

The Desolations of Jerusalem 02

From a Presentation by Duane Dewey 11, 2011

Transcription by Sister Grace

Please Kneel for Prayer: Loving Father again, thank you dear Lord for coming here to study these things, we thank you for your love for the church, that means you love me Lord, had it not been for your love, what hope would we have? And we are grateful dear Lord today that even if we understand the story of Nehemiah as we should, Nehemiah was encouraged and he was the man you sent and he finished the work and it was a good work. We pray dear Lord that through you, we will be those people who will finish the work and that we can go home. Bless us to these ends we pray, give us understanding, for we lack it, and give hearts that are willing to receive your word, we pray in Jesus name, Amen.

I want to read to you something from Selected Messages before we get into some of the deeper aspects of this man's understanding on Biblical hermeneutics. Now I want to re-emphasize, Brother Pippenger wrote me an email about this material that am presenting and it is very liberal in its aspects, so we want to guard against condoning any thought that we are in agreement with any of the liberal things that maybe mentioned in these talks. We are not in agreement with them. But we want to stress the fact that we are in agreement with the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy on the correct understanding of Biblical Hermeneutics and the interpretation of the Bible

There is a wonderful passage in 2SM 101-118 but we won't read all of it and it's called 'The Three Angels and the Other Angel', I thought that was appropriate because we are living now in the time of the Judgment of the Living, at the time of the Other Angel.

A Mixture of Truth and Error

"I have not been able to sleep since half past one o'clock. I was bearing to Brother T a message which the Lord had given me for him. The peculiar views he holds are a mixture of truth and error. If he had passed through the experiences of God's people as He has led them for the past forty years, he would be better prepared to make the correct application of Scripture...

She is saying that there is a brother she is writing to who has a mixture of truth and error, had he passed through this experience, he would be better prepared to make the correct application of the scripture. It's in this history she says you find the correct application of scripture. The experience that people had in this history, they were accurately able to understand the Bible; Its application.

Continues... "The great way marks of truth, showing us our bearings in prophetic history, are to be carefully guarded, lest they be torn down, and replaced with theories that would bring confusion rather than genuine light. I have been cited to the very erroneous theories that have been presented over and over again. Those who advocated these theories presented Scripture quotations, but they misapplied and misinterpreted them. The theories supposed to be correct were incorrect... (That means somebody must have been deceived, is that right?)

Continues...and yet many thought them the very theories to be brought before the people (and I would submit to you that in the church today, these things have been done now for a long, long time). The prophecies of Daniel and John are to be diligently studied.” {2SM 101.2}

Now she is saying that there was a group of men who were in error, present before the people what they thought was truth, but now she saying, in the face of that, the prophecies of Daniel and John are to be diligently studied. There is something about studying the prophecies of Daniel and John that will place you on a firm platform. That will separate you from the error of misinterpretation and Bible speculation.

“There are those now living who, in studying the prophecies of Daniel and John, received great light from God as they passed over the ground where special prophecies were in process of fulfillment in their order (that means in this history, there were special prophecies in fulfillment in their order, so that means that this is not relevant to the ash-can of SDA history but is a living history and it’s applicable now!).

Continues...They bore the message of time to the people. The truth shone out clearly as the sun at noonday. Historical events, showing the direct fulfillment of prophecy, were set before the people, and the prophecy was seen to be a figurative delineation of events leading down to the close of this earth’s history. {2SM 102.1}

This (the chart) bore a message of time to the people, notice on top the 2520, the 2300 days is a message on time, unto two thousand three hundred days, then shall the sanctuary be cleansed. There is a difference between darkness and noonday right?

“If he had passed through the experiences of God’s people as He has led them for the past forty years, he would be better prepared to make the correct application of Scripture.” {2SM 101.2}

And the correct application of scripture she describes as a ‘figurative delineation of events leading down to the close of this earth’s history’.

“The scenes connected with the working of the man of sin are the last features plainly revealed in this earth’s history. (I would suggest to you that what we are studying is part of the last plan of what she calls, ‘the man of sin’). The people now have a special message to give to the world, the third angel’s message. Those who, in their experience, have passed over the ground, and acted a part in the proclamation of the first, second, and third angels’ messages, are not so liable to be led into false paths as are those who have not had an experimental knowledge of the people of God.” {2SM 102.1}

That means that if you take this and throw it into the ash-can of Adventist history, you’re going to be led astray by the man of sin. And her application at the beginning of this statement is because of a misunderstanding or misinterpretation of scripture. This is how the Man of Sin is going to accomplish his work.

“There have been one and another who in studying their Bibles thought they discovered great light, and new theories, but these have not been correct. (Someone should say Amen) The Scripture is all true, but by misapplying the Scripture men arrive at wrong conclusions. We are engaged in a mighty conflict, and it will become more close and determined, as we near the final struggle. We have a sleepless adversary, and he is constantly at work upon human minds that have not had a personal

experience in the teachings of the people of God for the past fifty years. Some will take the truth applicable to their time (Now this is (Raymond) Cottrell's argument, notice what she says), and place it in the future. (Anybody know about futurism in Adventism?) Events in the train of prophecy that had their fulfillment away in the past are made future, and thus by these theories the faith of some is undermined." {2SM 102.2}

So I want you to notice that Sister White was aware that a misapplication or a misinterpretation of the scriptures is a product of the work of the Man of Sin, now you want to keep that in mind as we continue our study. She also stresses that this history brought to the people of God in it and experience that fortified them; it placed their feet on a solid foundation, and it was a message based on time. It was a message based on a delineation of events. Let me read it again.

"They bore the message of time to the people. The truth shone out clearly as the sun at noonday. Historical events, showing the direct fulfillment of prophecy, were set before the people, and the prophecy was seen to be a figurative delineation of events leading down to the close of this earth's history. The scenes connected with the working of the man of sin are the last features plainly revealed in this earth's history. The people now have a special message to give to the world, the third angel's message. Those who, in their experience, have passed over the ground, and acted a part in the proclamation of the first, second, and third angels' messages, are not so liable to be led into false paths as are those who have not had an experimental knowledge of the people of God. . . ." {2SM 102.1}

Now, where we left off in the book called 'The Role Of Bible Hermeneutics And Preserving Unity In The Church' on the subject of unity and Bible translation. We were discussing the two methods of Bible study. One is the Proof Text Method, one is called the Historical Method. One is based on—according to this gentleman (Raymond Cottrell)—it's based on the idea that we compare the scriptures with our own culture and experience of our own culture and we interpret the scriptures based on that. He says that that's the wrong way to do it. And then he says that the correct way to do it is to go back into the past and take the historical method, and what that does is that it compares the original historical and literary context and applies it to them directly and he says that in context with an objective of understanding how to apply its principles and its instructions to our time and circumstances. Let me read this, it says:

"The first of these two methods of reading and understanding the Bible usually goes by the name proof-text method, which often takes Bible statements and passages out of their original historical and literary context and applies them directly to our time often under very different circumstances to which they do not apply. The second usually goes by the name 'Historical Method' because it first reads the Bible in its own literary and historical context, with the ultimate objective of understanding how to apply its principles and instruction to our time and circumstances." *The Role of Biblical Hermeneutics in Preserving Unity in the Church, pg 5*

Notice how he couches this statement 'usually goes by the name', you're going to find out here in a little while that Raymond Cottrell has coined this phrase 'Historical Method'. This is not a method used by anybody else in the confines of the Protestant or Catholic world but this term has been made by Raymond himself. You don't know that on the initial reading here, but I am going to show it to you. He says:

“The second usually goes by the name historical method (*There is a reason for him saying usually goes by, he’s invented the word*) because it first reads the Bible in its own literary and historical context, with the ultimate objective of understanding how to apply its principles and instruction to our time and circumstances.” Ibid, Pg 5

“The big advantage of the proof-text method, if there is any advantage, is that it requires no special training or experience. In fact a person need not even be aware of following any method. For most people the big disadvantage of the historical method is that it does require training and experience. Fortunately, however, those who have not had the privilege of that training and experience can still follow the historical method by making use of information those who do have that training have provided. More about that later.” Ibid, Pg 5

“Two factors are involved in obtaining an accurate understanding of the meaning the Holy Spirit and a Bible writer intended a statement or passage of Scripture to convey, the Bible itself and the person studying it. Let us briefly explore both of these essentials to an accurate understanding of the Bible.” Ibid, Pg 6

We are not going to go into all that he covers, he covers objectivity, humility, openness, he is trying to convince you that if you just have an open mind, if you are objective, you are going to be able to use his form of Bible study, and he is going to be able to convince you that he is correct. He gives you a little lesson in how to be open, open minded. I should inform you, that this particular reasoning... psychologists have used this type of reasoning for many years now and it is a form of hypnosis. This man is being guided by a spirit that he knows not. You know in the eastern cultures when they do their meditation, they want to so open their minds so that they empty it completely, so what this man is talking about is very dangerous. We need to approach God’s word with reverence, knowing that He alone is the interpreter of His word. The human mind is not to be used as an open interpreter of the word of God. Very dangerous. It’s Catholic in its origin—really it’s satanic in its origin. It lifts man above the Word and it places us on a ground, that to humanity it seems like an advantage, but it really is a disadvantage because it places us above the Divine. So that’s all I will say about that.

So then he goes on with the principle of sola Scriptura. Every body know that it’s the Bible and the Bible only so we don’t have to discuss that in any detail, right?

“The Bible was thought inspired, not verbally inspired. The Holy Spirit impressed the minds of the Bible writers with principles and instruction they addressed to people in covenant relationship to God, in specific historical circumstances. (*He is always going back to the specific historical circumstances, I want you to notice that. He is saying, that what you must do to define or rightly interpret the Bible, is that you must understand the historical, history, context and salvation perspective of the times in which the statement was written, before you can rightly translate the Bible*) They applied these principles and this instruction to issues of the time in which they wrote, in language and thought forms appropriate to the understanding of their contemporaries—in much the same way as a pastor does in his Sabbath morning sermon. It is essential to an accurate understanding of the Bible to distinguish between its divine (*notice this now*) and its human aspects (*now we read earlier that the human and the divine has been combined in the word of God, they are not two separate aspects at all*) lest divine principles and instruction be construed as human (*this thing is very, very subtle*), or their application to a local situation be construed as universally applicable at all times and under all circumstances. It is essential to read the Bible perceptively.” Ibid, pg 8

I would suggest to you that this is strictly human philosophy. He goes on down here to say:

“The Human Aspect of the Bible. The human aspect of the Bible includes such matters as the languages in which it was written, the literary forms, idiomatic expressions, and discrepancies; its perspective of salvation history (*he is always referring back to this thing called the perspective of salvation history*), the way in which the New Testament makes use of the Old Testament, the fact that it was all addressed to particular people in the context of particular historical circumstances, and the nature and purpose of predictive prophecy. Let us take a closer look at some of these human features of the Bible, all of which are inherent in the Bible itself. Its perspective of salvation history. An exhaustive study” Ibid, pg 9

What he is excluding for you is any rationale that led to the understanding of William Miller. So he goes down now, first he gives you its perspective of salvation history, I want you to go over this one just briefly and we are going to get to some other things that I want to get to

“Its perspective of salvation history. An exhaustive study of all that the Old Testament writers have to say about God's purpose for ancient Israel provides conclusive evidence that He originally intended them to remain the covenant people and chosen instrument for the salvation of the world throughout history. The Old Testament knows nothing about Israel's eventual withdrawal from the covenant relationship, the transition to another covenant people, or anything beyond the close of Old Testament times.” Ibid, Pg 9

Now anybody who has correctly read the Old Testament will disagree with that statement, all of it, but he has to do this to convince you that his method is correct.

“As for the New Testament perspective of salvation history, Jesus explicitly told His disciples that He would return within their generation (*notice what he is doing now and cutting of our understanding of salvations' history*), and nearly forty times the New Testament writers echo the expectation of the second coming of Christ by the close of New Testament times. There is no hint of time continuing for two thousand years. The Bible's own perspective of salvation history as reaching a climax at the close of Bible times is an important and valuable key to interpretation.” Ibid, Pg 9

What he is saying is that there is nothing prophesied down into the future that comes into the conclusion 2300 years later, based on the perspective of Bible history, based on the culture on which the Bible was written. What he is doing, he is using what they call the ‘Historical Critical Method’ of Biblical interpretation. Raymond Cottrell coined the phrase, ‘Historical Method’ to hide the second part of the phrase, ‘Critical’, out of that statement. We are going to see here in a little bit from Ps. Pippin’s book how true this is. As I begin to read this and I shared it with Jeff (Pippenger), he told me that Daniel was reading the book called ‘Receiving the Word’, which I had in my library for many years, but I had decided not to read because it did not wet my appetite. So when he told me that you were reading it, and Jeff said, “There is something there that you need to look at and having you quiver when you come to give these messages.” I opened up the book and there is a chapter that we are going to look at that discusses this very paper that we are reading. The Historical Method is what it discusses.

So, then he (Raymond Cottrell) discusses typology, its different from predictive prophecy what he means is by that is that typology is not predicted prophecy. What he claims is that there is no predicted prophecy in the Bible. That God never wrote prophecy to predict any of the events, but he uses

typology them as a way to muddy the water, so to speak. (we have reproduced these books and they are available where you acquired this document.) So some of the stuff I am discussing with you, you're going to be able to better understand when you read this for yourself. I can't cover it all, I haven't got enough time. So when you read it for yourself and you think back about the discussions we had today at this dialogue, I want you to consider for yourself the things that this man has been inculcating within the church for almost seventy years. It is very dangerous. Now he says, this is the summary of his conclusions

"1. A reliable biblical hermeneutic is essential to an accurate understanding of the Bible. Consensus regarding such a hermeneutic, and the way we relate to one another on issues in which hermeneutics is involved, is essential to the continuing unity of the world church." Ibid, Pg 11

What he is trying to do is indoctrinating people to his view of Biblical hermeneutics so that they will be in unity. To him unity cannot exist unless they go by his methods of Biblical hermeneutics.

"2. Biblical hermeneutics has been at the root of every theological doctrinal issue in the church, notably the debate on righteousness by faith in 1888, differences of opinion with respect to "the daily 11 of Daniel 8 in the first decade of the twentieth century, repeated challenges to the traditional interpretation of Daniel 8:14 over the past century, culminating at Glacier View in 1980, and the current debate over the ordination of women to the gospel ministry." Ibid, Pg11-12

Notice that now he is getting to our subjects. He started off with women's ordination, but now he is telling us that the correct Biblical hermeneutics is going to cure all these other problems too, just like it will with women's ordination. Now trust me, it going to go in his favour of the issue but for those of us who disagree with him, we will be in disagreement nevertheless with his hermeneutic principles. But he is saying to us that all these other issues can be solved by the same type of hermeneutics that he is suggesting will bring unity to the church.

"3. Primary evidence that the Bible is, indeed, God's Word to humanity resides in its perspective of the origin, nature, and destiny of the universe and the human race, in its analysis of human perversity and its solution to the problem, and in its formula for harmonious human relationships. The application of these principles would result in a very real heaven on earth." Ibid, Pg 12

That's a bunch of nice sentiment and flowery words but it has no relationship to the truth. If we would give the Third Angels' Message as God had asked us to do on October 22nd 1844, there would be a real heaven on earth, but in short of that, there will not be. So I disagree with his statement. His statement is very flowery, it sounds good, but it's not the Third Angel's Message.

"4. Differences in understanding the Bible are the result of differing hermeneutics." Ibid, Pg 12

That I will agree with.

"5. For those who accept the Bible as God's Word, there are two fundamentally different ways of reading and understanding it. One method consists of understanding it from the modern reader's perspective of life, society, culture, history, salvation history, human destiny, and the universe. *(He even includes the universe. I don't think William Miller saw the universe from his*

perspective, but nevertheless, he includes the universe) The other consists of ascertaining the meaning the Holy Spirit and the Bible writers intended it to convey, from the perspective of life, society, culture, history, salvation history, human destiny, and the universe of their time. These two approaches to the Bible are as mutually incompatible as matter and antimatter. One reads the Bible out of its original literary and historical context (*meaning the proof text method*); the other (*Historical Method*) in its original literary and historical context. One consists of a rote understanding of words; the other, of identifying the meaning -- the principles explicit and implicit in the Bible--in order to understand and apply them accurately and wisely in modern life." Ibid, Pg 12

You need to get this part. What he is saying is that the only way to do it right is to go back to their time, to their human destiny, to their human salvation history to their society, culture, life and perspective and then you can rightly understand the Bible.

"6. The first method (*the proof text method*) requires no prior training or experience; the second requires either (1) training and experience with biblical languages, history, and textual analysis, or (2) discriminating use of information provided by those who do have this training and experience." Ibid, pg 8

So if you don't have it yourself you can reply upon Ray Cottrell and a few others to lend it to you that you might be a Bible scholar. Everybody wants to be a Bible scholar don't they? So if you don't have the training, you can get it right here.

Skip number 8 and go on to number 9

"9. Reliable study of the Bible requires attention to the meaning of key words in the original language, grammar and syntax, context, the historical and cultural circumstances to which the writers addressed their messages (*this is the formula by which they would deny the 2300 days of Daniel 8:14*), and the salvation history perspective of the time, all with the objective of ascertaining the meaning the Holy Spirit and the inspired writers intended their words to convey." Ibid, pg 8

With this salvation history perspective of the time, Raymond Cottrell would produce in his book 'The Eschatology of Daniel' which I have not yet read, but I have read snippets from it from his works, he takes the prophecy of Daniel 8 and 9 and places them in the time period of Daniel and doesn't go any further than that. And he replaces our understanding of the 457 BC date which leads down 2300 days later to Oct 22nd 1844, and he gives it a literal interpretation--1150 days of a daily sacrifice, and he goes back to Antiochus Epiphanies, using his historical method, which indeed is what Desmond Ford had done. This man went to Glacier view in defense of Desmond Ford. Yes he did!

"10. The ultimate purpose of an objective study of the Bible is to identify the divine principles and instruction in order to make an appropriate use of them as divine guidance for our time." Ibid, pg 8

Then he goes through a discussion that you need to read called "What a Bible scholar does" and he gives you a definition of the all the little things that he is able to do, but number 7 in his list says,

"Examine the immediate context in which the passage occurs, as the principal means by which to determine the meaning the writer intended it to convey." Ibid

In other words, he is saying that when you read in Daniel, 'unto 2300 days (evenings and mornings) then the sanctuary shall be cleansed,' you cannot take it outside of the context in which the text was written.

"And then correlate all this data (after you have taken the prophecy of Daniel and only applied it to the time period of Daniel,) collect all this data and base your conclusion on the weight of evidence."

So if you do that then you can throw out the 2300 days as ending in ct 22nd 1844, very easy to do. You just have to have the right hermeneutics and voila, you can destroy Adventism, just like that.

Interpretation Since Bible Times

He is talking here now about the inspiration of the Bible. He's now going to bring back these two methods again, he says:

"The first of these two methods, in general use down through the centuries since Bible times, interprets the Bible from the reader's perspective of life, contemporary circumstances, and salvation history. (the Proof-Text method, the one that William Miller, Ellen White, James White and all the rest used, Josiah Litch, Fitch, everybody). In doing so, she or he often construes the words of Scripture out of their original literary and historical context, misses the meaning the inspired writer, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, intended them to convey, and reads into them her or his personal opinions." Ibid pg 23

So what he is saying is that Miller was telling you his own personal opinions, and Ellen White too.

"The second method comes to the Bible looking for the meaning the inspired writers intended their words to convey, from their perspective of life, historical circumstances, and salvation history. Its objective is a clear understanding of the divine principles set forth, with a view to applying them accurately and wisely to the reader's time and circumstances." Ibid Pg 23

Remember when we read from 'Selected Messages' earlier a moment ago? She warns about people who come with all this light.

"Let me illustrate. In his classic four-volume 'Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers', Le Roy Edwin Froom identifies more than 350 Bible scholars down through the twelve centuries prior to 1844 who set dates for the fulfillment of Daniel's time prophecies. In doing so they were following the first method (the Proof-Text method), in an endeavor to make Daniel's prophecies relevant to their time. Obviously they were all mistaken." Ibid, pg 24

All of them were mistaken, all of them. According to this man (Raymond Cottrell), he is the only one that is right, and all of his colleagues that agreed with him, of course.

"In the ninth century a Jewish Bible scholar by the name of Nahawendi devised the day-for-a-year principle in an endeavor to make the prophecies of Daniel relevant to his time (Now he is attacking the year day principle brethren), more than a thousand years after they were written. Three hundred years later Roman Catholic scholars adopted the principle. Eventually, some of them applied the antichrist of Revelation, by which John referred to imperial Rome, to papal Rome. When the Protestants of Reformation times began identifying the pope as antichrist, on

the basis of this principle, the Catholic Church denounced the day-for-a-year principle (*you can see why right?*) and, logically, ceased to use it." Ibid, pg 24

"In the sixteenth century it had long been customary to think of planet Earth as the immovable center of the universe. (*Notice his logic here*) Along came Copernicus with the idea that the sun, and not the earth, is really the center of the solar system. In the early seventeenth century Galileo confirmed Copernicus' model of the solar system. Catholic theologians, following the first method of Bible interpretation then in general use (*I am glad to know that at least the man of sin has been using the Proof Text Method*), branded both Copernicus and Galileo as heretics. An erroneous interpretation of the Bible thus initiated the great rift between science and religion that has persisted to this day." Ibid, pg 24

As historically true as that may be, there's no perfunctory truth that his method of Bible hermeneutics is thereby guaranteed by this unfortunate history. But he is using it as an example, but nevertheless he goes on:

"In the nineteenth century, Charles Darwin originally studied theology. Following the first method of interpretation, still in general use, he understood the expression "after its kind" in Genesis 1 to mean that each successive generation of animals would reproduce identically with its parents. When he observed the variations in the finches and turtles of the Galapagos Islands he discovered that this observable data proved the Bible (as he understood it) in error. It was not the Bible, however, but his mistaken way of understanding it, that gave rise to the theory of evolution." Ibid, pg 24

So Cottrell is trying here to build for you the idea that if you just rightly use the right method, you are going to come to the right conclusion, if you use the wrong method, if you misunderstand the Bible, then your going to come to the wrong conclusion. Generally, those specifics are true, but he is trying to use this as a convincing tool to prove to you that his method is the method to use. There is a difference now; you have to be wiser than the man that is writing to you. Then he goes on, notice this, I need to share this so that you can understand. He is going to reveal to us a little later here why he says this statement, but I can't get to why he says it until I tell you this first.

Recovery of the Ancient Past

"Thus it was that, to approximately the middle of the nineteenth century, everyone, or at least nearly everyone, read the Bible more or less as if it were a modern book (*In other words, they were using the proof-text method*). Little attention was given to the historical circumstances to which the writers addressed their messages and the meaning they intended their words to convey to people of their time, for the simple reason that relatively little was known about the ancient past." Ibid, pg 24

Notice this "Historical Circumstances", the term 'Historical Critical Method' brought in by the enlightenment of humanism in the 18th and 19th century, was done so through German enlightenment, in Germany. I didn't bring the book with me this morning but I have it, I will share it with you. But there is a book we have in our denomination called 'Living Fountains or Broken Cisterns' and in it is found the discussion about the educational system within Protestantism and also the education systems that should have been brought, fostered and perpetuated within our denomination which is contrary to the educational system that fallen Babylon has been using, which is based on the enlightenment which

came from the German Protestant schools which had been infiltrated by the Jesuit principles. There is a chapter on that in this book called 'Living Fountains or Broken Cisterns'.

And so behind the lines here what he is telling you, these ideas which he is expressing come from the German enlightenment from the 18th and 19th century, and it's a humanistic critical examination of the scriptures. And one of the ways that they deny creation is by using what they call, 'The Historical Critical Method', or the historical circumstances the words conveyed to the people of their time. "And for the simple reason that relatively little was known about the ancient past." See it's the ancient past that we need to study that gives us an idea of what the Bible is really trying to tell us, don't you know. That's his conclusion.

"Events of the nineteenth century began to remedy that defect. Modern archeology was born with the discovery and deciphering of the Rosetta Stone in 1799 and 1832, respectively. The discovery of ancient Bible manuscripts centuries closer to the original autographs, such as the Sinaiticus in 1844, the Chester Beatty papyri in the early decades of the twentieth century, and the Dead Sea Scrolls in 1947, made a much more accurate text available for study. The recovery of thousands of documents from ancient libraries made the ancient past to which the Bible writers addressed their messages come alive as never before. Most important of all, these discoveries made possible a far more accurate way to study and understand the Bible." Ibid, pg 24

So all these guys he mentioned for 300 years have used the proof text method and the year day principle, what they really needed to have was the information he discovered in the 19th century and that information he discovered is going to straighten out all their problem for them. What information do you suppose that was? Anybody have a guess? We have another man in our ranks who is gone now, his name is B. G. Wilkinson, and he wrote a book called 'Our Authorized Bible Vindicated' meaning the KJV, and he wrote another book called 'Truth Triumphant' and he understood the issues involved with what brother Cottrell is here going to mention. And this man would tell you to steer away from what now Cottrell says has been an advancement to our understanding of our ancient past. But Brother Wilkinson, in his book 'Truth Triumphant' would say that, no, it was not an advancement, it was brought in through the Catholics. And it has to do with the translation of the scriptures and the manuscripts by which they use to translate the modern translations of the Bible. For then they thought that they were bettering the KJV Bible. Notice what Cottrell says here.

"Events of the nineteenth century began to remedy that defect. Modern archeology (*which Sister White says that we should not be involved in*) was born with the discovery and deciphering of the Rosetta Stone in 1799 and 1832, respectively (*And remember I said that it came from the 18th and 19th century*). The discovery of ancient Bible manuscripts centuries closer to the original autographs, such as the Sinaiticus in 1844, the Chester Beatty papyri in the early decades of the twentieth century, and the Dead Sea Scrolls in 1947, made a much more accurate text available for study. The recovery of thousands of documents from ancient libraries made the ancient past to which the Bible writers addressed their messages come alive as never before. Most important of all, these discoveries made possible a far more accurate way to study and understand the Bible." Ibid, pg 24

The Sinaiticus is one heralded by the papacy as the most accurate manuscript of all time. Now Brother Wilkinson would differ with that and he would praise the use of the KJV translators in using the Textus

Receptus as the most authoritative Bible manuscript. And we are celebrating the 400th year of the KJV because of the use of the Textus Receptus, not the Sinaiticus of 1844. Notice the date in which it was discovered, 1844. So, now he is really going to straighten you out. His issue here is unity through correct Biblical hermeneutics, that's his issue for Seventh-day Adventist's. Now he is going to get down to the really guts of what we want to look at. The rest of the stuff was just bringing you up to the speed of this.

Historical Adventist Hermeneutical Methodology

“Like most if not all of his predecessors and contemporaries, William Miller followed the proof-text method of prophetic interpretation. An informed person today reading what he wrote is aghast at his misuse of Scripture. As pioneers of the Seventh-day Adventist faith struggled to understand the Bible in the turbulent wake of the great disappointment of October 22, 1844 (*Here is that date again, when they found this other manuscript*), they too followed the proof-text method and sometimes came to wrong conclusions which they, or others in later years, found it necessary to revise...”

Now this is a perversion of Adventist history. There were some corrections made, yes Miller didn't have the event correct, there were some things which needed to have some further Bible studied which we know they did, and had come to the conclusion that the sanctuary was not the earth but was the sanctuary in heaven the most holy place that needed to be cleansed and Christ entered there into the wedding. The marriage supper of the Lamb and He there received a kingdom and the seventh trumpet sounded. Those were the things that were corrected but Cottrell would suggest. . . notice what he says:

Continues... “For instance, Dr. Desmond Ford has identified twenty-two modifications the church has made in its understanding of the sanctuary doctrine since pioneer days...”

So what he is saying to you here, is that the Millerites, the pioneers, they just didn't have enough information. That's what they needed, a little more information and then they would be on the right track. Now if you want to look around Adventism today like Nehemiah did, to review for your self the desolation of Jerusalem, I just read to you why we are in the shape that we are in. This describes the Desolation of Jerusalem

Continues... “In his exposition of the prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation Uriah Smith likewise followed proof-text principles and procedures, and for nearly half a century the church has considered his classic Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation out of date” Ibid pg 24

Now do you know who implemented the fact that we now consider Uriah Smith to be out of date? It wasn't Raymond, oh no. W.W. Prescott would do a warfare against the book of Uriah Smith like no other in the church. So brother Cottrell is not the only part of this history, let me be as fair as I can so I don't make any accusation that I'll regret. But there are other instruments which are a part of this history which go along with his part of it. Prescott is part of that history and it's a domino (continuing) affect.

It began with Uriah Smith in 1884, Smith would deny the writings of Ellen White, some were and some were not inspired. Then it went from him to Brother Butler and he would deny certain portions of the scriptures and he claimed that they were not inspired. And there were 10 articles written in the Review by him on his study on which ones were inspired and which ones were not. And then from there, that was the stage set. The leaders of the church that were reading this material, the General Conference

president and the editor of the review, Uriah Smith being the editor of the review, George Butler being the president of the General Conference, those men's influence would be taken into the General conference of 1888 in Minneapolis, and thereby the work that should have been received, the righteousness of Christ in the Third Angels' Message, not out of it, was rejected, because of their criticisms of the divine inspiration of the Spirit of Prophecy and their criticism of the divine inspiration of the Word of God.

Now you fast forward to the days of W.W Prescott and he is continuing on in their progress and he will conclude that all the books need to be re-written. I will show you this week that he also concluded that most of Ellen White's works needed to be corrected. Then by the time you get to the 1930's the dye has been cast and along comes 'The Biblical Research Fellowship' headed by non other than Raymond Cottrell. So the history now is complete. But now what we need to do is to examine the evidence for ourselves, which we are going to do, and you will see for yourselves what I mean by the topic of the 'Desolation of Jerusalem'. He goes on now to say:

"In his exposition of the prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation Uriah Smith likewise followed proof-text principles and procedures, and for nearly half a century the church has considered his classic Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation out of date. At a number of points the pioneers would feel quite uncomfortable with our present 27 Fundamental Beliefs." Ibid, pg 24

I would say that they would not agree with probably any of them

"All of this reflects the fact that, over the years, continuing study (*he implies here that if you study the Bible with the correct method of study that you are going to straighten everybody out*) has led to an ever clearer and more accurate understanding of the divine Word. We would be more than a little naïve to think that we have nothing more to learn." Ibid, pg 24

And now he has the nerve to misquote Ellen White on her statement of new light, in reflection upon what he is presenting, as if his light is the new light that needs to be seriously considered and I won't go into these quotes on Ellen White, you are familiar with these quotes on new light, I am sure that everybody has read them for themselves. He uses them as a means to support his ideas.

Now where we want to go with this, I know that I have probably wet your appetite so that now you want to read this document for yourself, is that right? But I can't read it all to you but I will go to the portions that really open up the can of worms that really we are looking at. So basically, what we have looked at now is that brother Cottrell has concluded that for unity in the church, just the correct form of Biblical hermeneutics which if applied, and that would be the historical method, would be the answer to all of our dilemmas, including the sanctuary doctrine, the nature of Christ—go down the list—if you just have the correct Biblical hermeneutics, everybody would be in unity.

Therefore, the brethren down in South America, third world countries that deny the north America their cultural apparatus to extend to women their right of women's ordination would be solved, whatever problem it might be would be solved. Let me read this one part. Remember I mentioned to you that this was German enlightenment; he says that with this new addition of the Sinaiticus discovery in Egypt of the manuscript, by the way, this is in the Vatican library, the Catholics own this thing. This is their manuscript; they have got it under glass in the Vatican library. (sic)

[The Codex Sinaiticus came to the attention of scholars in the 19th century at the Greek Orthodox Monastery of Mount Sinai, with further material discovered in the 20th and 21st centuries. Although

parts of the Codex are scattered across four libraries around the world, most of the manuscript today resides within the British Library. Since its discovery, study of the Codex Sinaiticus has proven to be extremely useful to scholars for the purposes of biblical translation.] Wikipedia.

“First to respond to these discoveries were the modernist-oriented Bible scholars of Germany, such as Julius Wellhausen and Ernest Troeltsch, who developed the historical-critical method.”
Ibid, pg 24

These are the men who are the father of the historical-critical method. Out of Germany, which we know that the Counter Reformation in the book I mentioned ‘Living Fountain or Broken Cisterns’, the Jesuits entered into the educational systems of Protestants to destroy the Protestant Reformation. And now Raymond Cottrell is so naïve to think that he can follow these men’s methods and save Adventism! Now think about that for just two seconds. In this history, Protestantism took a moral fall based on the historical-critical method of Julius Wellhausen and Ernest Troeltsch. That’s how they fell when they were called out of Babylon, because their humanity had retranslated the Bible according to human perspectives and reasoning, based on the deism that William Miller came out of, to read his King James Bible. All that history is lost on Brother Cottrell for some reason.

Now here is where it comes close to home now, if it hasn’t already. You know when I first became an Adventist, I used to love to look at this little book that I had, ‘Bible Readings for the Home Circle’, I just loved that little book. When I first became an Adventist, I had a little cardboard box and in it I had my ‘Bible Readings for the Home Circle’, I had a book called ‘Love Unlimited’ which was a combination of ‘Steps to Christ’ and ‘Thoughts from the Mount of Blessing’ bound into one book, I don’t know if you have seen it, it has a very beautiful cover with Jesus sitting in the living room with the family, His arm around the father and they are reading their Bible together, Harry Anderson painted the cover. It’s Adventism at its best. My little Bible Readings had the same pictures in it, Anderson’s pictures. I am not saying anything bad about this, I am just saying how it touched my heart. And then I had my ‘Great Controversy’ and I had my ‘Daniel and Revelation’ by Uriah Smith. But little did I know then what I know now. I didn’t know that the majority of Adventist scholars had trashed Uriah Smith into the ash heap, then I didn’t know it. That was 1971, and neither did many Adventist who were raised in the church, they didn’t know neither. But I would cherish these little books and I would carry them around from Bible study to Bible study and people thought that it was goofy to carry my box of books around. But here it is – This is the history now that I’ve been wanting to get to:

Adventist Bible Scholars Adopt the Historical Method

“Prior to about 1935 Adventist expositors of the Bible were at least generally following the proof-text method of Bible study. **Two seemingly unrelated events of that decade led to a gradual transition to the historical method** (*did you know that? Did you know that there were two events in Adventist history that led from the proof-text method that was carried on by all the pioneers, and these two events would transition over into using the Historical Method? Well he did, because he is the originator of it and now he is going to tell you how he did it*) with the result that by the 1960's most of the Bible scholars of the church had adopted that method.”
Ibid, pg 26

I want you to notice that from 1816 to 1935, the brethren had been following the proof-text method, it served them well. It brought them out of Babylon, yes it did. It explained to them the great

investigative judgment, yes it did, it did all those things. The Sabbath truth was because of the proof-text method, the visions of Ellen White whether you recognise it or not were given based on the proof-text method.

So from 1935 to 1960, does that start to raise your antennas everybody? Did something happen between 1935 and 1960? Can anybody guess? What happened in 1957? 'Questions on Doctrine' right? Ok, now we are going to get to that too. By the 1960's most of our Bible scholars had adopted the historical method, thrown out the proof text method. And so when I am blissfully enjoying my new Adventism, cherishing my little cardboard box of books, cherishing my little 'Bible Readings for the Home Circle', little did I know that none of it was based upon the proof text method except for Uriah Smith's book and Ellen White's writings. But the 'Bible Readings for the Home Circle' was based on the historical method. I didn't know that until 8 weeks ago and I have been an Adventist since 1971. Now how do you suppose that made me feel? I said to myself, will the real Seventh-day Adventist please stand up. But it goes on to say . . . So by 1960 they have all adopted this method, now is going to describe to you these two events which would accomplish this in the church.

"In 1932 the General Conference concluded that it was necessary to upgrade the training and qualifications of persons who entered the ministry of the church, and voted to establish a school of theology. This led to the establishment in 1934, at Pacific Union College, of what was at first called the Advanced Bible School, and in 1937 moved to Washington, D.C. where it took the name Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary (*which it still bears to this day*):" Ibid, pg 26

Now at the same time in this history, this was taking place, this is the struggle for the prophetic heritage. At the very time of the bringing of the historical method into the church, A.G Daniels and brother Watson from Australia, the General Conference president, they manoeuvre things so that they take control of the White Estate away from Willy White in this same decade. So all this history is taking place in the same decade in the 1930's. They bring in the Historical Method, the control of the White Estate becomes the possession of the General Conference. Now I told you in the beginning that this isn't a witch hunt, but I am just going to tell you the history and you can make your own conclusions. This is a very sad state of affairs really and most of us want to deny it. But when Raymond Cottrell says that we need to look history square in the face, I suggest we do, and when we do, we are going to find out some things we didn't know, that we need to know. Now in 1932 the General Conference, now we have the Adventist Theological Seminary, based upon their reasoning, they needed to retrain their ministerial students, and that's the first event.

"The second event was a requirement imposed on the College of Medical Evangelists (now Loma Linda University) that students accepted for the medical course be graduates of accredited colleges." Ibid, pg 6

"These two events logically made it necessary for the colleges to upgrade their faculties including, of course, their religion teachers. As the colleges sent members of their religion faculties for advanced training in such subjects as biblical languages, ancient history and chronology, archeology, and ancient Bible manuscripts, they gradually came to realize the importance of the principles and procedures of the historical method in forming an accurate understanding of the Bible." Ibid, pg 7

So what this history is telling you is this, that if you want to graduate from Loma Linda University with an accredited medical degree, to carry out medicine in the state of California in the 1930's, the state was requiring that you be accredited. That event, and their desire to retrain their ministers, which seems like to unrelated events came together in California. And in so doing, not only did they send their instructors training the medical students had to have been trained at other accredited universities to be able to train student that can be graduated with accredited diplomas, then naturally we should obviously, our theologian need no less than the best, and so then we must have our faculty upgraded so that our ministerial student can graduate with the same accreditation as do the medical students. This is the rational. And this is what Cottrell say brings the historical method into the reaches of Seventh-day Adventism. Now you tell me, what kind of history this is telling us, in the face of what we are facing at the end of the world in Adventism, where every wind of doctrine is now blowing through the church. But men like Jeff Pippenger are accused of being fanatics when they place the people back on the foundations of Adventism. He says:

“As the colleges sent members of their religion faculties for advanced training in such subjects (notice what they are being trained in, Cottrell has already mentioned them earlier in the article) as biblical languages, ancient history and chronology, archeology, and ancient Bible manuscripts, they gradually came to realize the importance of the principles and procedures of the historical method in forming an accurate understanding of the Bible.” Ibid, pg 7

They will be retrained in biblical languages, number one, ancient history number two. Did you know that ancient history is why Prescott—he wasn't involved in the 1940's he passed away in the 1930's so he wasn't involved directly in this history—but it was the understanding of ancient history that allowed Prescott to see that we needed to change all of our books. Now in the 1930's, the end of Prescott's life. We now are sending out our young men to be retrained to rightly understand ancient history which lends a view of the times in which Daniel lived under another lens, we now see things differently than William Miller saw. And they will be retrained in the understanding of correct chronology, isn't that handy? If you want to displace the 457 and the 2300 days, it's pretty handy. And then they would also be retrained in biblical archeology, which Sister White writes in her writings that we should not go to Jerusalem and dig up the [hidden cities]. And they would be retrained in ancient Bible manuscripts. There sets the stage for the introduction for the historical method within Adventism.

Continues... “they gradually came to realize the importance of the principles and procedures of the historical method in forming an accurate understanding of the Bible.” Ibid, pg 7

This is the death knell of Adventism.

“Among the first to participate in this program were such persons as Edwin R. Thiele (I personally had contact with him), Siegfried Horn, Richard Hammill (Who I knew), Lynn Wood, E. E. Heppenstall, and I. I. Caviness--all but one of whom are now awaiting the coming of the Lifegiver. It was my privilege to become familiar with the historical method in the early 1940's, while teaching religion at Pacific Union College.” Ibid, pg 7

This is in 1996: today they are all awaiting the coming of the Lifegiver and should tell you friends, they are going to have a rude awakening, very rude. Now I am not the judge, but I do know that these men have not done right. They have denied the validity of the Spirit of Prophecy and the validity of the

foundations by which we have been brought about as a people, I do know that. But how they stand with Jesus, we will find out. He goes on to say...this name Caviness is important, remember it.

Now the way I run into Edwin Thiele is this: in my research, I was studying the 2520 one day on the internet for Randy Moeller, a friend of mine. I was looking up some stuff on the chronology on the 2520 and some dialogue that him and I were having and in so doing I run across a lot of material. One of the things I run across was an article by a man the name of Edwin R. Thiele. I didn't know who he was, this was two years ago and I read this (The Role of Biblical Hermeneutics in Preserving Unity in the Church) eight weeks ago. So now I am running across his name again. But when I first ran across his name two years ago, I thought to myself, well who is this guy? I don't know who this guy is, never heard of him but his article was pretty good. It was spot on as a matter of fact, to come to find out, I went to Wikipedia, and he was the man that was the chronological expert in the 1940's within the ranks of Seventh-day Adventists. The reason why, is because he was retrained in the Historical Method. So I ran into him before I read about him here. I have the document at home saved on my hard drive. So I find this interesting that his name comes up first on the list of those who were trained in the historical method.

Now Richard Hammill was the elder in the church which I was baptised in the 1973. He was the teacher in Loma Linda in the school of theology. E. E. Heppenstall taught for years at LaSierra. All these men had been inculcated in this method within all the graduating students from the 1950's until this very day. That is why you hear the sermons you do on our pulpits, it's based on the historical critical method.

I am out of time, let's have prayer and we will continue this in the next meeting.

Loving Father in heaven:

We are so grateful for Your loving care! We are so grateful dear Lord that You are revealing these things now at the end of the world. Lord our hope is not to discourage others; it is not our hope to malign the characters of any; but dear Lord, we want especially to reach those today that must be reached, including myself with the message of the First, Second and Third angel.

Lord, the Adventist church is yours, it doesn't belong to men, it is not owned by the General Conference but yet You have established order in the church, so dear Lord we want to pray today, this morning as we close this meeting, for the leadership of the General Conference, for the laity, for all who can read the Bible for themselves as William Miller did, as the pioneers did, and they can come to the same conclusions as they did, using the proof-text method. Jesus said that except you become as a little child, you shall not enter the kingdom of heaven.

Lord please help us to have hearts that are willing to learn, willing to except new light that does not contradict the old, and help us dear Lord as Seventh-day Adventists to give the First, Second and Third Angels' Messages as given to us in the very beginning of our denomination, that we will see in it the love of Christ like we have never seen it before, that it is the Everlasting Gospel and that we have in it, dear Lord, our greatest hope—Your soon coming. So we pray dear Lord that You will come soon, that You will bring about an atmosphere that will allow Ephraim and Judah to be joined and that there will be unity in the church, based in the great truths that You have given us in our past, the foundation laid in the Midnight Cry and the hope of Your soon return. We pray and ask You for these blessings in Jesus name, Amen.