Jews to the "period of the Messiah," the period of Jesus, showing its superiority to everything that happened in the "the period of the law."

Hebrews is a study of contrasts between the old and the new, between one era and another. Hebrews contrasts the Old Covenant with the New. See Hebrews 7:22; 8:6-8; 12:24. It contrasts the old Levitical earthly priesthood with the new, better priesthood of Jesus. See Hebrew 8:4, 5; 7:11-15. It contrasts the old system's animal blood with the better blood of Jesus. See Hebrews 9:13, 14. It contrasts the old earthly mediation with Christ's new and better heavenly mediation. See Hebrews 8:1. And it contrasts the old earthly sanctuary to the new and better sanctuary in heaven: "But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." Hebrews 9:11, 12.

The book does not deal with *which* apartment he entered in the heavenly sanctuary. The issue is that He *is* ministering there in our behalf, a *better* mediator of a *better* covenant, with *better* blood, in a *better* ministration, in a *better* sanctuary.

The only time Hebrews talks about the second apartment *alone* is in 9:3 when, describing the earthly system, it says: "After the second veil, the tabernacle which is called the *holiest of all*." Some translate holiest of all as "most holy place." Here, beyond question, the author is talking about the second apartment *only* and uses the plural words *hagia hagion*.

Nowhere else in Hebrews is that specific phrase used in describing where Christ is in heaven! Different plural words (all the words are plural) are used, but never *hagia hagion*, which deals with the second apartment alone. If He entered the *hagia hagion*, why doesn't Hebrews say so, even once?

If the writer of Hebrews wanted to specify that Christ was in the second apartment, then why didn't he use *hagia hagion*, for example, in Hebrews 9:8, which says in the New International Version: "The Holy Spirit was showing by this that the

way into the Most Holy Place had not yet been disclosed as long as the first tabernacle was still standing." (Notice the *contrast* between the earthly and heavenly.) This version translates it "Most Holy Place," though the Greek phrase used there, *ton hagion*, was used also in Hebrews 8:2, which refers to the entire heavenly sanctuary itself: "A minister of the sanctuary [*ton hagion*], and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man." *Hagia hagion* was not used here, or anywhere else, in discussing the location of Jesus in the heavenly sanctuary.

The only verse that, at first, might seem to contradict this point is Hebrews 9:25, which says: "Nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entered the holy place every year with blood of others." Here the word for "holy place" is not *hagia hagion*, but another plural word, *ta hagia*, even though the text appears to be talking about the second apartment because it refers to "every year." The Day of Atonement is, apparently, alluded to.

Does this verse, then, contradict my thesis regarding the use of *hagia hagion*? No! The high priest applied blood in *both* apartments on the Day of Atonement, which is why Hebrews doesn't use *hagia hagion*, a phrase that refers to the second apartment alone! Instead the writer used a word that is translated "sanctuary" also, because once a year the high priest entered *both* apartments, the whole sanctuary, where he ministered blood. See Exodus 30:10.

If Hebrews wanted to specify that Jesus was in the second apartment, it would have at some point put Him in the *hagia hagion*. It doesn't, not even once.

Saying that Hebrews places Christ in the second apartment is like saying that John's phrase in Revelation, "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day" (Revelation 1:10), proves that Jesus changed the Sabbath to Sunday. It is reading into the texts more than is there.

Instead, the issue in Hebrews is not which apartment Christ entered, but that He is there ministering His shed blood in our behalf.

Chapter Nine

During the height of the sanctuary controversy, the day-year principle came under attack. People claimed that it was not valid, or at least that it was not "explicit" in Scripture. Others challenged our application of the day-year principle in Daniel 7, 8, and 9.

The question is crucial. If the principle is not valid, or at least should not be applied in Daniel 7, 8, and 9, our message crumbles.

Is the day-year principle legitimate, and, if so, why apply it to those three chapters in Daniel?

First of all, the day-year principle was not originated by Millerites or Seventh-day Adventists. Jews and Christians have been applying it for centuries, often on the same texts that Adventists use today. Clement of Alexandria (second and third centuries A.D.), a church father, applied the day-year principle to the seventy weeks of Daniel 9, as have most scholars through the ages, both Jew and Gentile. One of the greatest Hebrew scholars, Rashi (A.D. 1040-1105), translated Daniel 8:14 as—"And he said unto me, Unto 2300 *years*." This principle has been recognized and accepted all over the world for centuries. It is not an Adventist innovation.

But what is the biblical evidence? We all are familiar with Numbers 14:34: "After the number of days in which ye searched the land, even forty days, each day for a year." And Ezekiel 4:4-6: "According to the number of the days that thou shalt lie upon it . . . I have appointed thee each day for a year." Though these

texts hint at the day-year principle, what other evidence exists?

The Old Testament has long recognized a relationship between days and years, and, in some cases, though the word *year* is meant in the text, the literal Hebrew word has been *days*. The Passover feast, for example, was kept once a year. See Exodus 13:10. The text in the KJV is translated: "Thou shalt therefore keep this ordinance in his season from year for year." Yet the original Hebrew reads literally "from days to days," even though it meant from year to year!

First Samuel 20:6 reads: "If thy father at all miss me, then say, David earnestly asked leave of me that he might run to Bethlehem his city: for there is a yearly sacrifice there for all the family." Yet "yearly sacrifice" is translated from words that literally mean "sacrifice of the days." As in Exodus, the word *days* was used even though year or yearly was meant.

First Samuel 27:7 reads, "The time that David dwelt in the country of the Philistines was a full year and four months." The original Hebrew reads, "days and four months" instead of "year and four months."

There is a common Hebrew word for year, *shanah*, but in these verses "days" is used instead, thus showing a link between year and day in the Bible.

Other examples of this type can be found. See 1 Sam. 2:19; 1 Sam. 1:21; 1 Kings 1:1. Nevertheless, even if these and other verses help prove the idea of the day-year relationship, can we be sure that we should apply it to the time prophecies of Daniel 7, 8, and 9?

Daniel 9 stated that from the "commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah" would be sixty-nine weeks. Even if someone argued for a date fifty years different from 457 B.C. for the command to rebuild Jerusalem, about 400 years still exist between that date and the coming of Jesus—"the Messiah the Prince." If the sixty-nine weeks are literal, then from the command to restore and rebuild Jerusalem (fifth century B.C.) until the Messiah (first century A.D.) would have to be sixty-nine weeks—or *one year, four months, and one week*. Ridiculous! The day-year principle must be applied here, or else the prophecy becomes senseless.

Perhaps the greatest proof of the validity of the day-year principle and its application in Daniel 9 is that *it works!* Is it coincidence that if you apply the principle to sixty-nine weeks, you get a time span that fits the two events depicted in the verse? If you don't use the principle, the prophecy becomes meaningless; if you do use the principle, the prophecy works perfectly. That point alone irrefutably proves the day-year principle.

Obviously, the day-year principle is operating in the seventy-week time prophecy, which was "cut off" from the 2300-day time prophecy. So, really, they both are part of the same prophecy. Now if the day-year principle is working in one part of the time prophecy, then would it not be logical that it would be working in the other too? Of course, it would be very logical.

Indeed not only logical, but absolutely necessary. Applying the day-year principle to the seventy weeks gives 490 years, or 176,400 days. How could you cut off 176,400 days from 2300? You can't. The only way it could be cut off is if you applied the day-year principle to the 2300 days as well. Otherwise, it would be like trying to cut off two miles from three feet. Therefore, the day-year principle must be working in the 2300 days as well.

More evidence exists for the day-year principle in the 2300 days. The question that prompted the response about the 2300 days is in Daniel 8:13, which reads literally, "Until when the vision [*hazon*], the daily, and the transgression of desolation giving the sanctuary and the host a trampling?" A few important points must be noted:

The literal translation is "Until when" will these things be?—not "How long?" The emphasis is on the *end point*. "Until when" will these events happen?

Notice the word for vision: *hazon*, which we saw deals with the entire vision, i.e., the ram, the goat, etc.

And finally, though the KJV supplies the word *concerning* ("How long shall be the vision *concerning* the daily sacrifice?"), the literal Hebrew doesn't have *concerning* there, nor does the construction of the Hebrew demand that the word be there. Actually, it definitely does not belong. (For those who know

Hebrew, *vision* has the *Hē* article, so it is definitely *not* in the construct state.)

What does all this mean? The question concerns the *end* point ("until when") of everything listed: the *hazon* or vision (which includes the ram and the goat), the daily, and the transgression of desolation are included. It is not asking just about the vision concerning the "daily" and the activity of the little horn, but about everything in the vision, including the part of the *hazon* concerning the ram and the goat. "How long" until all these things regarding the ram, the goat, and the little horn? The answer is literally, "Until evening morning 2300."

Therefore, the 2300 days cover all the events listed in the question: the ram, the goat, and the little horn. The time frame then deals with Media-Persia, Greece, as well as pagan and papal Rome. All these factors are within the time frame of the question "Until when?" and they must be completed within 2300 days.

Taken literally, 2300 days comes to six years, three months, and twenty days. How could this time prophecy be literal and cover all these events? It couldn't. Media-Persia itself went from 539 to 331 B.C. That nation alone, much less Greece and Rome, covers far too much time to fit in just over six years. Therefore it must be using the day-year principle, which covers over two millennia, enough to span all the events. Without the day-year principle, the prophecy makes no sense.

Also, though the prophecy starts out with nations that go back thousands of years, Daniel was told that the vision was for the "time of the end." Obviously, any time frame involved must cover much more than six years in order to bring the prophecy from thousands in the past into the "time of the end." Without the day-year principle, the prophecy could not extend that far. Here, too, the day-year principle solves the problem.

In Daniel 7, we have this terrible little horn power. By far, more details are given about the horn than about all the other beasts, which included the mighty Babylonian, Media-Persian,

Grecian, and pagan Roman empires—nations that lasted hundreds of years apiece. Yet the emphasis is on the little horn power, who is so terrible that God Himself in the judgment brings an end to it. Yet this little horn power, worse than any of the other beasts lasting for hundreds and hundreds of years, is going to last only a literal three and a half years? A literal three and a half years doesn't fit the magnitude of the larger events depicted in the previous parts of the prophecy. Plus, we saw that the fourth beast was pagan Rome, which ended over 1500 years ago. The next power, the little horn, had to come down to the time of the end, when the judgment is to sit and God is to establish His kingdom. Somehow, three and half years doesn't quite extend far enough from the final days of pagan Rome to the time of the end. Here, too, literal time does not fit the events that are depicted in the prophecy though, again, the day-year principle solves the problem.

Notice, too, the exact wording for the time prophecy in Daniel 7:25. "Until a time and times and the dividing of time." What a strange way to say three and a half years. It's as if someone asked my age, and I replied that "I am twenty years, two years, and ten years." Perhaps I was trying to say something else. Indeed, Daniel 4:25 says that Nebuchadnezzar will be sick, living like an animal, until "seven times shall pass over thee." Why didn't it say until "a time, and times, and times, and a time, and a half a time and a half of time?" The day-year principle can't be applied in this verse, or else the king would have to be almost 4,000 years old. Obviously, Daniel meant literal time concerning the length of the king's sickness, which was probably why he gave a normal number.

Perhaps Daniel said, "Until a time and times and the dividing of time," in chapter 7 because a literal three and a half years was not meant. Instead, prophetic time was. In Daniel 7 we have symbols almost all the way through: a lion, a bear, a leopard with wings, horns that speak—all symbolizing different things. Is it then not logical to think that the time sequence given in that prophecy would also be symbolic of some-

thing else as well, especially when it is given in such a strange manner? Of course.

Even with the 2300 days, the same factors are found. Daniel 8 is also a vision with *symbolic* imagery. It is no more a prophecy about animals than was Daniel 7. It's prophetic all the way through. Would it not also then be expected that a time sequence in these chapters would also be symbolic, rather than literal?

Additionally, "evening and morning" is not the common way to describe days. The typical words for days in the Bible is *yamin*, plural of *yom*, which occurs more than a thousand times in the Bible. Also, wouldn't it be more simple to have said, "Unto six years, three months, and twenty days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed," instead of 2300 days? Daniel 8:14 is not the typical way to denote time. In 2 Samuel 5:5, for example, it says that the king "reigned over Judah seven years and six months," not 2700 days.

Even the seventy weeks of Daniel is not a common way to express time. Why wasn't it given as one year and four and a half months?

The reason for all this could simply be that the Lord wasn't dealing with literal time, and He used these "symbolic" numbers and units in order to show the reader that prophetic time, not literal time, was meant.

Clearly, much evidence exists for the day-year principle in Daniel 7, 8, and 9. They make no sense without it.

1. The first part of the paper is devoted to the study of the properties of the function $f(x)$ defined by the equation $f(x) = \int_0^x f(t) dt$. It is shown that $f(x)$ is a constant function, and its value is determined by the initial condition $f(0)$.

2. In the second part, we consider the problem of finding the maximum value of the function $f(x)$ on the interval $[0, 1]$. It is shown that the maximum value is attained at $x = 0$ and is equal to $f(0)$.

3. The third part of the paper is devoted to the study of the properties of the function $f(x)$ defined by the equation $f(x) = \int_0^x f(t) dt$. It is shown that $f(x)$ is a constant function, and its value is determined by the initial condition $f(0)$.

4. In the fourth part, we consider the problem of finding the maximum value of the function $f(x)$ on the interval $[0, 1]$. It is shown that the maximum value is attained at $x = 0$ and is equal to $f(0)$.

5. The fifth part of the paper is devoted to the study of the properties of the function $f(x)$ defined by the equation $f(x) = \int_0^x f(t) dt$. It is shown that $f(x)$ is a constant function, and its value is determined by the initial condition $f(0)$.

6. In the sixth part, we consider the problem of finding the maximum value of the function $f(x)$ on the interval $[0, 1]$. It is shown that the maximum value is attained at $x = 0$ and is equal to $f(0)$.

7. The seventh part of the paper is devoted to the study of the properties of the function $f(x)$ defined by the equation $f(x) = \int_0^x f(t) dt$. It is shown that $f(x)$ is a constant function, and its value is determined by the initial condition $f(0)$.

8. In the eighth part, we consider the problem of finding the maximum value of the function $f(x)$ on the interval $[0, 1]$. It is shown that the maximum value is attained at $x = 0$ and is equal to $f(0)$.

9. The ninth part of the paper is devoted to the study of the properties of the function $f(x)$ defined by the equation $f(x) = \int_0^x f(t) dt$. It is shown that $f(x)$ is a constant function, and its value is determined by the initial condition $f(0)$.

10. In the tenth part, we consider the problem of finding the maximum value of the function $f(x)$ on the interval $[0, 1]$. It is shown that the maximum value is attained at $x = 0$ and is equal to $f(0)$.

Part Three: *Investigating the Judgment*

Chapter Ten

Obviously, the doctrine of the 1844 investigative judgment stands as firm as the Word of God itself. But what is the importance of the judgment? And what does it mean for our lives today?

To understand the judgment, we must understand the universality of the great controversy and that sin is not an earthly issue alone. "How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning!" Isaiah 14:12. Sin began in heaven, with Lucifer. It involves all of the creation, who have questions concerning sin, the law, and the character of God—questions that for thousands of years have been battled out on the earth. "Woe to the inhabitants of the earth and of the sea! for the devil is come down unto you, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time." Revelation 12:12.

Jesus won the decisive victory at the cross. Here the penalty for transgression was paid in full, and those who claim the blood of Christ in their behalf have been redeemed.

But what of the onlooking universe? Were all their questions about sin, the great controversy, the law of God answered at the cross?

Apparently not, because Paul wrote that God's "intent was that now, *through the church*, the manifold wisdom of God should be made known to the rulers and authorities *in the heavenly realms*, according to his eternal purpose which he accomplished in Christ Jesus our Lord." Ephesians 3:10, 11, NIV.

This text, written years after Jesus died, shows that not

everything the "principalities and powers in heavenly places" needed to know about the "manifold wisdom of God" was revealed to them at Calvary. Instead, God was going to reveal more of that wisdom "by the church."

Notice, too, that this plan to reveal God's wisdom to the universe through His church was "according to his eternal purpose which he accomplished in Christ Jesus our Lord." We often think of Christ's death as planned from the beginning—and it was! But this verse teaches that God's plan to reveal His wisdom to the universe through His church is also part of God's "eternal purpose."

How, though, are we to be used in revealing this wisdom?

"We are his workmanship, *created in Christ Jesus unto good works*, which God prepared beforehand, that we should walk in them." Ephesians 2:10.

We were created not only for good works, but these works were "prepared beforehand," just as the plan for the church to show God's wisdom to the universe was planned from the beginning. Does any link exist between our good works and God's wisdom being revealed to the onlooking universe?

Indeed! "Herein is my Father glorified," said Jesus, "that ye bear much fruit." John 15:8. "Let your light so shine before men," He also said, "that they may see your *good works*, and glorify your Father which is in heaven." Matthew 5:16.

The book of Job shows that God, before the "principalities and powers in heavenly places," was glorified by the character and good works of Job, whose faithfulness under adversity proved Satan's accusations wrong before the onlooking "sons of God"—the heavenly beings mentioned in the first chapter. No wonder Paul writes that we are a spectacle unto men and angels. See Corinthians 4:9.

This idea of God being glorified in His people is a crucial concept, and it is found in other parts of the Bible. "To appoint unto them that mourn in Zion, to give unto them beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness; that they might be called trees of *righteousness*, the planting of the Lord, that *he might be glorified*." Isaiah 61:3. "Thy people also shall be all

righteous . . . that I may be glorified." Isaiah 60:21.

In Genesis 3:15, the first Gospel promise, God says to the devil, "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel."

We know that at Calvary the head of the serpent was bruised by Jesus. Yet in Romans 16, Paul writes to believers, warning them against false teachers. He says in verse 19 that he would have Christians "wise unto that which is good, and simple concerning evil." Then, in the next verse, he says, "the God of peace shall bruise Satan under *your feet* shortly."

Under our feet! God will bruise Satan under the feet of believers? Paul is obviously referring to Genesis 3:15, where Satan is told of his demise. Yet Paul implies that believers will have a part in that demise. Here's a text written years after the cross, which shows that God's people themselves are going to be involved in the defeat of the devil!

How can we bruise Satan? Can we literally stomp on him under our feet? Hardly. Instead, through the power of the indwelling Christ, we can allow Jesus to transform us into His image, allow Him to give us victory over all our sins, allow Him to make us "wise unto that which is good, and simple concerning evil" and thus by the characters we form bring glory to God. We will show that the devil's accusations against God's law are wrong. *God's law can be kept, and He will use us to help prove it!*

What other evidence proves that not everything the heavenly host needed to know about the plan of salvation was answered at the cross? And what else will God use to answer these questions?

Envision the sanctuary in the wilderness. The altar of burnt offerings symbolized the cross. The laver symbolized cleansing. The first apartment symbolized reconciliation and forgiveness, and in it stood the lamp stand (a symbol of the Holy Spirit), the table of shewbread (a symbol of Jesus), and the altar of incense (symbol of Christ's righteousness ascending with our prayers).

The second apartment was where the judgment occurred. The ark contained the Ten Commandments, which expressed God's law, and the gold cover on the ark—the mercy seat—symbolized God's mercy in dealing with those who break that law. Above the mercy seat sat the two angels looking down, symbolic of the heavenly host's interest in the plan of redemption.

Here the Jews had a pictorial representation of the entire plan of salvation: atonement, forgiveness, justification, confession, sanctification, judgment—it was all there!

Now, if everything that the heavenly host needed to know about the plan of salvation was revealed at the cross, then when the Lord made the sanctuary model (a symbol of that plan), why didn't He place those two Cherubim—*who symbolized the heavenly host's interest in salvation*—over the altar of burnt offerings, looking down at what symbolized the cross? Instead, God placed them all the way in the second apartment, looking down at the *judgment*!

God chose to symbolize heaven's interest, not at the cross, but where the investigative judgment occurs!

This position does not diminish from what Jesus accomplished at the cross. Instead, it simply shows that as far as the whole universe is involved—and they are involved—everything was not answered at Calvary. Instead, they are answered at the judgment, which is why the Lord placed the angels in the second apartment, overlooking the judgment and not on the altar of burnt offerings, overlooking Calvary (angels were embroidered in the first apartment, but that representation is not as strongly expressed as in the two statues of gold). Apparently, the judgment is also involved in answering the universe's questions.

Notice Romans 3:4, which talks about God Himself being judged. "Let God be true though every man be false, as it is written, 'That thou mayest be justified in thy words, and prevail when thou *art judged*.'" RSV.

The New English Bible reads: "Will their faithlessness cancel the faithfulness of God? Certainly not! God must be true though every man living were a liar; for we read in Scripture:

'When thou speakest thou shalt be vindicated, and win the verdict when *thou art on trial.*' " Verses 3, 4.

In Today's English Version: "Does this mean that God will not be faithful? Certainly not! God must be true, even though every man is a liar. As the scripture says, 'You must be shown to be right when you speak; you must win your case when *you are being tried.*' "

The Phillips says, "That thou might be justified in thy words, and mightest prevail when thou *comest into judgment.*"

These verses all convey the idea of God Himself coming under judgment—that He will be tried, and the outcome of that judgment vindicates God. "You must win your case when you are being tried."

The King James Version reads: "That thou mightest be justified in thy sayings, and mightest overcome when *thou art judged.*"

The verse quoted above is taken from Psalm 51: "Have mercy upon me, O God, according to thy lovingkindness: according unto the multitude of thy tender mercies blot out my transgressions. Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity, and cleanse me from my sin . . . that thou mightest be justified when thou speakest, and be clear when thou judgest." Verses 1-4.

David is asking God to cleanse him from sin, to wash him from iniquity, and to blot out his transgressions. Why? "That thou [God] mightest be justified when thou speakest, and be clear when thou judgest." In other words, God will be "justified" and "clear" according to how He deals with His people's sin.

The other versions give the idea that God Himself is being judged: "when you are being tried;" "when thou art judged." Yet both concepts together brilliantly convey the idea that God will be judged by how He judges His people. Indeed, Psalm 51 talks not only about the cleansing of sin, but the *blotting out* of sin too. When is sin blotted out? In the judgment—the second apartment of the sanctuary, where the two angels, symbolizing heaven's interest, sit above the mercy seat. Obviously, God will win His "case," He will "prevail" or "be shown

right" in the judgment, when He blots out our ~~sin~~ of hosts shall be exalted in judgment." Isaiah 5:16

Before whom will He "be exalted," or "vindicated" or "shown right"?

In Daniel 7 we saw a description of the investigative judgment, which was given "to the saints." Verse 22. And who stood before God as the judgment session began? "Ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him: the judgment was set, and the books were opened." Verse 10. Literally millions of heavenly beings—symbolized by the two cherubim in the second apartment—witness the judgment of God's people. Because the whole universe is involved and interested in the great controversy and the plan of salvation, God convenes this divine judgment before them. His universe is not run like a fascist state, where people are arrested, tried, and sentenced in secret. Instead, God deals with the questions of sin and rebellion in a wide open manner—before all heaven, who will have their questions about His character answered. God Himself will be "clear when [He] judgest."

What is the first angel's message? "Fear God, and give glory to him; for *the hour of his judgment is come.*" Revelation 14:7. Does this mean that God begins judging, or does this verse refer to the beginning of God Himself being judged: "the hour of his judgment?" It can mean both! He is being judged on how He judges!

Indeed, Revelation 14:7 heralds the message that the hour of God's judgment "has begun." The judgment begins in chapter 14. Two chapters later, in the time of the plagues (which means that probation has already closed, something that hadn't happened in Revelation 14) heavenly beings cry out: "Even so, Lord God Almighty, true and righteous are thy judgments." Revelation 16:7.

How do they know His judgments are true and righteous? Because they were witnesses to the judgment scene. This is why they declare: "Thou art righteous, O Lord, which art, and wast, and shalt be, because *thou hast judged thus.*" Revelation 16:5.

God is righteous "because thou has judged thus!"

Clearly, the Bible teaches that not everything the universe needed to know about the "manifold wisdom of God" was learned at Calvary. God was going to give them more. And two things He will use to answer these questions will be the character development of his people and the judgment in heaven.

With these two points established, we are ready to understand the investigative judgment.

Chapter Eleven

If you study the earthly sanctuary service, one point stands out clearly—order. Every detail, from the shape of the furniture to the minutiae concerning the sacrifices, is given. God is a God of order; He runs the universe in an orderly fashion. And, as the earthly sanctuary shows, He is likewise dealing with the problem of sin and rebellion in an orderly fashion. God could have blotted out sin and Satan instantly. Instead, God will resolve the great controversy in an open and *orderly* fashion, before all the “principalities and powers in heavenly places.”

In the earthly sanctuary service, after a person would sin, he would bring a spotless animal to the sanctuary. Then he would “lay his hand upon the bullock’s head, and kill the bullock before the Lord.” Leviticus 4:4. The laying on of the hand symbolized the transfer of sin from the guilty sinner to the innocent animal.

After the animal was killed, the priests—in one of a number of ways—would take the blood and manipulate it in either the courtyard or the sanctuary. This manipulation involved the transfer of sin (in the form of the blood) to the sanctuary area itself. This idea is given in Leviticus 10:17, 18 when the Lord says to the priest: “Wherefore have ye not eaten the sin offering in the holy place, seeing it is most holy, and God hath given it *you to bear the iniquity of the congregation*, to make atonement for them before the Lord? Behold, the *blood of it was not brought in within the holy place.*”

A sinner comes to the sanctuary with his sacrifice. He confesses his sin upon the animal. His sins are transferred to the animal, which is slain in the sinner's place. The priest then takes the blood which "carries" the sin, and the priest "bears the iniquity" until he brings the "sin-laden" blood into the sanctuary, where the sins are left. This sequence—sin from the sinner, to animal, to priest, to sanctuary—went on *daily* (remember that word?).

During the year, of course, much sin was transferred into the sanctuary. On the Day of Atonement, the great judgment day, the sanctuary itself was to be cleansed of that sin. All the sins brought in were to be taken out.

"He shall make an atonement for the holy place, because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and because of their transgression in *all* their sins." Leviticus 16:16.

The sanctuary needed atonement, not because it sinned, but because all the sins of Israel had been brought into it. And just as atonement for a person involved the transfer of sin from that individual, atonement for the sanctuary involves the transfer of sin from the sanctuary itself.

On the Day of Atonement blood is again brought into the sanctuary, where it is sprinkled in the second apartment. Now, however, no mention is made of the laying on of hands on the animal whose blood is brought in. In other words, no sin has been confessed on the animals in this part of the service. It is "clean" blood, with no sin confessed on it, that is *first* brought in. This "clean" blood then "picks up" all the sins (just as it would pick up the sin from the individual sinner) and removes them from the sanctuary. The priest then goes outside the sanctuary after he has cleansed it "from the uncleanness of the children of Israel" (via the blood), which now "carries" all the sins brought in during the year. Then he "shall lay both his hands"—bloodied from sprinkling—"upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him *all* the iniquities of the children of Israel, and *all* their transgressions in *all* their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat, and shall send him away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness: and the goat shall bear upon him *all* their iniquities unto a land

not inhabited." Leviticus 16:19, 21, 22.

In the *yearly* service, all the sins brought into the sanctuary (through the *daily* service) were then taken out by the priest who confessed them onto the scapegoat, which was made to bear all those iniquities accumulated through the year. The scapegoat symbolizes Satan, who ultimately will bear all the sins that he caused God's people to commit. (In Jewish tradition this scapegoat symbolizes Azazel, the leader of rebellious angels!)

Look at sin as atomic waste, the blood a container, and the sanctuary as a temporary storehouse. The waste goes from the sinner to the animal and then (via the blood) to the priest, who stores it in the sanctuary. Then, on a special day, all that waste (again, via the blood) is taken out and disposed of in a "land not inhabited," or disposed of in a place where it can do no harm.

This earthly sanctuary service involved the transfer of sin from the sinner to the one *ultimately* responsible for sin—the devil. And it was all done in an open, orderly manner.

The earthly service, however, symbolized the real service in heaven. The earthly sanctuary was a copy and a "shadow of heavenly things." Hebrews 8:5. The slain animal symbolized Jesus, "the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." John 1:29.

Where does He *taketh* away our sins to? Jesus, we know, "bare our sins in his own body." 1 Peter 2:24. Afterward, He went into heaven, where He serves as our High Priest. And just as the earthly priest's intercession in behalf of Israel involved the taking their sins away from them and placing them in the sanctuary, Jesus' intercession in our behalf in heaven is doing the same thing. "We have such a high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens; a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man." Hebrews 8:1, 2.

When we confess our sins, we are forgiven for those sins, which are taken from us and marked pardoned in the heavenly sanctuary—just as they were symbolically placed in the earthly sanctuary, where they also were pardoned. And, like

the earthly, the heavenly, too, will be cleansed of those sins which will one day fall upon the one responsible for them—Satan—symbolized as the scapegoat. “Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.” Daniel 8:14. “It was necessary, then, for the copies of the heavenly things [earthly sanctuary] to be purified with these sacrifices [animal], but the heavenly things themselves [heavenly sanctuary] with better sacrifices than these [Jesus].” Hebrews 9:23, NIV.

Hebrews 9:28, talking about Jesus, says, “Unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time *without sin* unto salvation.”

Without sin? Did Jesus ever sin? Of course not! But He “became sin for us” as the Lamb of God, and He bears our sins now as high priest. Yet, just as the earthly sanctuary was cleansed of all sin, so will the heavenly be cleansed. Sin will be taken out. Christ will finish his mediation in heaven. The cry will be heard, “He that is unjust, let him be unjust still: . . . and he that is holy, let him be holy still.” Revelation 22:11. Jesus will return “without sin,” and all the sins God’s true Israel have committed since Adam will be placed on the devil!

Why does God go through this elaborate system when He could have eradicated sin and the devil instantly? Because God wanted to show the whole universe His justice and mercy in dealing with sin and rebellion. Christ died, and now serves as a high priest in the heavenly sanctuary, in order to eradicate sin, save humanity, and punish the devil in an *orderly* way that leaves no questions in the minds of the onlooking universe—which will see His mercy in forgiving us our sins and His justice in finally placing them on the instigator of all evil.

Now. What does this cleansing of the sanctuary have to do with us?

Plenty, because on the Day of Atonement, the sanctuary itself wasn’t the only thing cleansed. “On that day shall the priest make an atonement for you, to cleanse you, that ye may be clean from *all your sins* before the Lord.” Leviticus 16:30. The people, too, were cleansed. Like the sanctuary, the people are cleansed of “all” their sins.

What are the elements that, besides the cross, God will use to make his "manifold wisdom" known to the "principalities and powers in heavenly places?" The judgment, which is the Day of Atonement, is one; and a people who obey His law, who bear fruit, who are cleansed of sin, is another.

On the Day of Atonement, *both* these elements occur! If one person, by bearing much fruit, brings glory to God, imagine a whole camp. Indeed, the Day of Atonement was the climax—a *yearly* type of what God wants to have in reality: a sanctuary in heaven cleansed of sin, and a people on earth cleansed of sin—all before the onlooking universe!

The link between the judgment and a clean, holy people is found elsewhere. In Malachi 3, we see the judgment. "The Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple." "I will come near to you to *judgment*." Verses 1, 5. In the first verse there is motion, God going to His temple. In the judgment scenes of Daniel 7, we see God in motion as well. ("Thrones *were [placed]*, and the Ancient of days *did sit*." "One like the Son of man *came*." "The Ancient of days *came*.") Malachi is describing this judgment.

Yet in the midst of this judgment, what happens to God's people? "He is like a refiner's fire, and like fullers' soap: and he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver: and he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver." Verses 2, 3.

What will God be doing to His people while the judgment takes place? He will be purifying, purging, cleansing them (with "fullers' soap"). In the message to Laodicea—the church living in the judgment!—the Lord uses the same imagery as Malachi. "I counsel thee to buy of me *gold* tried in the *fire*." Revelation 3:18.

Here, as in Leviticus 16, judgment is linked to the purifying and cleansing of God's people. God's people will be cleansed during the judgment!

Notice the verse that prompts Malachi 3. "Ye have wearied the Lord with your words. Yet ye say, Wherein have we wearied him? When ye say, Every one that doeth evil is good in the sight of the Lord, and he delighteth in them; or, Where

is the God of judgment?" Malachi 2:17.

Look at the concepts here: character development ("Every one that doeth evil is good in the sight of the Lord") and judgment ("Where is the God of judgment?"). People are saying that it doesn't matter if you do evil, God delighteth in you anyway. And they also question the idea of judgment.

It is no coincidence that those who downplay obedience also downplay the judgment, for obedience and judgment are inseparably linked! And this issue is exactly what we confront today. Those who question the importance of obedience, who say that God delights in us despite our sin, are the same ones who question the reality of the investigative judgment! Diminish the importance of obedience, and you will inevitably diminish the importance of the judgment.

And yet, what is God's response to these attitudes? It begins with the next verse which starts Malachi 3, where the Lord tells of a judgment and of the refined, purified characters that His people will have in that judgment!

And, finally, what is the first angel's message? "Fear God, and *give glory* to him; for the hour of *his judgment* is come." Revelation 14:7. Notice that part of the third angel's message describes the character of God's people during this judgment. "Here is the patience of the saints: here are they that *keep the commandments of God*, and the faith of Jesus." Revelation 14:12.

Look at the elements here. We are told to give glory to God. How do we glorify God? By obedience, by bearing fruit, by allowing him to cleanse us. Is it coincidence, then, that His people are described as those who "keep the commandments of God, and have the faith of Jesus"? Hardly. What better way to glorify God than by obeying the commandments and having the faith of Jesus!

We also saw that the judgment gives glory to God—that He is judged and glorified by how He judges us—and the judgment is part of this message too. "The hour of *his judgment* is come."

Here, as we saw in Leviticus and Malachi, is the concept of judgment linked to an obedient people.

So the gist of the investigative judgment, as it relates to us, is that during this judgment, God will prepare a people cleansed from "all . . . sin," a people purged "as gold and silver," a people who "keep the commandments of God."

Indeed, that same chapter in Revelation talks again about the condition of God's people in the end. "Another angel came out of the temple, crying with a loud voice to him that sat on the cloud, Thrust in thy sickle, and reap: for the time is come . . . for the harvest of the earth is *ripe*." Verse 15.

God's people are described as ripe.

How are the wicked described? "Another angel came out from the altar, which had power over fire; and cried with a loud cry to him that had the sharp sickle, saying, Thrust in thy sickle, and gather the clusters of the vine of the earth; for her grapes are *fully ripe*." Verse 18. It then says that these grapes will be cast "into the great winepress of the wrath of God." Verse 19.

The wicked here are described as fully ripe.

Look at the contrast. God will have a people obedient to His law, a people refined, purified, cleansed—a people ripe. When Christ finishes mediation in heaven, His Spirit will be removed from the earth, and except for this small, obedient remnant, Satan will have unrestrained control over the rest of the world. No wonder, then, Satan's people will be "fully ripe."

This ripening happens just before the second coming, where the separation between the converted and the unconverted climaxes into this extreme contrast between ripened holiness and ripened evil. In the midst of this worldwide lawlessness, Jesus will have a people who "keep the commandments of God" while the universe, on a scale as never before, will see the contrast between obedience and disobedience.

God is seeking to refine and purify a people to keep the commandments, a people to stand in the day of judgment. The judgment, therefore, is a crucial call to sanctification. It is time for "perfecting holiness in the fear of God." 2 Corinthians 7:1. Just as the typical Day of Atonement was a special time of heart searching, repentance, and preparation, how much more so is the real Day of Atonement, in which we have been

living since 1844. As in the earthly judgment day, God is seeking to cleanse us from all sin. The judgment is important in our lives because God wants to prepare us to stand in it!

Jesus said that to whom much is given much is expected and who has been given more than Adventists? With our understanding about the great controversy, Calvary, the law, sacred history, diet, health, the mind, education, etc., what more could Jesus do to try to prepare us to meet Him? We should be allowing Christ to make us the ripest Christians on earth.

And yet God's "ripe" people are not saved because they "keep the commandments of God" but because they have the "faith of Jesus." Standing in the judgment has nothing to do with legalism—with salvation by works. Those who live in this time are saved by the same thing that saved the thief on the cross: the righteousness of Jesus for them, in place of them, imputed to them. When their names come up in the judgment, Christ will plead His blood, His righteousness in their behalf. *Character development, when understood in the context of bringing glory to God, is not legalism!*

Nevertheless, through the indwelling power of the Holy Spirit, God will have a people who would not only rather die than break the law, but who will not break that law. Christ promises power to overcome every sin, and we all can claim that power and have the victory through Christ—even now. Obedience, holiness, sanctification—these are the calls of the judgment, and if we don't herald them, God will bring into the ranks others who will!


Two things will occur simultaneously, whether or not we as a people will be involved. In heaven, God will have completed the judgment, cleansed the sanctuary, blotted out His people's sin—all before the onlooking universe, who shout: "Righteous and true are Thy judgments, O Lord." At the same time, on earth, God will be glorified by the character development and the obedience of His people who, despite worldwide apostasy and lawlessness, keep His commandments.

There will be a clean sanctuary in heaven, a clean people on earth, and sin will ultimately fall upon the one who started it

all. In heaven and earth, by what God does in both, His ways—open to “the principalities and powers in heavenly places”—will be seen as just, perfect, and true.

What is the essence of the judgment and its relevance to our lives today? While God blots out our sins that have been recorded in heaven, we must love Jesus enough to allow Him to blot out our sin on earth, in order that He may be glorified before the onlooking universe.

Here is our call. Here is present truth. And here is the relevance of the judgment for our lives today.



What significance, if any, does the year 1844 and the oft-attacked events surrounding it have for Christians today? Is there a way to make sense of the confusing maze of beasts, dates, and kingdoms in Daniel?

From a man who came unbearably close to denying the validity of an investigative judgment and leaving the church that taught it, comes the boldest, most *simple* explanation and ringing endorsement of this paramount biblical teaching.

In this his latest book, Clifford Goldstein, best-selling author of *The "Saving" of America*, solves the maze of Daniel's prophecies. He reveals the truth about 1844 and the investigative judgment in stunning clarity and unashamed passion.

***1844 Made Simple* is destined to be one of the most important books you, as a Christian awaiting the imminent return of Christ, will ever own. If you've wondered whether you'd ever get it all straightened out, look no further. The key to solving 1844's maze and becoming grounded in present truth is now in your hands.**