JAAS

Journal of Asia Adventist Seminary

18.1–2
2015

issn 1908–4862

JOURNAL OF ASIA ADVENTIST SEMINARY (ISSN 1908–4862)
Theological Seminary
Adventist International Institute of Advanced Studies
Volume 18 • Number 1–2 • 2015

EDITORIAL STATEMENT

The *Journal of Asia Adventist Seminary (JAAS)* is a biannual peer-refereed academic journal that publishes, in the context of a faith community, quality biblical-theological research, including studies in biblical theology, archaeology of the biblical world, systematic and historical theology, applied theology, and missiology. *JAAS* is indexed in *Index Theologicus* (Universität Tübingen, GERMANY), *International Review of Biblical Studies* (Brill, NETHERLANDS; Universität Paderborn, GERMANY), *Religious and Theological Abstracts, Old Testament Abstracts, New Testament Abstracts, BiBIL* (Bibliographie biblique informatisée de Lausanne, SWITZERLAND), *Bulletin de Bibliographie Biblique, THEOLDI* (Theological Literature Documented in Innsbruck, AUSTRIA) and *RAMBI* (Index of Articles on Jewish Studies, Jerusalem, ISRAEL). The ideas expressed in the articles, research notes, book reviews, and thesis and dissertation abstracts are the sole responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the thinking of the Theological Seminary of the Adventist International Institute of Advanced Studies.

ISSN 1908–4862 Printed in the Philippines

Journal of Asia Adventist Seminary 18.1–2 (2015): 1

EDITORIAL

MICHAEL W. CAMPBELL, PH.D.
Adventist International Institute of Advanced Studies, PHILIPPINES

The current issue is devoted to the Protestant Reformation as part of a series of essays for the 2017 AIIAS annual Seminary forum. In early 2016, Nikolaus Satelmajer and I began to collaborate on some ideas for the 500th anniversary of the Protestant Reformation and, specifically, how to relate these ideas to Seventh-day Adventism. As a result, we came up with a forthcoming book titled *Here We Stand: Luther, the Reformation, and Seventh-day Adventism*. Together with the book, there will be a series of academic conferences of which two are connected specifically with the book and take place about a month apart. The first will occur at Andrews University from Oct. 12–14, 2017, and the second at AIIAS on Nov. 9–11, 2017. The book will be released in conjunction with these two conferences, and some presenters will present at one or the other of the two conferences, and a few will present at both. As part of this celebration, this issue features the work of several of the presenters who will speak at the AIIAS Seminary forum and whose work will be forthcoming eventually as part of the book.

One of the challenges that the editorial team has faced is how to make sure that the current volume of publication matches the year of publication. In light of this fact, we have decided to publish the next two issues as double issues. Subscribers should take note that this will be treated as a single subscription, and it will help us by making the journal current. We plan to have these two next out in quick succession. In light of this fact, we have decided to forego any book reviews in this issue.

The Reformation means many different things for many different people. For Seventh-day Adventists, I believe the Reformation represents a desire to stand upon the authority of Scripture. Yet as part of this process, the Reformation has always represented the best of biblical scholarship. Most of the Reformers were university professors, and they drank deeply from the well of *ad fontes*—the desire to return to the original sources. This involved textual criticism, learning biblical languages, and vigorous study of the Bible. It is in this spirit that this issue (and eventually the book) is being sent forth to help better understand the nature of this relationship, and its legacy, for Seventh-day Adventists today.

Journal of Asia Adventist Seminary 18.1–2 (2015): 2

GUEST EDITORIAL

CRISTIAN DUMITRESCU, PH.D.
Adventist International Institute of Advanced Studies, PHILIPPINES

When my colleague, Michael Campbell, announced he was going to return to the US, the current issue of *JAAS* was in the pangs of making. At the same time, Eike Mueller, the associate editor was entrusted new administrative responsibilities, while Alvaro Rodríguez, the assistant editor, also returned to his native country. This situation created the need for appointing a new editorial team. Unfortunately, the process took longer than expected. We apologize to our subscribers and readers for the gap in the regular publishing of *JAAS*. I am glad to announce that the new editorial team is in place and the printing of the current issue is the sign of return to the normal editorial and publishing process. We invite you to write and share your expertise in this journal. Stay tuned for the news and the new contributions to scholarship in *JAAS*.

Journal of Asia Adventist Seminary 18.1–2 (2015): 3–12

SOLA SCRIPTURA: A COMPARISON OF LUTHER AND THE ADVENTIST UNDERSTANDING

REMWIL R. TORNALEJO
Adventist International Institute of Advanced Studies, PHILIPPINES

Sola scriptura was one of the principles of the Reformation.[1] Although not unique to Martin Luther, it is a concept popularized by him.[2] One of the earliest references to the principle of *sola scriptura* occurs during a debate between Luther and John Eck at Leipzig in 1519. Luther declared, "No Christian believer can be forced [to believe an article of faith] beyond Holy Scripture."[3] The same idea is embodied in his defense at Worms on April 18, 1521:

> Unless I am convinced by the testimony of the Scriptures or by clear reason (for I do not trust either in the pope or in councils alone, since it is well known that they have often erred and contradicted themselves), I am bound to the Scriptures I have quoted and my conscience is captive to the Word of God. I cannot and I will not retract anything, since

1 *Sola scriptura* is generally accepted to mean that the Bible alone is the authority in matters of faith and practice. The other two principles that complete the three *solas* are *sola gratia* (grace alone) and *sola fide* (faith alone).

2 See Arthur Skevington Wood, *Captive to the Word-Martin Luther: Doctor of Sacred Scripture* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1969), 31–40. Arthur Skevington Wood labors to explain that Luther is indebted in many ways to his predecessors and, especially, to Augustine of Hippo, William of Occam, and later the Occamist theologians regarding his view of the Scriptures. Moreover, *sola scriptura* as a theological formula is a by-product of the Reformation rather than its presupposition. See Ibid.; Bernhard Lohse, *Martin Luther: An Introduction to His Life and Work* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986), 153; cf. Bernhard Lohse, *Martin Luther's Theology: It's Historical and Systematic Development*, ed. and trans. Roy A. Harrisville (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2011), 22, 23. The phrase *sola scriptura* per se is not found in the works of Luther. However, the idea that the Scripture stands supreme in authority over the church and other religious authorities is central in his more developed theology.

3 Lohse, *Martin Luther's Theology*, 123.

it is neither safe nor right to go against conscience. "I cannot do otherwise, here I stand, may God help me, Amen."[4]

Seventh-day Adventists affirm the *sola scriptura* principle. They have frequently been called "the people of the book" and place a high regard upon Scripture. However, what Luther meant by *sola scriptura* is a contested subject among church historians and theologians.[5] This chapter explores and compares the meaning of Luther's *sola scriptura* principle and the understanding of this principle by Seventh-day Adventists.

1. Luther and *Sola Scriptura*

Several recent studies maintain that it is a misconception, or at least an oversimplification, to argue that for the Reformers the Scripture was the sole authority and that tradition had no role.[6] For example, Irena Backus, states, "It is by now a well-known fact that the Reformers did not reject the tradition of the Early Church, which in their eyes was to be sharply distinguished from the corruptions of medieval ecclesiastical structures."[7] These developments necessitate a more careful look at what the term *sola scriptura* meant for Luther. To understand this phrase, it is necessary to place the issue in its historical context.

1.1. *Sola Scriptura* Principle in Historical Context

During Luther's time, the issue was not the authority of Scripture itself but rather, to what extent does this authority compare with the Roman

[4] Martin Luther, *Career of the Reformer 2*, vol. 32 of *Luther's Works*, ed. George W. Forell (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1958), 113.

[5] For a discussion on the meaning of *sola scriptura* see, James R. Payton Jr., *Getting the Reformation Wrong: Correcting Some Misunderstandings* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2010), 132–159; John C. Peckham, "Sola Scriptura: Reductio ad absurdum?" *Trinity Journal* 35.2 (2014): 195–223; Aleksander S. Santrac, "The Sola Scriptura Principle in the Current Debate," *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 24.1 (2013): 107–126; Kwabena Donkor, "Contemporary Responses to Sola Scriptura: Implications for Adventist Theology," *Reflections: The BRI Newsletter* 41 (January 2013): 5–8.

[6] Payton, *Getting the Reformation Wrong*, 133.

[7] Irena Backus, *The Disputation of Baden, 1526 and Berne, 1528: Neutralizing the Early Church; Studies in Reformed Theology and History* (Princeton: Princeton Theological Seminary Press, 1993), 81, http://scdc.library.ptsem.edu/mets/mets.aspx?src=SRTH199311&div=11&img=3.

Catholic Church and its leaders. Catholic leaders taught, "The unwritten tradition could just be as authoritative as the Scriptures."[8] At times it could even be superior since it was the church's creation. Luther, as priest, adhered to this belief during his early life. Even after posting his *Ninety-Five Theses*, he maintained a high regard for the writings of the church fathers and papal decrees. He declared:

> First, I testify that I desire to say or maintain absolutely nothing except, first of all, what is in the Holy Scriptures and can be maintained from them; and then what is in and found from the writings of the church fathers and is accepted by the Roman church and preserved both in the canons and papal decrees.[9]

In addition, others maintained that the pope or a church council represented the ultimate authority to determine the meaning of the Bible.[10]

1.2. Luther's View of the Church Fathers and Their Teachings

Luther did not altogether discard tradition. He fought against the radical reformers[11] who wanted to eliminate all church traditions. He warned: "One needs a more cautious, discreet spirit, which attacks the accretion which threatens the temple without destroying the temple of God itself."[12] And to those who accused him of rejecting all the teachings of the church fathers, he answered,

> I do not reject them. But everyone, indeed, knows that at times they have erred, as men will; therefore, I am ready to trust them only when they give me evidence for their opinion from Scripture, which has never erred.[13]

Luther, after several disputations against papal representatives, rejected the common understanding that "the teaching of the Scripture and the

[8] Roger E. Olson, *The Story of Christian Theology: Twenty Centuries of Tradition and Reform* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1999), 385.

[9] Martin Luther, *Career of the Reformer 1*, vol. 31 of *Luther's Works*, ed. Harold J. Grimm (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1958), 83, 93, 94.

[10] Wood, *Captive to the Word*, 120.

[11] The radical reformers or Anabaptists were more consistent in applying the *sola scriptura* principle. See Alister E. McGrath, *Reformation Thought: An Introduction*, 3rd ed. (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1999), 155.

[12] Martin Luther, "Concerning Rebaptism," in *Martin Luther's Basic Theological Writings*, Timothy F. Lull and William R. Russell, eds. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), 346.

[13] Luther, *Career of the Reformer 2*, 11.

teaching of the Roman Catholic Church were necessarily identical."[14] He wrote, "What else do I contend for but to bring everyone to understand the difference between the divine Scripture and human teaching or custom."[15] The Holy Scripture is "more reliable than any other writings"; wherein one can refer to judge all other writings, for it is the only "true lord and master of all writings and doctrine on earth."[16] He advised that "the Sacred Scriptures must be sharply distinguished from those that have been invented by men in the Church, it matters not how eminent they be for saintliness and scholarship."[17]

Luther argued for the primacy of Scriptures over the writings of the church fathers but at the same time upheld their value. In 1521, he wrote, "We Gentiles must not value the writings of our fathers as highly as the Holy Scripture, but as worth a little less."[18] He added, "The teachings of the Fathers are useful only to lead us to the Scriptures, as they were led, and then we must hold to the Scriptures alone."[19] Furthermore, he explained,

> The writings of all the holy fathers should be read only for a time, in order that through them we may be led to the Holy Scriptures.... The dear fathers wished, by their writings, to lead us to the Scriptures, but we use them as to be led away from the Scriptures, though the Scriptures alone are our vineyard in which we ought all to work and toil.[20]

[14] Wood, *Captive to the Word*, 120; cf. Lohse, *Martin Luther's Theology*, 188. According to Ernst Zeeden, "Luther was not breaking new ground when he turned to the Bible, but only when he cut the Bible off from the pope and Church, or subordinated them." Ernst W. Zeeden, *The Legacy of Luther: Martin Luther and the Reformation* (Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1954), quoted in Wood, *Captive to the Word*, 119.

[15] Martin Luther, "Answer to the Superchristian, Superspiritual, and Superlearned Book of Goat Emser," quoted in Hugh T. Kerr, ed., *A Compend of Luther's Theology* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974), 15.

[16] Luther, *Career of the Reformer* 2, 11.

[17] Martin Luther, "The Babylonian Captivity of the Church," quoted in Kerr, *A Compend of Luther's Theology*, 12.

[18] Martin Luther, "On the Councils and the Church, 1539," in *Selected Writings of Martin Luther, 1529-1546*, ed. Theodore G. Tappert (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 243.

[19] Luther, "Answer to the Superchristian," 14.

[20] Martin Luther, "An Open Letter to the Christian Nobility," quoted in Kerr, *A Compend of Luther's Theology*, 13.

1.3. Luther and Religious Authority

Luther did not despise church authority without qualification. His strong objection was against the claim of the pope that the church has authority above the Word of God and therefore must be its arbiter.[21] For him, the Scripture is its own interpreter and, therefore, it must be interpreted by comparing Scripture with Scripture.[22] He protested against the Catholic teaching that the Scripture is insufficient "apart from the treasury of popes and councils."[23] Contrary to the popular belief of his time, he disagreed that the church is above the Scripture. Instead, he believed that the Word of God bore and nourished the church. Therefore, "the Word of God is incomparably superior to the Church, and in this Word the Church, being a creature, has nothing to decree, ordain, or make, but only to be decreed, ordained, and made."[24]

Wood attests that Luther profusely quoted from the church fathers, but he subjected their authority to the Scripture and refused to accept them whenever they appeared to contradict the Word of God.[25] According to Luther, "All the holy fathers, when they speak apart from the Scriptures are fallible as anyone else."[26] He added, "I will not listen to the Church or the fathers or the apostles unless they bring and teach the pure Word of God."[27] He quoted the apostle Paul in Gal 1:18 when he emphasized that any person (regardless of status or rank) and even angels are suspect when they preach contrary to the Word of God.[28] Even professed

[21] Martin Luther, *Lectures on Galatians 1535 Chapters 1-4*, vol. 26 of *Luther's Works*, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan (St. Louis: Concordia, 1963), 51.

[22] Martin Luther, *Lectures on Deuteronomy*, vol. 9 of *Luther's Works*, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan (St. Louis: Concordia, 1960), 21.

[23] Michael S. Horton, "Scripture Alone: Luther's Doctrine of Scripture," in *The Legacy of Luther*, R. C. Sproul and Stephen J. Nichols, eds. (Orlando, FL: Reformation Trust, 2016), 12.

[24] Martin Luther, *Word and Sacrament 2*, vol. 36 of *Luther's Works*, ed. Abdel Ross Wentz (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1959), 107.

[25] See Wood, *Captive to the Word*, 125.

[26] Martin Luther, "Avoiding the Doctrine of Men and a Reply to the Texts Cited in Defense of the Doctrines of Men, 1522," in *Selected Writings of Martin Luther, 1520-1523*, ed. Theodore G. Tappert (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 204.

[27] Luther, *Lectures on Galatians 1535*, 67.

[28] See Martin Luther, *Sermons on the Gospel of St. John Chapters 6-8*, vol. 23 of *Luther's Works*, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan (St. Louis: Concordia, 1959), 191–192.

prophets who work wonders and miracles must be judged "in the light of God's Word."[29]

1.4. Summary of Luther and *Sola Scriptura*

The idea of *sola scriptura* for Luther does not mean that the Scripture is the *sole* religious authority. It is evident that the above statements were not intended to mean that Luther despised all the teachings of the church fathers. Although he made it clear that the Scripture must be above creeds and papal decrees, his acceptance of church authority and the creeds depended upon their biblical authority.[30]

James R. Payton Jr. aptly summarizes Luther's understanding of *sola scriptura* by stating that, for Luther, "Scripture was the *only unquestioned* religious authority. It did not mean that Scripture was the *only* religious authority—as has often been assumed or misunderstood in subsequent Protestantism."[31]

For Luther, *sola scriptura* meant that the Word of God is the ultimate standard, norm, and the proper touchstone and final authority for faith and practice. All other authorities must be judged and evaluated in light of the Scripture. Moreover, for him the Word of God is self-sufficient. It is

[29] Martin Luther, *Sermons on the Gospel of St. John Chapters 14-16*, vol. 24 of *Luther's Works*, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan (St. Louis, MO: Concordia, 1961), 75; cf. Luther, *Lectures on Galatians 1535*, 383.

[30] See Martin Luther, *Church and Ministry 3*, vol. 41 of *Luther's Works*, ed. Eric W. Gritsch (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966), 123. Alberto R. Timm observes that, for the magisterial reformers like Luther and John Calvin, *sola scriptura* does not mean the rejection of other sources of religious knowledge. Alberto R. Timm, "*Sola Scriptura* and Ellen G. White: Historical Reflections," in *The Gift of Prophecy in Scripture and History*, ed. Alberto R. Timm and Dwain N. Esmond (Silver Spring, MD: Review & Herald, 2015), 288.

[31] Payton, *Getting the Reformation Wrong*, 13 (Emphases in original). Frank M. Hasel reaches a similar conclusion. He writes, "When Luther maintained the principle of *sola scriptura*, he was not suggesting that the tradition of the church was without value. Rather, he was arguing a case of relative clarity and weight. In other words, if a conflict arises in the interpretation of faith, then the Scripture carries the authority that transcends and judges any of the church's traditions." Frank M. Hasel, "Presuppositions in the Interpretation of Scripture," in *Understanding Scripture: An Adventist Approach*, ed. George W. Reid (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, 2005), 37.

its own interpreter and should never be beholden to any other authority for authentication.[32]

2. Seventh-day Adventist Understanding of *Sola Scriptura*

Seventh-day Adventists adhere to the *sola scriptura* principle.[33] In the 1872 declaration of fundamental beliefs, Uriah Smith wrote, "The Holy Scriptures, of the Old and New Testaments, were given by inspiration of God, contain a full revelation of his will to man, and are the only infallible rule of faith and practice."[34] However, Adventist thinkers have differed in their understanding of *sola scriptura*.[35] In order to grasp this Seventh-day Adventist understanding of the *sola scriptura* principle, I will examine the writings of Ellen G. White in order to establish an Adventist baseline view. It is important to note that when she referenced the idea of *sola scriptura*, she connected the idea to the Reformation understanding of this topic. She wrote, "In our time there is a wide departure from their doctrines and precepts, and there is a need to return to the great Protestant principle—the Bible, and the Bible only, as the rule of faith and duty."[36]

[32] Although Luther asserted the *sola scriptura* principle, it is evident that he did not agree with the principle of *tota Scriptura*, the idea that all Scriptures is equally inspired. He calls the Book of James the "epistle of straw" for the reason that it seemingly contradicts the idea of righteousness by faith alone. Luther wrote, "Away with James.... His authority is not great enough to cause me to abandon the doctrine of faith and to deviate from the authority of the other apostles and the entire Scripture." Paul Althaus, *The Theology of Martin Luther*, trans. Robert C. Shultz (Philadelphia, Fortress, 1966), 81. On the other hand, Adventists assert *tota Scriptura* in consideration that "all Scriptures" are equally inspired and are profitable to the believers.

[33] See Hasel, "Presuppositions in the Interpretation of Scripture," 36.

[34] *A Declaration of the Fundamental Principles Taught and Practiced by the Seventh-day Adventists* (Battle Creek, MI: Steam Press of the Seventh-day Adventist, 1872), 5, http://seventhdayhomechurchfellowships.org/Resources/1872_-_Statements_of_Belief.pdf. This statement is accepted to be the declaration of the Adventist adherence to the *sola scriptura* principle.

[35] For example, see Tim Crosby, "Viewpoint: Why I Don't Believe in Sola Scriptura," *Ministry* (October 1987): 11–15; Woodrow W. Whidden, "Sola Scriptura, Inerrantist Fundamentalism, and the Wesleyan Quadrilateral: Is 'No Creed but the Bible' a Workable Solution?" *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 35.2 (1997): 211–226.

[36] Ellen G. White, *The Great Controversy* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1950), 204, 205.

2.1. Ellen G. White and *Sola Scriptura*

White consistently affirmed the *sola scriptura* principle. For her, "the Bible and the Bible alone, is our rule of faith."[37] In another place, she wrote,

> The Bible is its own expositor. One passage will prove to be a key that will unlock other passages, and in this way light will be shed upon the hidden meaning of the word. By comparing different texts treating on the same subject, viewing their bearing on every side, the true meaning of the Scriptures will be made evident.[38]

Contrary to her detractors, White never claimed that her writings should ever be considered as equal to the Scripture. She is emphatic on this point:

> God's Word is the unerring standard. The Testimonies [her writings] are not to take the place of the Word.... Let all prove their positions from the Scriptures and substantiate every point they claim as truth from the revealed Word of God.[39]

In comparison to the Bible, she claimed that her writings were a "lesser light" to lead people to the "greater light."[40] She penned that "if the Testimonies speak not according to the word of God, reject them."[41] She added, "Our position and faith is in the Bible. And never do we want any soul to bring in the Testimonies ahead of the Bible"[42] and that the Testimonies

[37] Ellen G. White, *Counsels on Sabbath School Work* (Washington, DC: Review & Herald, 1938), 84; cf. Ellen G. White, *Selected Messages* (Washington, DC: Review & Herald, 1958), 2:85.

[38] Ellen G. White, *Fundamentals of Christian Education* (Nashville: Southern Publishing Association, 1923), 187. Hasel comments that to take *sola scriptura* as a hermeneutical principle "does not negate the insight from other fields of study, such as biblical archaeology, anthropology, sociology, or history, which may illumine some biblical aspects and the background of scriptural passages, contributing to a better understanding of the meaning of biblical text. Nor does it exclude the help of other sources in the task of interpretation, such as biblical lexicons, dictionaries, concordances, and other books and commentaries. However, in the proper interpretation of the Bible, the text of Scripture has priority over all other aspects, sciences, and secondary helps. Other viewpoints have to be carefully evaluated from the standpoint of Scripture as a whole." Hasel, "Presuppositions in the Interpretation of Scripture," 36.

[39] Ellen G. White, *Evangelism* (Hagerstown, MD: Review & Herald, 1946), 256.

[40] Ellen G. White, *Colporteur Ministry* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1953), 125.

[41] Ellen G. White, *Testimonies for the Church* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1948), 5:691.

[42] White, *Evangelism*, 256.

would not be necessary if God's people diligently study the Scriptures.[43] She explained, "The Testimonies are not to give new light, but to impress vividly upon the heart the truths of inspiration already revealed."[44]

2.2. Ellen G. White and the Use of Other Sources

White's adherence to the *sola scriptura* principle does not mean that she never considered other sources. She cautioned, though, that

> many think that they must consult commentaries on the Scriptures in order to understand the meaning of the word of God, and we would not take the position that commentaries should not be studied; but it will take much discernment to discover the truth of God under the mass of the word of men.[45]

She consistently maintained that the Scripture is the ultimate gauge of faith and practice. Furthermore, she affirmed that "the Bible, and the Bible only, as the standard of all doctrines, and the basis of all reforms,"[46] and all other teachings and practices must pass the test of the Scriptures.[47]

2.3. Summary of Ellen G. White's Understanding of *Sola Scriptura*

White understood *sola scriptura* to mean that the Bible and the Bible alone is the foundation of Christian faith and practice. However, this does not mean that she disregarded other religious materials. She claimed that her writings did not have the same function as the Scripture but, instead, were intended to lead people back to the Word of God. Even though she

[43] White, *Testimonies*, 2:605–606. White claimed that her testimonies are to point people to the Scriptures that they have neglected. White, *Evangelism*, 257.

[44] White, *Testimonies*, 2:605, 606.

[45] White, *Fundamentals of Christian Education*, 187, 188.

[46] White, *Great Controversy*, 595.

[47] According to White, "The opinions of learned men, the deductions of science, the creed or decisions of ecclesiastical councils, as numerous and discordant as are the churches which they represent, the voice of the majority—not one nor all of these should be regarded as evidence for or against any point of religious faith. Before accepting any doctrine or precept, we should demand a plain 'Thus says the Lord' in its support." White, *Great Controversy*, 595; cf. White, *Testimonies*, 5:575.

maintained the principle that Scripture interprets itself, she allowed for the fact that other biblical tools and resources can be helpful as an aid to study the Bible. She emphasized that the Scripture must always be given priority over other sources of authority in order to determine the meaning of the text.

3. Conclusion

Luther and Seventh-day Adventists share three main commonalities about the principle of *sola scriptura*. First, both decisively affirm that the Bible is the only infallible and final touchstone of faith and practice. It means that all doctrine must pass the test of the Scripture in order to be considered valid. The Bible is the ultimate test of religious knowledge. Second, both agree that the Scripture is its own interpreter. It is not dependent upon external authorities or science to authenticate its claim. A difficult Scriptural passage must be understood in the light of the witness of Scripture as a whole. Finally, in application of the *sola scripture* principle, any teaching or doctrine that does not pass the test of the Scripture must be rejected.

Journal of Asia Adventist Seminary 18.1–2 (2015): 13–30

THE PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST IN LUTHER AND ADVENTISM

ALBERTO R. TIMM
Ellen G. White Estate, USA

God's salvation plan was foreshadowed in the OT and realized in the NT (Heb 8:1–5). The plan gravitates around Christ's atoning sacrifice on the cross and his priestly ministry in heaven. The centrality of the cross was stressed by Jesus in his statement: "And I, when I am lifted up from the earth, will draw all people to myself" (John 12:32–33, NRSV). Paul affirmed that "God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself" (2 Cor 5:19, NKJV).

After his sacrifice on the cross, Christ became the high priest of the heavenly sanctuary, where he intercedes "in the presence of God on our behalf" (Heb 9:24, NRSV). Hebrews 4:14–16 assures us that we have a High Priest who sympathizes with our weaknesses and invites us to come boldly to the throne of grace.

Martin Luther's emphasis on Christ's atoning sacrifice for the forgiveness of sins has been known as the "theology of the cross" (*theologia crucis*). Seventh-day Adventists have focused on Christ's priestly ministry in the heavenly sanctuary. These two approaches raise some questions: Did Luther's emphasis on the cross undermine Christ's heavenly priesthood? Does the Adventists' stress on priesthood overshadow the meaning of the cross? Are these approaches mutually exclusive, or can they be harmonized?

1. Martin Luther[1]

Martin Luther (1483–1546) challenged the medieval Roman Catholic philosophical theology. This process involved a substantial rupture with Aristotelian theological reasoning[2] and a hermeneutical pilgrimage from the medieval allegorical method to the grammatical-historical method of biblical interpretation.[3] Already in September 1517, Luther recognized that "virtually the entire *Ethics* of Aristotle is the worst enemy of grace" and that "the whole Aristotle is to theology as darkness is to light."[4] But this does not mean that he eliminated all philosophical-dichotomist traces from his thinking.

Luther viewed the cross as a historical event with deep spiritual meaning. Yet, his notion of "heavenly realms" continued to be portrayed largely in dichotomist terms with strong emphasis upon a theocentric heaven with almost nothing else added to it.[5] Even so, Luther made a significant contribution to a better understanding of Christ's sacrifice and heavenly priesthood.

1.1. Old Testament Types

Luther saw Christ as a true high priest to whom the Mosaic tabernacle, Levitical priesthood, and priesthood of Melchizedek all converged and in

1 The section is largely based on my chapter "The Priesthood of Christ According to Martin Luther," in *Christ, Salvation, and the Eschaton: Essays in Honor of Hans K. LaRondelle*, ed. Daniel Heinz, Jiri Moskala, and Peter M. van Bemmelen (Berrien Springs, MI: Old Testament Department, Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Andrews University, 2009), 171–187.

2 For further study of Luther's early dependence on Aristotelianism and his later breaking away from it, see e.g. Theodor Dieter, *Der junge Luther und Aristoteles: Eine historisch-systematische Untersuchung zum Verhältnis von Theologie und Philosophie* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2001); Robert Kolb, Irene Dingel, and L'ubomír Batka, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Martin Luther's Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 91–114.

3 In 1520, Luther argued that Scriptures "are to be retained in their simplest meaning ever possible, and to be understood in their grammatical and literal sense unless the context plainly forbids." (*LW* 36:30). See also *LW* 1:232-233.

4 *LW* 31:12 (thesis 41 and 50 of Luther's "Disputation Against Scholastic Theology"). In a letter of February 8, 1517, Luther wrote to Johannes Lang: "If Aristotle had not lived in the flesh I should not hesitate to call him a devil." Preserved Smith, *The Life and Letters of Martin Luther* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1911), 26.

5 Miriam van Scott, "Theocentric Heaven," in *Encyclopedia of Heaven* (New York: Thomas Dunne Books, 1999).

whom all were fulfilled. As "shadows or pictures of the Christ who was to come, and of His sacrifice,"[6] they were considered by Luther of great significance for the understanding of Christ's priesthood.

In his reflections upon Heb 9:1–5 (1517), Luther interpreted the Mosaic tabernacle and its furniture from a Christ-centered perspective.[7] Although the Mosaic tabernacle itself was typologically related to the priesthood of Christ, it was in the service of the tabernacle that Christ's priesthood became more foreshadowed. Luther explained that the reason the Levitical priests were called priests was "to show by means of such dramatic symbols and shadows that the true Priest, the promised Christ, would come, reconcile all men by His sacrifice, and preach and publish this fact in all the world through the Gospel."[8] That priesthood, with Aaron as its high priest, was instituted by God (Exod 28:1), having the "books of Moses" as its laws and "irrational animals and physical things" as its sacrifices.[9] After distinguishing between the moral law and the ceremonial law, Luther recognized that everything contained in the latter was "promised and prefigured with reference to Christ and in Christ."[10]

Foundational for the Levitical priesthood was the concept of transference of sin. Luther argued that the expressions "the iniquity of the sanctuary" and "the iniquity of your priesthood" (Num 18:1, KJV) were used "not because the sanctuary or the priesthood have committed them, but because it is the nature and the duty of the priesthood to be the bearer and the carrier of sins."[11] By carrying the sins of the people, the Levitical priests typified Christ as the one who would vicariously bear "our griefs" and carry "our sorrows" (Isa 53:4, KJV).

Luther noted that the typological relationship between the Levitical priesthood and Christ's priesthood was inadequate for two reasons. First, God chose the tribe of Levi, particularly the house of Aaron, for the priesthood (Num 8:5–26). "Since Christ was to be born of the tribe of Judah, He could not logically be a priest." Second, "God clearly wanted the two offices, king and priest, separately maintained. This is something

[6] *LW* 13:317.

[7] See *LW* 29:200-203.

[8] *LW* 13:317.

[9] *LW* 36:200, 219.

[10] *LW* 29:212-13. Luther refers to the "Ceremonial Law" also in *LW* 4:81; 12:85, 398, 401, 402; 26:121-123, 130, 138, 156, 157, 180, 181, 202, 203, 330, 333, 446, 447; 32:178; 46:146; 47:88 (n. 25).

[11] *LW* 29:168.

which secular insight has also discerned as necessary."[12] Christ would unite in himself both priestly and kingly offices (Zech 6:13) in a new "spiritual" and "not temporal" dimension.[13]

Melchizedek, therefore, a king and priest of the time of Abraham (Gen 14:17–20, cf. Ps 110:4, Heb 6:19–7:28), was a more appropriate type of our Priest Christ than Aaron.[14] In the expression "You are a priest forever according to the order of Melchizedek" (Ps 110:4), Luther saw an element that transcends the human level of existence, pointing towards the eternity of Christ.[15]

1.2. The Nature of Christ

Johannes Zachhuber argues, "Luther's theology is strongly Christocentric, but Christology is rarely the central focus of his writings."[16] This means that his Christology must be reconstructed from various "strands in his thought."[17] Some of his most significant insights about Christ as a high priest are found in his remarks on Ps 110:4 (1535), where Christ is portrayed as the everlasting king and priest according to the order of Melchizedek. For the reformer, "this is an extraordinary statement. It is marvelous."[18]

While dealing with the divine and human natures of Christ, Luther was able to distinguish "between the *duality* of natures and the *singularity* of the person."[19] In his book *The Babylonian Captivity of the Church* (1520), he argued that "in order for the divine nature to dwell in him bodily, it is not necessary for the human nature to be transubstantiated and the divine nature contained under the accidents of the human nature. Both natures are simply there in their entirety."[20] In the book *The Freedom of a Christian,*

12 *LW* 13:305.

13 *LW* 13:306.

14 *LW* 2:381.

15 *LW* 13:312-313.

16 Johannes Zachhuber, "Jesus Christ in Martin Luther," Academia, https://www.academia.edu/29044077/Jesus_Christ_in_Martin_Luther; cf. Jan D. Kingston Siggins, *Martin Luther's Doctrine of Christ* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970); Marc Lienhard, *Luther: Witness to Jesus Christ; Stages and Themes of the Reformer's Christology*, trans. Edwin H. Robertson (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1982).

17 Ibid.

18 *LW* 13:304.

19 Zachhuber, "Jesus Christ in Martin Luther," 15 (italics in the original).

20 *LW* 36:35.

he added in clear terms: "Christ is God and man in one person."[21] He stated elsewhere that Christ is "a man who is supernaturally one person with God, and apart from this man there is no God."[22]

This mysterious union also accounted for the fact that Christ remained uncorrupted and incorruptible by sin (John 8:46; Heb 4:15; 1 Pet 1:19). In his "Disputation on the Divinity and Humanity of Christ" (1540), Luther argued,

> Every man is corrupted by original sin, with the exception of Christ. Every man who is not a divine Person [*personaliter Deus*], as is Christ, has concupiscence, but the man Christ has none, because he is a divine Person, and in conception the flesh and blood of Mary were entirely purged, so that nothing of sin remained.[23]

Because Christ is "a lamb without blemish and without spot" (1 Pet 1:19), he was able to offer himself as "the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world" (John 1:29).

1.3. Christ's Atoning Sacrifice

The events of the cross, according to Luther, were not merely preparatory, allowing Christ to become a true high priest, but the beginning of his priestly office. The reformer stated that Jesus "has been a Priest since the day He became the Christ and began to sacrifice His body."[24] Luther referred to the cross as "the altar on which He [Christ], consumed by the fire of the boundless love which burned in His heart, presented the living and holy sacrifice of His body and blood to the Father with fervent intercession, loud cries, and hot, anxious tears (Heb 5:7)."[25] Ulrich Asendorf concluded that "at the cross Christ comes to his right priestly office."[26]

Christ's sacrifice on the cross was a real sacrifice consisting of the shedding of his blood "for the remission of sins," through which Christ himself became "the end of sins and the beginning of righteousness. As Gabriel said in Dan 9:24, 'to put an end to sin and to bring in everlasting

[21] *LW* 31:351.

[22] *LW* 37:218.

[23] WA 39/2:107. Translated from Latin by Christopher B. Brown, in http://www.iclnet.org/pub/resources/text/wittenberg/luther/luther-divinity.txt.

[24] *LW* 13:326.

[25] *LW* 13:319.

[26] Ulrich Asendorf, *Die Theologie Martin Luthers nach seinen Predigten* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988), 103.

righteousness.'"[27] While "the blood of Abel cries out for wrath and vengeance, ... the blood of Christ cries out for forgiveness and mercy."[28]

While recognizing that God, as the source of life, cannot suffer and die, Luther suggested that Christ's divine nature was so blended with his human nature that it also suffered and died. Luther argues,

> If it cannot be said that God died for us, but only a man, we are lost; but if God's death and a dead God lie in the balance, his side goes down and ours goes up like a light and empty scale. Yet he can also readily go up again, or leap out of the scale! But he could not sit on the scale unless he had become a man like us, so that it could be called God's dying, God's martyrdom, God's blood, and God's death. For God in his own nature cannot die; but now that God and man are united in one person, it is called God's death when the man dies who is one substance or one person with God.[29]

In his "The Misuse of the Mass" (1521), Luther criticized Roman Catholic priests for teaching that at the Eucharist they were repeating Christ's sacrifice, whereas Heb 9:26 (NRSV) states that the sacrifice was "once for all". He affirmed that "Christ has sacrificed himself once (Heb 7:27; 9:25-26); henceforth he will not be sacrificed by anyone else."[30] Since His "sacrifice is a living sacrifice,"[31] it is powerful and effective forever, and there is no need for any other atoning sacrifice.

1.4. Christ's Heavenly Priesthood

Luther was indebted to the Greek dichotomist perspective of the earthly and heavenly realities. Consequently, he could not conceive the existence of a real and concrete sanctuary/temple in a spiritual heaven. In 1525 he stated, "In the new order, the tabernacle or house is spiritual; for it is heaven, or the presence of God."[32] He saw Christ himself as that sanctuary. However, if this is the case, how do we understand passages that affirm that after His ascension Christ "entered once for all into the holy places" (Heb 9:12, ESV) and became "a minister in the holy places" (Heb 8:2, ESV)?

[27] *LW* 29:210, 212.

[28] *LW* 29:169.

[29] *LW* 41:103-104.

[30] *LW* 36:147.

[31] *LW* 36: 201.

[32] WA 17/2:228. English translation from *Sermons of Martin Luther*, 7:164.

We must recognize that Luther did not limit the priesthood of Christ to his atoning sacrifice on the cross, as some are inclined to do. Luther regarded Christ's priestly ministry in heaven as absolutely crucial for our salvation. He confessed that "nothing in Scripture is more comforting than what is said about the priestly office of our dear Christ."[33]

As a high priest, Christ represents God's people "before God and speaks in their interests."[34] Even more, he is also "the true King of Righteousness, who rules us through His priestly office. Through Him we are redeemed from sin and the power of the devil and come to eternal righteousness."[35] In reality, Christ "intercede[s] for us that such weakness and sin may not be reckoned to our account."[36] In doing it, Christ does not only "pray for us" but also applies the merits of his sacrifice to us. He "continues to present His sacrifice to the Father, to plead for us without ceasing, until the end of the world."[37] According to the reformer, after "Christ, by his own sacrifice and blood, has taken away the true sin," "he has gone in once for all through the curtain to God to make atonement for us (Heb 9:12)."[38] In this statement, Luther suggests that Christ's priestly work in heaven is still an atoning work on our behalf.

For Luther, Christ's heavenly priesthood had an extremely meaningful existential dimension. We are encouraged,

> Do not despair after sin, but lift your eyes on high to where Christ intercedes for us. He is our Advocate. He intercedes for us and says: "Father, I have suffered for this person; I am looking after him." This prayer cannot be in vain. In Heb 4:14 we read: "We have a great High Priest." But even though we have had Christ as our High Priest, Advocate, Mediator, Reconciler, and Comforter, yet we have fled for refuge to the saints and have regarded Christ as Judge. Accordingly, this text should be written with golden letters and should be painted in the heart. Therefore you should get understanding and say: "Christ, I know Thee alone as the Advocate, the Comforter, and the Mediator; and I do not doubt that Thou art such a Person for me but cling firmly to this with my heart and believe." Christ is born for us, suffers, as-

[33] *LW* 13:306.

[34] *LW* 13:308.

[35] *LW* 13:311.

[36] *LW* 13:320.

[37] *LW* 13:326.

[38] *LW* 35:247.

> cends into heaven for our sakes, sits at the right hand of the Father, and intercedes for us.[39]

By contrast, Luther regretted that Catholic priests taught "the people absolutely nothing concerning this priestly office of Christ."[40] He saw the Catholic priesthood as an abomination intended to cast away the truth about Christ's priesthood. He stated that

> into this holy, glorious, happy, gracious priesthood [of Christ] the devil's swine, the pope, has fallen snout and all; not only defiling it, but completely destroying and suppressing it, and setting up another priesthood, one of his own, stirred together out of all the heathen priesthoods like a stew of abominations.[41]

Luther declared, "Every promise of God includes Christ; for if it is separated from this Mediator, God is not dealing with us at all."[42]

We have highlighted basic concepts of Luther's understanding of Christ's priesthood as comprising the atoning sacrifice of the cross and also a mediatory work in the heaven. Keeping these concepts in mind, we turn to the Adventist understanding of the theme, with special attention to Ellen G. White's contributions.

2. Seventh-day Adventism

While there are many similarities between Luther and the Seventh-day Adventist understanding about Christ's priesthood, some basic differences exist. The Roman Catholic and Protestant worldviews were largely shaped by the Greek concept about the immortality of the soul or spirit that survives the death of the body.[43] This view became the basis of their anthropologies and distinctions between the present *tangible* world and the heavenly *spiritual* reality.

[39] *LW* 30:236.

[40] *LW* 13:326.

[41] *LW* 36:201.

[42] *LW* 3:26.

[43] A classic exposition of this theory is found in Dante Alighieri, *The Divine Comedy*, trans. by Henry W. Longfellow (New York: Barnes & Noble, 2008). This epic poem was written between 1308 and 1321.

By contrast, Seventh-day Adventists have a more Hebrew wholistic perspective of reality.[44] According to H. Wheeler Robinson, in Hebrew psychology there is no trichotomy dividing "human personality into body, soul, and spirit" and "not even a dichotomy in any strict sense." "The Hebrew idea of personality is an animated body, and not an incarnated soul."[45]

For Roman Catholics, and many Protestants, the idea of a real sanctuary in heaven sounds too *literalistic*. At the same time, Adventists find this notion in harmony with the Bible. While Luther provided insightful glimpses into the ongoing conflict between Christ and Satan,[46] Adventist theology is shaped by the great cosmic-historical controversy between good and evil.

2.1. Old Testament Types

Luther viewed the Mosaic tabernacle, Levitical priesthood, and priesthood of Melchizedek as pointing to Christ's atoning sacrifice and His heavenly priesthood. Even so, sometimes he tended to overemphasize the distinction between the Old and New testaments, between the law and the gospel.[47] White, for example, softened that distinction by speaking of the gospel of salvation by grace through faith as already available in the OT (Gen 15:6; Isa 55:1–3; Eph 2:8–10).[48]

White argued that "there is no such contrast as is often claimed to exist between the Old and the New Testament, the law of God and the gospel of Christ, the requirements of the Jewish and those of the Christian dis-

[44] A helpful analysis of how philosophical presuppositions can influence one's understanding of the biblical sanctuary is provided in Fernando L. Canale, "Philosophical Foundations and the Biblical Sanctuary," *AUSS* 36.2 (1998): 183–206.

[45] H. Wheeler Robinson, "Hebrew Psychology," in *The People and the Book*, ed. Arthur S. Peake (Oxford: Clarendon, 1925), 362.

[46] See Hans-Martin Barth, *Der Teufel und Jesus Christus in der Theologie Martin Luthers*, Forschungen zur Kirchen-und Dogmengeschichte 19 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967).

[47] For an analysis of Luther's distinction between the law and the gospel, see Paul Althaus, *The Theology of Martin Luther*, trans. Robert C. Schultz (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1966), 251–273; Gerhard Ebeling, *Luther: An Introduction to His Thought*, trans. R. W. Wilson (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1972), 110–124; William M. Landeen, *Martin Luther's Religious Thought* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1971), 174–190.

[48] Ellen G. White, "Obedience Better than Sacrifice," *Signs of the Times* (Seventh-day Adventist), September 14, 1882, 409; republished in *The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, rev. ed. (Washington, DC: Review & Herald, 1980), 6:1061.

pensation."[49] "The whole system of types and symbols was a compacted prophecy of the gospel, a presentation in which were bound up the promises of redemption."[50] "The Old Testament is the gospel in figures and symbols. The New Testament is the substance. One is as essential as the other."[51]

The most significant difference between Luther and the Adventist view of Christ's priesthood concerns their understandings about the typological relationship between the earthly and the heavenly sanctuaries. Both hold to a Christ-centered interpretation of the former. Luther reduced the latter to the person Christ enthroned on the right side of God the Father (John 2:21; Heb 10:19–20). Adventists expand upon this notion[52] to comprise also Christ's priestly ministry *within* His heavenly sanctuary/temple (Heb 8:2; Rev 11:19).[53]

White explains that God not only presented to Moses "a view of the heavenly sanctuary" itself but also gave him "the plan of that construction," "a miniature representation of the heavenly temple" as a model for the earthly sanctuary (Exod 25:9, 40).[54] Richard M. Davidson argues,

> In Exod 25:9, 40, it appears probably that תבנית (and τύπος in vs. 40, LXX) referrers to a *Nachbild* [copy] of an original *Urbild* (or perhaps the *Urbild* itself) that serves as a *Vorbild* [model]. It has in view the "pattern" for the earthly sanctuary that is simultaneously a miniature of the

[49] Ibid.

[50] Ellen G. White, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1991), 14.

[51] Ellen G. White, *Selected Messages* (Washington, DC: Review & Herald, 1958), 2:104.

[52] For Adventist reflections on God's throne motif, see e.g. Daegeuk Nam, *The "Throne of God" Motif in the Hebrew Bible*, Korean Sahmyook University Doctoral Dissertation Series 1 (Seoul, Korea: Institute for Theological Research, Korean Sahmyook University, 1994); Laszlo Gallusz, *The Throne Motif in the Book of Revelation*, LNTS 487 (London: Bloomsbury, 2014).

[53] Helpful Adventist assessments of the heavenly sanctuary/temple motif in the Bible are provided by Sanglae Kim, "The Heavenly Sanctuary/Temple in the Hebrew Bible" (PhD diss., University of Sheffield, 2002); Elias Brasil de Souza, *The Heavenly Sanctuary/Temple Motif in the Hebrew Bible: Function and Relationship to the Earthly Counterparts*, Adventist Theological Society Dissertation Series 7 (Berrien Springs, MI: Adventist Theological Society Publications, 2005), published also as Elias Brasil de Souza, *Toward a Theology of the Heavenly Sanctuary in the Hebrew Bible* (Saarbrücken, Germany: VDM Verlag, 2008); Leonardo G. Nunes, "Function and Nature of the Heavenly Sanctuary/Temple in the New Testament: A Motif Study" (ThD diss., Andrews University, forthcoming).

[54] Ellen G. White, *Patriarchs and Prophets* (Washington, DC: Review & Herald, 1958), 343.

> heavenly sanctuary and ultimately encompasses a vision of the heavenly sanctuary itself.[55]

White, like Luther, defined the OT sanctuary services as foreshadowing Christ's atoning sacrifice and his heavenly priestly ministry. She explains,

> Christ was the foundation and life of the temple. Its services were typical of the sacrifice of the Son of God. The priesthood was established to represent the mediatorial character and work of Christ. The entire plan of sacrificial worship was a foreshadowing of the Saviour's death to redeem the world.[56]

She also stated that "in the sacrificial offering on every altar was seen a Redeemer. With the cloud of incense arose from every contrite heart the prayer that God would accept their offerings as showing faith in the coming Saviour."[57]

While Luther spoke of the sanctuary services in more general terms, Adventists draw a clearer distinction between the daily and the annual services. Already by 1843, William Miller suggested that as the spring feasts of Israel were fulfilled at Christ's first coming (Lev 23:4–22; cf. John 13:1; Acts 2:1–4), so the autumn ones pointed toward events related to his second coming (Lev 23:23–43).[58] In his article "The Law of Moses" (1846), O. R. L. Crosier argued that the two compartments of the earthly tabernacle—the holy place and the most holy place—reflected the two compartments of the heavenly sanctuary/temple (Heb 9:1–3) and foreshadowed two distinct phases of Christ's heavenly priesthood.[59]

[55] Richard M. Davidson, *Typology in Scripture: A Study of Hermeneutical τύπος Structures*, Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series 2 (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1981), 388. See also ibid., 367–388; Richard M. Davidson, "Typology in the Book of Hebrews," in Frank B. Holbrook, ed., *Issues in the Book of Hebrews*, Daniel and Revelation Committee Series 4 (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1989), 121–186.

[56] Ellen G. White, *The Desire of Ages* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1940), 165.

[57] Ellen G. White, "The Two Dispensations," *Review and Herald*, (March 2, 1886): 129.

[58] W. Miller to [J. V.] Himes, *Signs of the Times* (Millerite), May 17, 1843, 85.

[59] O. R. L. Crosier, "The Law of Moses," *Day-Star* Extra, (February 7, 1846): 37–44.

2.2. The Nature of Christ

Over the years several discussions and tensions emerged within Seventh-day Adventism about the nature of Christ.[60] The important point for this chapter is to observe a few statements and expressions by White that represent her stand on this topic.

In agreement with Luther, White declared, "In Christ, divinity and humanity were combined. Divinity was not degraded to humanity; divinity held its place, but humanity by being united to divinity, withstood the fiercest test of temptation in the wilderness."[61] For her, Christ's claim, "I am the resurrection and the life" (John 11:25), implied that "in Christ is life, original, unborrowed, underived."[62] In reality, "the Lord Jesus Christ, the divine Son of God, existed from eternity, a distinct person, yet one with the Father."[63]

White acknowledged, "Jesus accepted humanity when the race had been weakened by four thousand years of sin"[64] and that he "took upon Him the infirmities of degenerate humanity..., with the possibility of yielding to temptation."[65] However, she also warned, "Be careful, exceedingly careful as to how you dwell upon the human nature of Christ.... He could have sinned; He could have fallen, but not for one moment was there in Him an evil propensity."[66]

[60] For an introduction to the Seventh-day Adventist Christological discussions, see Eric C. Webster, *Crosscurrents in Adventist Christology* (New York: Lang, 1984).

[61] White, "How to Meet a Controverted Point of Doctrine," *Review and Herald*, Feb. 18, 1890, 97; republished in *The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, 5:1082.

[62] White, *The Desire of Ages*, 530. White borrowed the language of John Cumming who, in 1856, stated that "'in him [Christ] was life,'—that is, original, unborrowed, underived." John Cumming, *Sabbath Evening Readings on the New Testament: St. John* (Boston: John P. Jewett, 1856), 5.

[63] Ellen G. White, "The Word Made Flesh," *Signs of the Times* (Seventh-day Adventist) (April 26, 1899): 1; republished in *Selected Messages*, 1:247.

[64] White, *The Desire of Ages*, 49.

[65] White, *The Desire of Ages*, 117.

[66] Ellen G. White to "Dear Brother and Sister Baker", Lt B-8 (Feb. 9, 1896), 1895; published in *The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, 5:1128-1129.

2.3. Christ's Atoning Sacrifice

White stated that Christ's "whole life was a preface to His death on the cross."[67] As Luther, she emphasized the value of Christ's atoning sacrifice for the salvation of the sinners. She explained that

> Christ was treated as we deserve, that we might be treated as He deserves. He was condemned for our sins, in which He had no share, that we might be justified by His righteousness, in which we had no share. He suffered the death which was ours, that we might receive the life which was His. "With His stripes we are healed."[68]

White saw the cross as having a broader and far-enduring cosmic influence. She declared, "But the work of human redemption is not all that is accomplished by the cross. The love of God is manifested to the universe."[69] Indeed, "all the blessings of this life and of the life to come are delivered to us stamped with the cross of Calvary."[70]

She even recognized the cross as the only means to prevent any future rebellion after sin and sinners are finally destroyed (Mal 4:1). In her words,

> the death of Christ upon the cross made sure the destruction of him who has the power of death, who was the originator of sin. When Satan is destroyed, there will be none to tempt to [do] evil; the atonement will never need to be repeated; and there will be no danger of another rebellion in the universe of God. That which alone can effectually restrain from sin in this world of darkness, will prevent sin in heaven. The significance of the death of Christ will be seen by saints and angels.... The angels ascribe honor and glory to Christ, for even they are not secure except by looking to the sufferings of the Son of God. It is through the efficacy of the cross that the angels of heaven are guarded from apostasy.... The death of Christ on the cross of Calvary is our only hope in this world, and it will be our theme in the world to come.[71]

[67] Ellen G. White to W. W. Prescott, Lt 67 (June 12), 1895; published in idem, *Fundamentals of Christian Education* (Nashville, TN: Southern Publishing Association, 1923), 382.

[68] White, *The Desire of Ages*, 25.

[69] Ibid., 626.

[70] Ellen G. White, *Christ's Object Lessons* (Washington, DC: Review & Herald, 1941), 362.

[71] Ellen G. White, "What Was Secured by the Death of Christ," *Signs of the Times* (Seventh-day Adventist) (December 30, 1889): 786; republished in *The Seventh-day Ad-*

Luther recognized that only by becoming man could Christ die on the cross. White stated more explicitly, however, "When Christ was crucified, it was His human nature that died. Deity did not sink and die; that would have been impossible."[72] After quoting John 11:25 ("I am the resurrection and the life"), she added,

> He who had said, "I lay down my life, that I might take it again" (John 10:17), came forth from the grave to life that was in Himself. Humanity died; divinity did not die. In His divinity, Christ possessed the power to break the bonds of death. He declares that He has life in Himself to quicken whom He will.[73]

The apostle Paul says that at the cross "God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself," and now through Christ's mediation in the heavenly sanctuary we can be individually "reconciled to God" (2 Cor 5:18–21). No wonder White acknowledged that "the intercession of Christ in man's behalf in the sanctuary above is as essential to the plan of salvation as was His death upon the cross."[74]

2.4. Christ's Heavenly Priesthood

Both Luther and Adventists saw Christ's heavenly priesthood as crucial for salvation. In agreement with the reformer, White stated, "By the atoning sacrifice of Christ, and his work of mediation in our behalf, we may become reconciled to God."[75]

However, Adventists differed from Luther in two major aspects. The first is with the *place* of Christ's mediatory work in heaven. While Luther's view of the heavenly sanctuary was focused on the biblical image of God's throne (Acts 7:55–56; Heb 10:12; 12:2; 1 Pet 3:22; etc.), early Adventists expanded that view to include also the many biblical allusions to a real sanctuary/temple in heaven (Ps 11:4; Heb 8:1, 2; 9:11, 12; Rev 11:19; 14:17; 15:5; 16:17; etc.).[76]

ventist Bible Commentary, 5:1132. See also idem, *The Truth About Angels* (Boise, ID: Pacific Press, 1996), 296.

[72] Ellen G. White, "To Ministers, Physicians, and Teachers," Lt 280 (Sept. 3), 1904; published in idem, in *The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, 5:1113.

[73] White, *Selected Messages*, 1:301.

[74] White, *The Great Controversy*, 489.

[75] Ellen G. White, "The Cities of Refuge," *Signs of the Times* (Seventh-day Adventist), (January 20, 1881): 26.

[76] E.g., O. R. L. Crosier, "Law of Moses," *Day-Star* Extra (February. 7, 1846): 38, 40, 41; J. N. Andrews, *The Sanctuary and Twenty-Three Hundred Days* (Rochester, NY: James

The notion that the heavenly sanctuary/temple comprises two compartments—a holy place *and* a most holy place—derived from (a) the concept that both the Mosaic tabernacle and the Jerusalem temple were built with two holy places that at the same time resembled (Exod 25:8, 9, 40; 39:32–43; 1 Chr 28:10–19; Wis 9:8) and foreshadowed (Heb 9:1–9) the heavenly sanctuary; (b) the use of the plural "holy places" (from the original Greek *ta hágia*) in reference to the heavenly sanctuary (Heb 8:2; 9:8, 12; 10:19); and (c) those descriptions of God's heavenly temple in which allusions are made to such holy place furniture as the candlestick with seven lamps (Rev 4:5; cf. Zech 4:2), the golden altar of incense (Rev 8:3; 9:13), and the golden censer (Rev 8:3) as well as to the most holy place ark of God's testament (Rev 11:19; cf. Ps 99:1).[77]

The second area in which Adventists differed from Luther is the actual *nature* of Christ's priesthood in heaven. While Luther limited it to a single mediatory work of atonement for the forgiveness of sin, Adventists describe it as a two-phase priesthood carried on in the two-apartment heavenly sanctuary/temple. The first phase corresponded to a mediatory work in the holy place (1 Tim 2:5; Heb 4:14–16; 1 John 2:1–2) very much in terms of what Luther described. However, the second phase was seen as taking place in the most holy place and adding to the mediatory work, also the cleansing of that sanctuary (Dan 8:14; Heb 9:23) by means of a pre-advent investigative judgment (Dan 7:9–14; Rev 11:19; 14:6–7).[78] The transition

White, 1853), 52–54; [Uriah Smith], "Synopsis of the Present Truth. No. 15," *Review and Herald* (February. 18, 1858): 116, 117; [idem], *The Sanctuary and Twenty-Three Hundred Days of Daniel 8, 14* (Battle Creek, MI: Steam Press of the Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, 1863), 36–51.

[77] E.g., Crosier, "Law of Moses," *Day-Star* Extra, Feb. 7, 1846, 38, 40, 41; Andrews, *The Sanctuary and Twenty-three Hundred Days*, 52-54; [Smith], "Synopsis of the Present Truth. No. 15," *Review and Herald*, Feb. 18, 1858, 116, 117; [idem], *The Sanctuary and Twenty-three Hundred Days of Daniel VIII, 14*, 36-51.

[78] E.g., Crosier, "Law of Moses," *Day-Star* Extra, Feb. 7, 1846, 42-44; Joseph Bates, *An Explanation of the Typical and Anti-Typical Sanctuary, by the Scriptures with a Chart* (New Bedford, MA: Benjamin Lindsay, 1850), 10; [Smith], *The Sanctuary and Twenty-three Hundred Days of Daniel VIII, 14*, 51-78. For further study of the early Adventist understanding of the cleansing of the sanctuary and the investigative judgment, see Timm, *The Sanctuary and the Three Angels' Messages*, 70-78, 161-174. For a more detailed Adventist exposition of the biblical bases for an investigative judgment, see William H. Shea, *Selected Studies on Prophetic Interpretation*, rev. ed., Daniel and Revelation Committee Series 1 (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, 1992).

between the two phases was marked in 1844 by the end of the 2300 symbolic evenings and mornings of Dan 8:14.[79]

Describing the installment of that judgment, Dan 7 mentions that "thrones were put in place" (v. 9); the movable throne of God had wheels like "a burning fire" (v. 9); and the Son of Man (Christ) went to the Ancient of Days (God the Father; v. 13).[80] Daniel 7 explains that the judgment is at the same time against the "horn" that persecuted the saints and "in favor of the saints of the Most High" (vv. 21, 22).

When Christ finishes his mediatory/judicial work in the heavenly sanctuary/temple, he will take his faithful children to heaven, where they will serve him in his temple. As foreseen by the apostle John, "Therefore they are before the throne of God, and serve Him day and night in His temple. And He who sits on the throne will dwell among them" (Rev 7:15).

In line with Luther, Adventists view the Roman Catholic papacy with its priestly system—including the sacrifice of the mass and the claim that Catholic priests can forgive sins—as a counterfeit to Christ's sacrifice on the cross and His heavenly priesthood (Dan 7:20–25; 8:9–13; Matt 24:15; 2 Thess 2:1–12).[81] White declared that the "compromise between paganism and Christianity" resulted in the development of a "gigantic system of false religion" that can be considered "a masterpiece of Satan's power."[82]

In part, the Catholic priesthood challenged Luther to start the Reformation of the sixteenth century. More than three centuries later, early Ad-

[79] More in-depth historical-chronological studies of the 2300 evenings and mornings of Daniel 8:14 are provided in Siegfried H. Horn and Lynn H. Wood, *The Chronology of Ezra 7*, 2nd ed. (Washington, DC: Review & Herald, 1970); Frank B. Holbrook, ed., *Symposium on Daniel*, Daniel and Revelation Committee Series 2 (Washington, DC: Biblical Research Institute, 1986); Frank B. Holbrook, ed., *The Seventy Weeks, Leviticus, and the Nature of Prophecy*, Daniel and Revelation Committee Series 3 (Washington, DC: Biblical Research Institute, 1986); Brempong Owusu-Antwi, *The Chronology of Dan 9:24-27*, Adventist Theological Society Dissertation Series, vol. 2 (Berrien Springs: Adventist Theological Society, 1995); Juarez R. de Oliveira, *Chronological Studies Related to Daniel 8:14 and 9:24-27* (Engenheiro Coelho, SP, Brazil: Imprensa Universitária Adventista, 2004). See also Alberto R. Timm, "Miniature Symbolization and the Year-Day Principle of Prophetic Interpretation," *AUSS* 42.1 (2004): 149–167.

[80] See Ellen G. White, *Early Writings of Ellen G. White* (Washington, DC: Review & Herald, 1945), 55.

[81] See *Seventh-day Adventists Believe... A Biblical Exposition of Fundamental Doctrines*, 2nd ed. (Silver Spring, MD: Ministerial Association, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 2005), 181–189.

[82] White, *The Great Controversy*, 50.

ventists felt the burden to continue that restoration process. As Luther restored the centrality of Christ's atoning sacrifice on the cross and, to some extent, also his heavenly priesthood, so Adventists viewed themselves as restoring both dimensions.

3. Conclusion

One of the most meaningful themes of Scripture is the sanctuary and its services. This theme flows from the early patriarchal altars through the Mosaic tabernacle and the temple of Jerusalem. It reaches its climax at Christ's sacrifice on the cross and His priestly ministry in the heavenly sanctuary. The sanctuary is the abiding place of God (Exod 25:8; Isa 6:1; Rev 11:19), the depository of His law (Exod 25:16; 31:18; Rev 11:19), and the place where salvation is available to all (Heb 4:14–16; 1 John 2:1, 2).[83] Luther confessed, "Nothing in Scripture is more comforting than what is said about the priestly office of our dear Christ."[84] White added, "The correct understanding of the ministration in the heavenly sanctuary is the foundation of our faith."[85]

According to Luther, Christ offered himself as a single, self-sufficient, and unrepeatable atoning sacrifice for the sins of the whole world. At the right hand of God, Christ now "make[s] atonement for us (Heb 9:12),"[86] and he "continues to present His sacrifice to the Father, to plead for us without ceasing, until the end of the world."[87] According to Luther, the Catholic papacy and priesthood attempted to overthrow Christ's sacrifice on the cross and His heavenly priesthood.

Adventists resonate with Luther's view of the atoning nature of both Christ's sacrifice on the cross and His priesthood in heaven. Luther limited the heavenly priesthood exclusively to the biblical image of God's throne. Adventists see Christ's priesthood as taking place within a real heavenly sanctuary/temple, comprised of two compartments—a holy place and a most holy place—or at least of two distinct phases. At the end of the 2300 symbolic evenings and mornings of Dan 8:14 in 1844, Christ began a

[83] Alberto R. Timm, "Recognizing Heavenly Realities: Ellen White's Insights into the Heavenly Sanctuary," *Adventist World* (February 2013): 24.

[84] *LW* 13:306.

[85] Ellen G. White to George C. Tenney, Lt 208 (June 29), 1906; published in idem, *Evangelism* (Washington, DC: Review & Herald, 1946), 221.

[86] *LW* 35:247.

[87] *LW* 13:320, 326.

special work of pre-advent investigative judgment (Dan 7:9–14; Rev 11:19; 14:6–7).

As I argue elsewhere, "the everlasting gospel flows through the sanctuary motif, integrating the plan of salvation into an unfolding whole."[88] We can better understand what Christ already did, what he is now doing, and what he will still do for our salvation. We can, by faith, accept his atoning sacrifice on the cross; behold his priesthood in the heavenly sanctuary/temple; and look for that glorious day when we will worship him "in His temple" (Rev 7:15).

[88] Timm, "Recognizing Heavenly Realities," 25.

Journal of Asia Adventist Seminary 18.1–2 (2015): 31–37

PRIESTHOOD OF BELIEVERS IN LUTHER AND ADVENTISM

MICHAEL SOKUPA
Ellen G. White Estate, USA

Martin Luther's understanding of the priesthood of all believers is widely recognized by most Reformation scholars. Timothy George contends, "Luther's greatest contribution to Protestant ecclesiology was the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers."[1] Oswald Bayer notes in connection with one of Luther's publications that *The Address to the Christian Nobility* was "a document that had great effect, in the public realm as well, which one might call the Magna Carta for Luther's understanding of the priesthood of all believers."[2] At the same time this was not Luther's original contribution, even though he certainly placed great emphasis and his understanding came at a critical moment in the history of the Christian church. Tertullian, during the early church, presented baptism as the ordination to priesthood. He understood that, in baptism, believers "are thoroughly anointed with a blessed unction."[3] Luther, many centuries later, expressed the same thought when he wrote, "We are all priests, as many of us as are Christians."[4] Thus, according to Robert Muthiah, the Reformation was a turning point in terms of this understanding of the priesthood of all believers.[5] Such a shift in thinking, as part of the Reformation, is largely attributed to Luther. This chapter examines both Luther and Adventist reflections about this vital doctrine. The emphasis is on how Luther's understanding resonates or varies from that of Seventh-day Adventists.

1 Timothy George, *Theology of the Reformation* (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 2013), 97.

2 Oswald Bayer, *Martin Luther's Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008), 274.

3 Tertullian, *On Baptism* 7, in vol. 3 of *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, ed. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1951-6), 672.

4 *LW* 36:113; 44:127.

5 Robert Muthiah, *The Priesthood of All Believers in the Twenty-First Century* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2009), 6.

1. Luther and the Priesthood of Believers

Luther discussed this topic throughout his literary works. As a consequence, there are many ways scholars have viewed this topic. Voss Hank proposed a chronological treatment. He suggested "a Roman Catholic period (1505-17); a period of strong emphasis (1518-23); a transitional period (1524-25); and a period of weaker emphasis (1526-46)."[6] In the first stage, the Roman Catholic Church's understanding of priesthood influenced Luther. During the second phase of development, his literary output was at its peak. He produced eleven of the fifteen works on the topic during this period. It is in these works that most of his thoughts on this subject are found. Luther's focus on the transitional period is on Christian freedom and his polemic against Karlstadt was the intellectual driving force behind the peasant's rebellion.[7] According to Voss, the last twenty years of Luther's *liewsefe* shows a decline in his emphasis upon the priesthood of all believers due to the fallout from the peasant's war along with the growing influence of Anabaptist teaching. The doctrine, however, remained central in Luther's ecclesiology. Three centuries after Luther, Adventism emerged during the 1830s as a lay-driven, trans-denominational, Scripture-focused movement. As the movement grew, it drew from both the Radical and Magisterial Reformations, a heritage that sought to conform everything with Scripture.

1.1. The Essence of Luther's Teaching

Luther's ideas on the priesthood of believers were formulated within the socio-religious and political context of his time. At that time, the major division within society concerned the difference between laity and clergy.[8] His ecclesial world, according to Voss, "was divided into three estates: clerics, monastics, and laics."[9] On July 2, 1505, Luther became a monk and two years later, a priest in the Roman Catholic Church.[10] Another important division that impacted society at that time was between the spir-

6 Hank Voss, *Priesthood of All Believers and the Missio Dei: A Canonical, Catholic and Contextual Perspective* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2016), 132.

7 Brett Muhlhan, *Being Shaped by Freedom: An Examination of Luther's Development of Christian Liberty, 1520-1525* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick), viii.

8 Voss, *Priesthood of All Believers*, 131.

9 Ibid., 130.

10 Ibid.

itual and secular. Based on biblical grounds, Luther rejected these divisions. His rejection of these divisions may be observed in a number of his literary works. Voss highlights two such works that provide the clearest evidence: "*On Monastic Vows* (1521) and his vigorous debate with Jerome Esmer (d. 1521) over 'priesthood' in 1 Peter 2:5, 9."[11] In these works, Luther argues against the spiritual/secular divide; the lay/clergy division is also rejected. Luther believed that the priesthood of all Christians flows from the priesthood of Christ.[12] Hé argued that "as Christ's brothers, Christians receive a share in his priestly office, namely through baptism, regeneration and anointing with the Holy Spirit."[13] It is, however, important to note that Luther's position on the division between laity and clergy did not rule out church office.[14] Therefore, he did not reject the ministry as a special calling and function. The public character of the ministerial office is the main difference that sets it apart from the priesthood of all believers.

1.2. The Function of Priesthood

In the treatise *On Appointing Ministers of the Church*, Luther lists seven functions of the priesthood: teaching or preaching, baptism, consecration or the administration of the Lord's Supper, binding and loosing sins, intercession, sacrifices, and the judging of doctrines. A number of scholars discuss these functions with reference to both ministers and laity. Brian Gerrish observes that Luther "assigns to the royal priesthood all the functions that, in other places, are assigned to the church's official ministry."[15] Michael Parsons interprets Luther to be saying that "all Christians are permitted to perform the same functions."[16] For Gerrish, Luther simply demonstrates that the function belongs to the whole priesthood and every member.[17]

[11] Ibid., 131.

[12] Paul Althaus, *The Theology of Martin Luther*, trans. by Robert C. Schultz (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1970), 314.

[13] Ibid.

[14] Muthiah, *Priesthood of All Believers*, 19.

[15] Brian Gerrish, *The Old Protestant and New* (New York: T&T, 1982) 97, 98.

[16] Michael Parsons, *Aspects of Reforming: Theology and Practice in Sixteenth Century Europe* (Milton Keynes, UK: Paternoster, 2013).

[17] Gerrish, *Old Protestant and New*, 98.

2. Luther's Biblical Foundation for the Priesthood of All Believers

2.1. Old Testament

Prominent texts used by scholars about the priesthood of all believers include Exod 19:5–6. Luther, however, does not engage this passage in his major arguments. Instead, he opts for the NT passage based upon the LXX. He notes some echoes and allusions to the priesthood of believers across the OT. For example, he applies ecclesiological language to Cain and Adam when he states: "But the words which Cain adds—'I shall be hidden from your face'—deal with an ecclesiastical punishment and with true excommunication. Since Adam was in possession of the priesthood and of royal rule, and Cain is excommunicated by Adam because of his sin, he is at the same time deprived of the glory of the priesthood and of royal rule."[18] He summarizes the loss Cain sustained this way: "He [Cain] is compelled to leave not only the common home, dear parents, and the protection of parents but also his hereditary birthright, the prerogative of rule and priesthood, and the fellowship of the church."[19] Luther's understanding about the origin of the priesthood and his treatment of the subject in the OT seems to be individualistic rather than corporate. He concludes, "Therefore the true priesthood was in existence from the very beginning of the world, first covertly but later on promised more clearly to Abraham."[20] Luther recognized the Levites had a special priesthood. They were "appointed by God as priests; but they were mortal, and therefore they gave a blessing that was only temporal. For as the priest, so the blessing. They could not do away with sin and death; nor could they purify hearts."[21] The approach that Luther uses to draw attention to the echoes of priesthood in the OT presents some challenges. There is no mention of priesthood in the texts that he picks in Genesis. This may be viewed as eisegesis; however, Luther also uses a typological method to relate this to the church. While this may be appreciated, it raises more questions as to whether typology was indeed intended in those passages. The best way is to make a judgment based upon the tools available to him at that time.

[18] *LW* 1:299.

[19] *LW* 1:308.

[20] *LW* 4:177.

[21] Ibid.

2.2. New Testament

In his argument against Jerome Emser,[22] Luther draws upon biblical evidence in the NT.[23] In Luther's own words, the Scripture is the primary foundation of his argument on the priesthood of believers. He states:

> For it stands in Scripture ... but you are a chosen race, a royal priesthood.... Tell me, can anyone be so crude as not to understand what St. Peter speaks here? Or do the passages from the fathers have to step forward here and provide the interpretation? He [Peter] names the people and the congregation very clearly; and he calls them all together a royal priesthood.[24]

This appeal represents Luther's approach throughout his writings in support of his argument for the priesthood of believers. This passage also is part of the debate Luther had with Emser, who represented the Roman Catholic Church. Emser wrote a treatise against Luther's position and Luther responded: "He may interpret 'priests' as he pleases, but all Christians are nevertheless such priests through this passage. If all of us should preach, then the tonsure-bearers (what he chose to call the Roman Catholic priests) must keep silent, since they have a different, special priesthood above all Christians."[25] In the course of the debate, Luther used several NT passages, including 1 Pet 2:9, Rev 5:9–10, and 20:6. He concludes,

> Thereby the Holy Spirit teaches us that the ointments, consecrations, tonsures, chasubles, albs, chalices, masses, sermons etc. do not make priests or give power. Rather, priesthood and power have to be there first brought from baptism and common to all Christians through the faith which builds them upon Christ the true high priest.[26]

[22] Some background information about Emser, Luther's opponent, is important: "Jerome Emser (1477-1527) the goat of Liepzig – Luther's designation because Emser's coat of arms, a shield and helmet adorned with a goat, was displayed on the title page of his writings, had pursued a variegated career before engaging Luther in a bitter literary feud. After studying law and theology at the university of Tubingen and Basel, he became secretary to Cardinal Raymund von Gurk, papal legate in the matter of indulgencies until 1505" (*LW* 39:107).

[23] Michael Sokupa, "Martin Luther on the Priesthood of all Believers," (MTh Thesis, University of Stellenbosch, 2004).

[24] *LW* 39:236. All Luther's direct quotations are taken from the following edition: Eric W. Gritsch, Helmut T. Lehmann eds, *Luther's Works* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1970).

[25] Ibid.

[26] *LW* 39:236, 237.

Luther always buttressed his argument, including this one with Esmer, based upon Scriptural evidence.

3. Luther, Adventism, and the Priesthood of Believers

In this chapter, I have summarized the essence of Luther's views on the priesthood of believers into two areas: biblical and ecclesiological. These two areas form the basis for engaging Luther's doctrine from an Adventist perspective. While separated by centuries, a comparison of key points is helpful to understand the connection that Adventism has to Luther. This can be seen especially in a recent dialogue between Lutherans and Seventh-day Adventists.

The Lutheran World Church Federation engaged in a consultation meeting with Seventh-day Adventist leaders between 1994 and 1998. Lutheran and Adventist representatives shared their theological perspectives. Out of the ten points, the fifth point reads: "Stressing the priesthood of all baptized believers to indicate the equality of all Christians before God and the apostolic obligation of the whole Christian community."[27] The consultation meeting held on November 1–5, 1994 revealed that both Adventists and Lutherans understood the church as a community of believers. There was also a strong appreciation for the work of Luther among Adventist theologians.[28]

The priesthood of believers is a scriptural teaching that lies at the heart of the Seventh-day Adventist beliefs. Adventist theologians and historians have highlighted the importance of this concept. According to Norskov Olsen, "The Lutheran Reformation grew out of Luther's own religious experience in which he found justification by 'faith alone' and 'grace alone' through 'Christ alone' and 'the Bible alone.'"[29] Among other things, the emphasis is on *sola scriptura* as reflected in Luther's teaching of the priesthood of believers. Olsen summarizes Luther's ecclesiology: "From this experience stems his ecclesiology: negatively as a reaction against sacerdotalism and positively in the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers."[30] Reflecting on Luther's teaching in general, Rex Edwards mentions

[27] General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists and The Lutheran World Federation, *Lutherans and Adventists in Conversation* (GC and LWF, 2000), 75.

[28] Ibid., 6.

[29] Norskov V. Olsen, *Myth and Truth: Church, Priesthood and Ordination* (Riverside, CA: Loma Linda University Press, 1990), 105.

[30] Ibid.

three principles: "the supremacy of Scripture over tradition, the supremacy of faith over works, and the supremacy of the Christian people over an exclusive priesthood."[31]

In demonstrating how Scripture plays a foundational role for his teaching on the priesthood of believers, Luther boldly stated, "Therefore, when we grant the Word to anyone we cannot deny anything to him pertaining to the exercise of his priesthood."[32] Luther's ideas on the priesthood of believers

> signaled a revolution in the concept of the church. In place of a hierarchical and stratified ecclesiastical structure, Luther proposed a model based on the equality of all members under the head, Christ. He replaced the rule of the oligarchical few and the rule of the democratic many, with the rule of the eternal Son of God who was active in all true members.[33]

Such reflections demonstrate that the priesthood of believers played a central role for both Luther and his descendants and remains an important part of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Adventists view a strong consistency between *sola scriptura* and the priesthood of all believers.

4. Conclusion

This chapter hopefully stimulates further discussion on the connections between Luther and Adventism on the subject of the priesthood of believers. We need to reflect upon Luther's understanding and the continued legacy of this concept. Luther must be understood on his own terms. He believed that every doctrine should be based upon Scripture. Such an approach must begin with Scripture as its foundation. The application of the doctrine should also find relevance and application for the church today. Luther balanced these two principles in his approach as he addressed relevant issues in his time.

[31] Rex Edwards, "Priesthood of Believers," www.adventistbiblicalresearch.org, 12.

[32] Ibid., 13 (See *LW* 40:21).

[33] Ibid., 17, 18.

Journal of Asia Adventist Seminary 18.1–2 (2015): 39–49

MARTIN LUTHER AND EDUCATION

HEIDI CAMPBELL
Adventist International Institute of Advanced Studies, PHILIPPINES

Education played a crucial role in the Protestant Reformation enabling it to grow and thrive. Even earlier efforts at religious reform, such as the Waldenses and the Hussites, recognized the value of education in transmitting religious values. The Seventh-day Adventist Church, in a similar way, builds upon this Reformation heritage by continuing in this rich spirit of reform that is closely aligned with and transmitted through education. With an educational system that spans the globe and has almost two million students,[1] the Seventh-day Adventist Church maintains one of the largest religious educational systems in the world. This Adventist system, as with many other aspects of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, is a beneficiary to a Protestant legacy of education with deep roots that can be credited to Martin Luther and the Reformation.

Martin Luther transformed the world, especially Western culture, by writing his *Ninety-Five Theses*. He also changed expectations about what an ideal government is and, in turn, this had implications for the definition of what a good citizen should be also. Through this process, Luther drastically altered all levels of education. Most governments today provide education and ensure the right of education for all citizens.[2] These rights are very much a part of Luther's enduring legacy. As R. Wald Holder writes, "Part of the story of the Reformation is a story of the foundation of schools."[3] This chapter explores why Luther developed this educational perspective and what his views of education were that have impacted Protestants, including Adventists.

1 "The General Conference Education Team," Department of Education, Seventh-day Adventist Church, http://education.gc.adventist.org/about.html.

2 John Witte Jr., "The Lutheran Reformation and Its Impact on Legal Culture," in *Protestantism After 500 Years*, ed. Thomas Albert Howard and Mark A. Noll (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016), 69.

3 R. Ward Holder, *Crisis and Renewal: The Era of the Reformations* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2009).

1. Medieval Foundations for Education

Martin Luther was born at a time when the educational system was not well-coordinated and was unavailable to most. Education consisted of a mix of cathedral, parish, monastic, and palace schools, along with universities that emerged just prior to Luther's time.[4] These schools did not provide general education for all children but rather trained students for certain careers, generally in the government or the church. Monastic schools, for example, existed primarily to provide religious education and literacy for novice monks and nuns. Occasionally monasteries provided education for laity, but that was rare and generally viewed as a distraction from their primary focus. Instead, they trained monks, who, in turn, often became instructors in the newly developing universities.[5] The universities formed during the late medieval period were modeled upon Islamic universities[6] and gradually replaced the cathedral schools. These universities produced a rich flowering of intellectual achievement, but only for the privileged few. Universities were too expensive, inaccessible to most, and had little impact on regular clergy.[7]

The education provided by these schools was also inconsistent. Many schools failed to provide even basic literacy. Children at parish schools, for example, were frequently taught only memorized prayers rather than even how to read, and the teacher (generally the local priest) was not necessarily literate either.[8] Cathedral schools could be excellent schools, and some of the most gifted intellectuals of the medieval period attended them, but the content and quality depended almost entirely on the master.[9] Even though schools and universities were tasked with producing an educated clergy, the evidence indicates that the education for most clergy was generally neglected.[10]

4 John J. Contreni, "Schools, Cathedral," *Dictionary of the Middle Ages*, ed. Joseph R. Strayer (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1988), 11:59–63.

5 Charles W. Jones, "Schools, Monastic," *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* 11:72–78.

6 James E. Reed and Ronnie Prevost, *A History of Christian Education* (Nashville, TN: B&H, 1993).

7 Justo L. González, *The History of Theological Education* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 2015). This was still a problem in 1527 after the Reformation.

8 Ibid., 53.

9 Contreni, "Schools, Cathedral," 11:59–63.

10 Jones, "Schools, Monastic," 11:72–78.

With such a low level of education among clergy, it is therefore not surprising that it was not highly valued among the laity. The late medieval period went through a rapid expansion of capitalism, and many in Germany saw education as a waste of time as children were needed on the farms.[11] In the preface to Luther's *Small Catechism*, he reacts to the generally poor state of education and condemns the lack of knowledge on the part of the clergy.[12] The main focus of "A Sermon on Keeping Children in School" is to encourage parents to educate their children instead of hurrying them into the workforce. Luther states, "Common people appear to be quite indifferent to the matter of maintaining the schools. I see them withdrawing their children from instruction and turning them to the making of a living and to caring for their bellies."[13] Against this background of apathy towards education, Luther posted his *Ninety-Five Theses*.

2. The Reformers as Educators

Martin Luther, along with most other Protestant reformers, was university educated. Not only did they benefit from a university education, but also many like Luther, a monk as well as a professor at the University of Wittenberg, were career teachers.[14] The Augustinians—Luther's monastic group—were known for producing theology professors.[15] Augustine's theology played a key role in the formation of Luther's thinking, including educational reform. As a professor, Luther had a reputation for being a meticulous and thorough professor who carefully prepared his lectures.[16] Even in the midst of the conflict following his dissemination of the *Ninety-Five Theses*, Luther continued his role as a university professor.

As Christian reformers and professors, Luther and his co-reformer Philip Melanchthon recognized the importance of education as a mechanism for

[11] Charles M. Jacobs, "Introduction to A Sermon on Keeping Children in School," in *The Christian in Society 3*, by Martin Luther, vol. 46 of *Luther's Works*, ed. Robert Schultz III (St. Louis, MO: Concordia, 1966), 209. *Luther's Works* is hereafter abbreviated as *LW*.

[12] Kevin P. Emmert, "Luther's Small Catechism," in *Encyclopedia of Christian Education*, ed. George Thomas Kurian and Mark A. Lamport (New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015), 2:770, 771.

[13] *LW* 44:219.

[14] González, *History of Theological Education*, 69–77.

[15] Scott H. Hendrix, *Martin Luther: Visionary Reformer* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2015), 34.

[16] Ibid., 39.

implementing lasting values and changes. Additionally, both valued it and saw the need for universal Protestant education. In a religion that focused on the need to return to Bible-based doctrine, logically, its adherents needed to be able to read the Bible. As Melanchthon noted, God wrote the Ten Commandments Himself for others to read; therefore, it followed that His believers needed the ability to read and understand the Bible.[17] They also recognized that Protestants needed a deep understanding of their faith and the biblical evidence supporting Protestant beliefs to withstand the arguments of the Catholic Church.[18]

Thus, Luther wrote extensively about the need to establish parish schools supported by the government. A tour of churches and schools in 1527 brought further impetus for reforms by ensuring that basic education was given to as many Protestants as possible, including all clergy. During the trip, Melanchthon was horrified to discover that many of the priests and monks, who had accepted Protestantism, still did not have any significant understanding of Protestant doctrine. Some of the priests and teachers could not even read.[19] As a result, Melanchthon wrote *Instructions for the Visitors of Parish Pastors in Electoral Saxony*.[20] The reforms that he and Luther encouraged were so instrumental in developing a German educational system that, in the wake of the Reformation, Melanchthon received the moniker "Educator of Germany."[21]

Melanchthon indeed deserves much of the credit for many of these educational efforts. Luther was a firm advocate of Melanchthon's efforts at reform and supported these endeavors through a series of pamphlets: "To the Councilmen of All Cities in Germany That They Establish and Maintain Christian Schools" (1524) and "A Sermon on Keeping Children in School" (1530).[22] In 1529, he wrote two catechisms with a specific educational purpose: *Small Catechism* and *Large Catechism*. The *Small Catechism* was written as training material for both home and school. Together, both catechisms

[17] González, *History of Theological Education*, 72.

[18] Ibid., 74.

[19] Ibid., 73.

[20] The authorship of *Instructions for the Visitors of Parish Pastors in Electoral Saxony* is disputed, but Melanchthon is generally believed to be the primary author.

[21] Charlotte Methuen, "Luther's Life," in *The Oxford Handbook of Martin Luther's Theology*, ed. Robert Kolb, Irene Dingel, and L'ubomír Batka (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016), 18.

[22] D. Schulz, "Martin Luther's Influence," in *Harper's Encyclopedia of Religious Education*, ed. Iris V. Cully and Kendig Brubaker Cully (San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row, 1990), 388; Reed and Prevost, *History of Christian Education*.

were meant to ensure a basic knowledge of Christian beliefs for children and adults.[23] The *Small Catechism* proved incredibly popular at the time and remains popular among Lutherans.[24]

Luther and Melanchthon's education ideals were profoundly influenced by humanism as well as Protestant theology.[25] When Luther began his career at the University of Wittenberg, scholasticism was the predominant philosophy in education. Those educators who differed in their philosophy, such as humanists, were pressured to conform to scholasticism.[26] Early in his career, recognizing the deficiencies of scholasticism, Luther was attracted to humanism. Although how he initially became interested in humanism is unknown,[27] it is clear that he appreciated the worth of the writings of humanist Faber Stapulensis and Erasmus's *New Testament*.[28] Although Luther never became a true humanist himself[29] (he adopted parts of humanism that resonated with his worldview and rejected the rest), his humanist philosophy, along with his biblical worldview, impacted his views. Protestant and Adventist educational practices were influenced by Luther's views, especially in regard to theological training.

One way humanism shaped Luther's view of education was in the area of teaching methods, particularly for children. As revealed by the *Catechisms*, Luther believed that education must be more than rote memorization. Instead, he advocated that all church members should think deeply and understand their beliefs.[30] Furthermore, education should awaken an interest in learning.[31] As a consequence, his *Small Catechism* was written in a question-and-answer format[32] that made it easy for children to remember and to reflect questions children might ask. His catechisms were written in

[23] Emmert, "Luther's Small Catechism," 2:770, 771.

[24] Schulz, "Martin Luther's Influence," 388.

[25] Alister E. McGrath, *Reformation Thought: An Introduction*, 4th ed. (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), 56.

[26] Robert Rosin, "Humanism, Luther, and the Wittenberg Reformation," in *The Oxford Handbook of Martin Luther's Theology*, 93, 94.

[27] Ibid., 96.

[28] Ibid., 99.

[29] Ibid., 101; McGrath, *Reformation Thought*, 54, 55.

[30] Gerald Strauss, *Luther's House of Learning: Indoctrination of the Young in the German Reformation* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978), 5.

[31] Schulz, "Martin Luther's Influence," 388.

[32] Emmert, "Luther's Small Catechism," 2:770, 771.

German rather than Latin in order to be as widely read and understood as possible.[33] Additionally, he concurred with humanists that education should be presented to children in small components that they could easily be grasped and built upon.[34] Teaching methods should be adapted to the age and abilities of the students. In fact, education should be made enjoyable for children to learn and not be harsh and demanding. Most of these pedagogical methods now seem logical, but at the time, these were radical ideas and not embraced by the majority of society except for a few humanists, like Erasmus.[35]

Luther and the Reformation also changed the focus as to *who* should be taught. Luther's belief in the priesthood of all believers had significant implications for who was to be educated. During the medieval period, boys intended for the priesthood and government positions[36] or who came from wealthy families were educated. Boys from lower classes or not intended for careers that required the ability to read were not generally educated. Luther argued that every child with the ability to do so should have at least a basic education in order to be able to read the Bible.[37] In "A Sermon on Keeping Children in School," Luther urged parents to educate their children, even if in the end they worked in a career that did not require education, as it would prepare them for service to God and enable them to explain their beliefs.

More radically, Luther also pushed for girls to receive an education. Girls were not generally viewed as worthy of an education.[38] Only girls from a few rich and/or noble families could afford to hire a tutor for their daughters. Like monks, nuns, who generally also came from wealthy families, were, according to their charters, to be educated. Of course, as with monks, education was the ideal and not necessarily the norm. One Italian proverb is representative of the predominant attitude about female educa-

[33] McGrath, *Reformation Thought*, 245.

[34] Strauss, *Luther's House of Learning*, 5; Schulz, "Martin Luther's Influence," 388.

[35] González, *History of Theological Education*, 66-68.

[36] Luther's father, a pious miner and owner of foundries, wanted Luther to become a lawyer.

[37] Jeff Mallinson, "Lutheran Church Christian Education," *Encyclopedia of Christian Education* 2:768, 769.

[38] Although nuns were supposed to be taught to read and write, evidence indicates that this was unevenly applied.

tion. It states, "'A girl should be taught to sew and not to read, unless one wishes to make a nun of her.'"[39]

If, as Luther contended, all Christians were priests, then all Christians from across all social classes, and including both boys and girls, must be able to read in order to understand the Bible. Although Luther still viewed wives as subordinate to their husbands, he recognized the importance of both fathers and mothers in the educating of their children. To this end, Luther encouraged each parish to establish a school for boys and another for girls and to provide a female teacher financially supported by the parish.[40]

After centuries of neglecting female education, Luther's emphasis on education for both genders did not bring immediate results. Nevertheless, between the efforts of the Reformation, as well as the Catholic Counter-Reformation, there was an increase in female literacy. In England, a study shows, female literacy rose from 2 percent just prior to the Reformation in 1500 to 9 percent by 1600 after the Reformation and expanded to 32 percent by 1700. The literacy rate also increased among men from 10 percent in 1500 to almost 40 percent by 1700. Thus, the Reformation encouraged widespread education, particularly in northern Europe where Protestantism was dominant, in contrast to southern Europe where Catholicism remained dominant.[41]

In order to obtain an education, Luther originally emphasized the importance of the home as the primary religious training ground.[42] In his view, parents had a duty to educate their children in basic Christian tenets. He argued that one of the worst sins for parents was to neglect educating their children, and he suggested that it might lead to eternal damnation.[43] However, when he wrote the *Catechisms*, Luther recognized that many parents were uneducated and not able to train effectively their own children. As Luther saw the results that came from a lack of education, he supported education funded by the government through taxes to be available to all children and indicated that a basic compulsory education for children would be the ideal.[44] His view that the government, rather than the church,

[39] T. L. Jarman, *Landmarks in the History of Education* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1952), 123, quoted in Reed and Prevost, *History of Christian Education*,159.

[40] Martin Luther, preface to *The Ordinance of a Common Chest* (*LW* 45:188, 189).

[41] Allan C. Ornstein, Daniel U. Levine, Gerald L. Gutek, and David E. Vocke, *Foundations of Education*, 11th ed. (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 2011), 85, 86.

[42] Strauss, *Luther's House of Learning*, 5; Jeffrey P. Greenman, "Luther's Catechisms," *Encyclopedia of Christian Education* 2:769, 770.

[43] Martin Luther, *A Sermon on Keeping Children in School* (*LW* 46:243).

[44] Ibid.

should organize education was due in part to his conflict with Catholic religious authorities and the support that he received from civil authorities.[45] In *To the Councilmen of All Cities in Germany That They Establish and Maintain Christian Schools*, Luther argued that if governments spent money on weapons and infrastructure, then they surely could spend an equal amount on the far more important task of educating its citizens.[46] Additionally, the rich and noble had a spiritual obligation to financially support impoverished children.[47] At that time, there was no separation between church and state; thus, public schools supported by the local government were focused on religious indoctrination, fulfilling Luther's ideal. Despite some resistance due to monetary concerns, the number of local schools grew substantially, and at least an elementary education and basic literacy became the norm.[48]

Luther's impact upon educational reform extended not only to who was educated, but it also changed what was studied. Luther's emphasis upon *sola scriptura* required a greater emphasis on the study of Greek and Hebrew instead of Latin, the dominant academic language at that time.[49] Melanchthon, a brilliant scholar and professor of Greek,[50] had a crucial influence in encouraging the study of biblical languages for clergy. In order to understand the Bible and develop a correct interpretation of it, Melanchthon believed the Bible should not be studied through a Latin translation that both Melanchthon and Luther recognized contained many translation errors.[51]

The humanist emphasis of *ad fontes*, or the need to return to the earliest possible source, meant a corresponding emphasis upon reading the Bible in the original languages.[52] In addition, the Bible should be translated from these original languages into the *lingua franca* of the people. To that end, Lu-

[45] Martin Luther, *On War against the Turks* (*LW* 46:187). This view is also expressed in Martin Luther, *To the Councilmen of All Cities in Germany That They Establish and Maintain Christian Schools* (*LW* 45).

[46] Martin Luther, *To the Councilmen*, 350.

[47] Ibid.

[48] Strauss, *Luther's House of Learning*, 200.

[49] Luther did not, however, argue that Latin should be removed from the curriculum, as it still remained a common language for scholars and government officials to communicate in, but rather that Greek and Hebrew be added to it.

[50] Hendrix, *Martin Luther: Visionary Reformer*, 75–77.

[51] González, *History of Theological Education*, 72.

[52] Rosin, "Humanism, Luther, and the Wittenberg Reformation," 96; McGrath, *Reformation Thought: An Introduction*, 35–58.

ther translated the Bible while in confinement in Wartburg Castle. In turn, education should also take place in the *lingua franca* so that all would have an opportunity to receive an education.[53] Influenced by humanists, such as Erasmus, Luther advocated for a broader curriculum that not only focused on the classical languages and the Bible but also included the liberal arts, in particular history, literature, rhetoric, moral philosophy, and mathematics.[54] The curriculum at the University of Wittenberg shifted under the guidance of Melanchthon to reflect this view. For clergy, education went from being recommended for clergy to being mandatory for ordination.[55]

Luther also advocated for changes in how students should be taught. From his own childhood and early educational experience, Luther cited three incidents of harsh punishment: a caning by his mother,[56] a whipping by his father,[57] and a caning at school. These experiences probably affected his views of discipline.[58] In this respect he was in good company with Erasmus and Augustine, who pondered if fear of punishment actually made people behave even worse.[59] In *To the Councilmen of All Cities in Germany That They Establish and Maintain Christian Schools,* Luther compared schools where students were beaten for not learning lessons as a "hell and purgatory" and contrasted them to schools where children can "study with pleasure and in play."[60] Furthermore, he also advised parents to "avoid all cruelty lest he shake the child's faith in him."[61] This is not to say that Luther did not believe in discipline, even corporal discipline, as he also extolled the virtues of teachers for disciplining their students.[62] Instead, Luther advocated a more humane view of discipline. Although not completely successful at changing the harsh punishment that had become engrained in society as a part of teaching, Luther sought to alter the system of discipline to a kinder

[53] Martin Luther, *To the Councilmen*, 347–378.

[54] Schulz, "Martin Luther's Influence," 388; González, *History of Theological Education*, 66–74; Rosin, "Humanism, Luther, and the Wittenberg Reformation," 91–104.

[55] González, *History of Theological Education*, 74.

[56] Martin Luther, *Table Talk*, *LW* 54:235.

[57] Ibid., 157.

[58] Roland Bainton, *Here I Stand: A Life of Martin Luther* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1950), 23.

[59] Strauss, *Luther's House of Learning*, 38.

[60] Luther, *To the Councilmen*, 369.

[61] Strauss, *Luther's House of Learning*, 37.

[62] Martin Luther, *Lectures on Galatians 1535, Chapters 1–4*, *LW* 26:417; Strauss, *Luther's House of Learning*, 180–182.

mation, "even the idea of mission" was absent.[4] Twentieth-century mission historians (including Kenneth S. Latourette, Stephen C. Neill, J. Herbert Kane, Ralph Winter, and Ruth Tucker) perpetuated this claim that the Reformers were indifferent to mission.

Yet, there is some evidence in Luther's writings that challenges this negative assumption about mission on the part of Luther and other Reformers. For instance, in his commentary on Zech 10:9, Luther describes what missiologists call the centrifugal force of mission (i.e., the scattering of missionaries among unbelievers):[5]

> They will be scattered among the nations ... they will be sent by God among the nations as preachers and thus draw many people to themselves and through themselves to Christ.... "They shall remember Me in far countries ... they shall preach and teach of Me, and thus they shall be increased and shall convert many others to Me."[6]

In Luther's metaphorical interpretation of Zech 12:6, he not only points to the global scope of mission but also to the power for its accomplishment: "The Christians shall also, through the Word, harvest much fruit among all the Gentiles and shall convert and save many.... The fire of the Holy Spirit ... shall devour the Gentiles ... and prepare a place everywhere for the Gospel and the kingdom of Christ."[7]

Luther also had a grasp of the integration of ministry (internal) and mission (external). In his explanation of the Lord's Prayer (1529), Luther writes,

> We pray ... *that all this may be realized in us* and that God's name may be praised through his holy Word and our Christian lives ... *that it may gain recognition and followers among other people and advance with power throughout the world.*
>
> God's kingdom comes to us ... through the Word and faith, and ... through the final revelation. Now, we pray for both of these, *that it may come to those who are not yet in it, and that it may come by daily growth here and in eternal life hereafter to us who have attained it.* All this is simply to say: "Dear Father, ... *give us thy Word, that the Gospel may be sincerely*

[4] Gustav Warneck, *Outline of a History of Protestant Mission from the Reformation to the Present Time*, ed. George Robson (New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1901), 8, 9.

[5] Ingemar Öberg, *Luther and World Mission: A Historical and Systematic Study*, trans. Dean Apel (St. Louis, MO: Concordia, 2007), 123.

[6] Martin Luther, *Lectures on the Minor Prophets 3: Zechariah*, vol. 20 of *Luther's Works*, ed. Hilton C. Oswald (St. Louis: Concordia, 1973), 305, 306, quoted in Öberg, *Luther and World Mission*, 123 (emphasis added).

[7] Luther, *Minor Prophets 3*, 20:326, quoted in Öberg, *Luther and World Mission*, 123.

were meant to ensure a basic knowledge of Christian beliefs for children and adults.[23] The *Small Catechism* proved incredibly popular at the time and remains popular among Lutherans.[24]

Luther and Melanchthon's education ideals were profoundly influenced by humanism as well as Protestant theology.[25] When Luther began his career at the University of Wittenberg, scholasticism was the predominant philosophy in education. Those educators who differed in their philosophy, such as humanists, were pressured to conform to scholasticism.[26] Early in his career, recognizing the deficiencies of scholasticism, Luther was attracted to humanism. Although how he initially became interested in humanism is unknown,[27] it is clear that he appreciated the worth of the writings of humanist Faber Stapulensis and Erasmus's *New Testament*.[28] Although Luther never became a true humanist himself[29] (he adopted parts of humanism that resonated with his worldview and rejected the rest), his humanist philosophy, along with his biblical worldview, impacted his views. Protestant and Adventist educational practices were influenced by Luther's views, especially in regard to theological training.

One way humanism shaped Luther's view of education was in the area of teaching methods, particularly for children. As revealed by the *Catechisms*, Luther believed that education must be more than rote memorization. Instead, he advocated that all church members should think deeply and understand their beliefs.[30] Furthermore, education should awaken an interest in learning.[31] As a consequence, his *Small Catechism* was written in a question-and-answer format[32] that made it easy for children to remember and to reflect questions children might ask. His catechisms were written in

23 Emmert, "Luther's Small Catechism," 2:770, 771.

24 Schulz, "Martin Luther's Influence," 388.

25 Alister E. McGrath, *Reformation Thought: An Introduction*, 4th ed. (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), 56.

26 Robert Rosin, "Humanism, Luther, and the Wittenberg Reformation," in *The Oxford Handbook of Martin Luther's Theology*, 93, 94.

27 Ibid., 96.

28 Ibid., 99.

29 Ibid., 101; McGrath, *Reformation Thought*, 54, 55.

30 Gerald Strauss, *Luther's House of Learning: Indoctrination of the Young in the German Reformation* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978), 5.

31 Schulz, "Martin Luther's Influence," 388.

32 Emmert, "Luther's Small Catechism," 2:770, 771.

German rather than Latin in order to be as widely read and understood as possible.[33] Additionally, he concurred with humanists that education should be presented to children in small components that they could easily be grasped and built upon.[34] Teaching methods should be adapted to the age and abilities of the students. In fact, education should be made enjoyable for children to learn and not be harsh and demanding. Most of these pedagogical methods now seem logical, but at the time, these were radical ideas and not embraced by the majority of society except for a few humanists, like Erasmus.[35]

Luther and the Reformation also changed the focus as to *who* should be taught. Luther's belief in the priesthood of all believers had significant implications for who was to be educated. During the medieval period, boys intended for the priesthood and government positions[36] or who came from wealthy families were educated. Boys from lower classes or not intended for careers that required the ability to read were not generally educated. Luther argued that every child with the ability to do so should have at least a basic education in order to be able to read the Bible.[37] In "A Sermon on Keeping Children in School," Luther urged parents to educate their children, even if in the end they worked in a career that did not require education, as it would prepare them for service to God and enable them to explain their beliefs.

More radically, Luther also pushed for girls to receive an education. Girls were not generally viewed as worthy of an education.[38] Only girls from a few rich and/or noble families could afford to hire a tutor for their daughters. Like monks, nuns, who generally also came from wealthy families, were, according to their charters, to be educated. Of course, as with monks, education was the ideal and not necessarily the norm. One Italian proverb is representative of the predominant attitude about female educa-

[33] McGrath, *Reformation Thought*, 245.

[34] Strauss, *Luther's House of Learning*, 5; Schulz, "Martin Luther's Influence," 388.

[35] González, *History of Theological Education*, 66-68.

[36] Luther's father, a pious miner and owner of foundries, wanted Luther to become a lawyer.

[37] Jeff Mallinson, "Lutheran Church Christian Education," *Encyclopedia of Christian Education* 2:768, 769.

[38] Although nuns were supposed to be taught to read and write, evidence indicates that this was unevenly applied.

tion. It states, "'A girl should be taught to sew and not to read, unless one wishes to make a nun of her.'"[39]

If, as Luther contended, all Christians were priests, then all Christians from across all social classes, and including both boys and girls, must be able to read in order to understand the Bible. Although Luther still viewed wives as subordinate to their husbands, he recognized the importance of both fathers and mothers in the educating of their children. To this end, Luther encouraged each parish to establish a school for boys and another for girls and to provide a female teacher financially supported by the parish.[40]

After centuries of neglecting female education, Luther's emphasis on education for both genders did not bring immediate results. Nevertheless, between the efforts of the Reformation, as well as the Catholic Counter-Reformation, there was an increase in female literacy. In England, a study shows, female literacy rose from 2 percent just prior to the Reformation in 1500 to 9 percent by 1600 after the Reformation and expanded to 32 percent by 1700. The literacy rate also increased among men from 10 percent in 1500 to almost 40 percent by 1700. Thus, the Reformation encouraged widespread education, particularly in northern Europe where Protestantism was dominant, in contrast to southern Europe where Catholicism remained dominant.[41]

In order to obtain an education, Luther originally emphasized the importance of the home as the primary religious training ground.[42] In his view, parents had a duty to educate their children in basic Christian tenets. He argued that one of the worst sins for parents was to neglect educating their children, and he suggested that it might lead to eternal damnation.[43] However, when he wrote the *Catechisms*, Luther recognized that many parents were uneducated and not able to train effectively their own children. As Luther saw the results that came from a lack of education, he supported education funded by the government through taxes to be available to all children and indicated that a basic compulsory education for children would be the ideal.[44] His view that the government, rather than the church,

[39] T. L. Jarman, *Landmarks in the History of Education* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1952), 123, quoted in Reed and Prevost, *History of Christian Education*,159.

[40] Martin Luther, preface to *The Ordinance of a Common Chest* (*LW* 45:188, 189).

[41] Allan C. Ornstein, Daniel U. Levine, Gerald L. Gutek, and David E. Vocke, *Foundations of Education*, 11th ed. (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 2011), 85, 86.

[42] Strauss, *Luther's House of Learning*, 5; Jeffrey P. Greenman, "Luther's Catechisms," *Encyclopedia of Christian Education* 2:769, 770.

[43] Martin Luther, *A Sermon on Keeping Children in School* (*LW* 46:243).

[44] Ibid.

should organize education was due in part to his conflict with Catholic religious authorities and the support that he received from civil authorities.[45] In *To the Councilmen of All Cities in Germany That They Establish and Maintain Christian Schools*, Luther argued that if governments spent money on weapons and infrastructure, then they surely could spend an equal amount on the far more important task of educating its citizens.[46] Additionally, the rich and noble had a spiritual obligation to financially support impoverished children.[47] At that time, there was no separation between church and state; thus, public schools supported by the local government were focused on religious indoctrination, fulfilling Luther's ideal. Despite some resistance due to monetary concerns, the number of local schools grew substantially, and at least an elementary education and basic literacy became the norm.[48]

Luther's impact upon educational reform extended not only to who was educated, but it also changed what was studied. Luther's emphasis upon *sola scriptura* required a greater emphasis on the study of Greek and Hebrew instead of Latin, the dominant academic language at that time.[49] Melanchthon, a brilliant scholar and professor of Greek,[50] had a crucial influence in encouraging the study of biblical languages for clergy. In order to understand the Bible and develop a correct interpretation of it, Melanchthon believed the Bible should not be studied through a Latin translation that both Melanchthon and Luther recognized contained many translation errors.[51]

The humanist emphasis of *ad fontes*, or the need to return to the earliest possible source, meant a corresponding emphasis upon reading the Bible in the original languages.[52] In addition, the Bible should be translated from these original languages into the *lingua franca* of the people. To that end, Lu-

[45] Martin Luther, *On War against the Turks* (*LW* 46:187). This view is also expressed in Martin Luther, *To the Councilmen of All Cities in Germany That They Establish and Maintain Christian Schools* (*LW* 45).

[46] Martin Luther, *To the Councilmen*, 350.

[47] Ibid.

[48] Strauss, *Luther's House of Learning*, 200.

[49] Luther did not, however, argue that Latin should be removed from the curriculum, as it still remained a common language for scholars and government officials to communicate in, but rather that Greek and Hebrew be added to it.

[50] Hendrix, *Martin Luther: Visionary Reformer*, 75–77.

[51] González, *History of Theological Education*, 72.

[52] Rosin, "Humanism, Luther, and the Wittenberg Reformation," 96; McGrath, *Reformation Thought: An Introduction*, 35–58.

ther translated the Bible while in confinement in Wartburg Castle. In turn, education should also take place in the *lingua franca* so that all would have an opportunity to receive an education.[53] Influenced by humanists, such as Erasmus, Luther advocated for a broader curriculum that not only focused on the classical languages and the Bible but also included the liberal arts, in particular history, literature, rhetoric, moral philosophy, and mathematics.[54] The curriculum at the University of Wittenberg shifted under the guidance of Melanchthon to reflect this view. For clergy, education went from being recommended for clergy to being mandatory for ordination.[55]

Luther also advocated for changes in how students should be taught. From his own childhood and early educational experience, Luther cited three incidents of harsh punishment: a caning by his mother,[56] a whipping by his father,[57] and a caning at school. These experiences probably affected his views of discipline.[58] In this respect he was in good company with Erasmus and Augustine, who pondered if fear of punishment actually made people behave even worse.[59] In *To the Councilmen of All Cities in Germany That They Establish and Maintain Christian Schools,* Luther compared schools where students were beaten for not learning lessons as a "hell and purgatory" and contrasted them to schools where children can "study with pleasure and in play."[60] Furthermore, he also advised parents to "avoid all cruelty lest he shake the child's faith in him."[61] This is not to say that Luther did not believe in discipline, even corporal discipline, as he also extolled the virtues of teachers for disciplining their students.[62] Instead, Luther advocated a more humane view of discipline. Although not completely successful at changing the harsh punishment that had become engrained in society as a part of teaching, Luther sought to alter the system of discipline to a kinder

[53] Martin Luther, *To the Councilmen*, 347–378.

[54] Schulz, "Martin Luther's Influence," 388; González, *History of Theological Education*, 66–74; Rosin, "Humanism, Luther, and the Wittenberg Reformation," 91–104.

[55] González, *History of Theological Education*, 74.

[56] Martin Luther, *Table Talk*, *LW* 54:235.

[57] Ibid., 157.

[58] Roland Bainton, *Here I Stand: A Life of Martin Luther* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1950), 23.

[59] Strauss, *Luther's House of Learning*, 38.

[60] Luther, *To the Councilmen*, 369.

[61] Strauss, *Luther's House of Learning*, 37.

[62] Martin Luther, *Lectures on Galatians 1535, Chapters 1–4*, *LW* 26:417; Strauss, *Luther's House of Learning*, 180–182.

and gentler system "in such a way that the rod is accompanied by the apple" and "all children are to be treated with equal love."[63]

3. Legacy for Adventist Education

Most Adventist schools, whether they recognize it or not, are the beneficiaries of the Reformation and its emphasis upon education. A glance at the theology program of most Adventist universities reveals Luther's influence upon them. The fact that most theology students are required to master the basics of Greek and Hebrew are some of the obvious evidences of Luther's educational legacy.

Adventist education was one of the last major organizational developments in the Seventh-day Adventist Church.[64] Initial attempts to develop an Adventist educational system resulted in modeling conventional forms of the day, particularly a focus on rote memorization and the study of the Latin classics. A major revolution occurred during the 1890s, particularly with the 1892 Harbor Springs Convention, when a broad philosophy of Adventist education was articulated that included the removal of Latin classics and making the Bible the center of the curriculum.[65] Adventists readily embraced and adapted the Sunday School movement, that became a vigorous Sabbath School, as another avenue of providing religious instruction for children.[66]

In many ways, Adventist education is the continuation of educational initiatives made by Martin Luther and other Reformers, particularly Melanchthon. Ellen G. White, who articulated as early as 1872 her views about education eventually paved the way for an Adventist system that resonated closely with Luther on educational issues.[67] Like Luther, she argued that

[63] Luther, *Table Talk*, 235.

[64] For a survey of the history of Adventist education, see Floyd L. Greenleaf, *In Passion for the World: A History of Seventh-day Adventist Education* (Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 2005).

[65] George R. Knight, "Harbor Springs, Michigan," *The Ellen G. White Encyclopedia*, 2nd ed., ed. Denis Fortin and Jerry Moon (Hagerstown, MD: Review & Herald, 2014), 856.

[66] "Sabbath School," in *The Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia*, rev. ed., Seventh-day Adventist Commentary Reference Series (Hagerstown, MD: Review & Herald, 1996), 2:508–510.

[67] Her original 1872 statement can be found in Ellen G. White, *Testimonies for the Church* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1948), 3:131–160. For a concise overview, see Her-

education was not merely for pecuniary gain or work skills or even academic knowledge, but its primary focus should be spiritual instruction and knowledge of God.[68] Although Ellen White's support led to the creation of the Adventist educational system, she, too, saw the home as the foundation of spiritual education.[69]

Pedagogically, Ellen White's views also closely matched Luther's. She viewed education as more than mere rote memorization in that "the work of true education" is "to train the youth to be thinkers, and not mere reflectors of other men's thoughts."[70] Discipline, she argued, should be strict but redemptive and not harsh.[71] Furthermore, students needed to have adequate resources in order to study. Every Adventist school and even the attached libraries owe their existence in part to Luther who greatly supported libraries.[72]

4. Conclusion

Martin Luther would see much in common with the Seventh-day Adventist system and philosophy of education. Adventist education is primarily religious education with an emphasis in the liberal arts and study of original sources, especially the Bible. Adventists support the belief of the priesthood of all believers and that means that all children deserve an education that begins on this earth, focuses on the development of character, and ultimately leads to a better understanding of the Bible and a personal relationship with Jesus Christ. The Reformation left a legacy that endures today through Seventh-day Adventist education.

bert E. Douglass, "Education, Ellen G. White's Role in Adventist," in *The Ellen G. White Encyclopedia*, 794-796.

[68] Ellen G. White, *Education* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1952), 13.

[69] Ibid., 275–286.

[70] Ibid., 17.

[71] Ibid., 287–297.

[72] Luther regarded libraries so essential to good education that he devotes a major portion of his *To the Councilmen* in how to properly set up libraries. See also Mallinson, "Lutheran Church Christian Education," 2:768, 769; Luther, *To the Councilmen*, 373-377.

Journal of Asia Adventist Seminary 18.1–2 (2015): 51–58

MISSIOLOGICAL LESSONS FROM MARTIN LUTHER: AN ADVENTIST PERSPECTIVE

ABNER P. DIZON
Adventist International Institute of Advanced Studies, PHILIPPINES

The fact that Martin Luther positively altered the course of Western history resulted in both 32 years of active ministry as well as the German translation of the Bible, hymn writing, and volumes of sermons and theological treatises. His influence is truly far-reaching. Luther is no stranger for Seventh-day Adventists. Ellen White, in her book *The Great Controversy*, introduced Luther as "foremost among those who were called to lead the church from the darkness of popery into the light of a purer faith."[1] For Adventists who view themselves as "heirs of the great truths"[2] of the Reformation, the question remains: does Luther have anything to offer Adventists about world mission?

1. The Debate About Luther's Missiology

Missions does not usually come to mind when discussing the Protestant Reformation. The literature on sixteenth-century Protestant missions points out that, except for the Anabaptists, there is little missionary vision or missionary spirit evident during the Reformation.[3] Among the first to promote this notion was Gustav Warneck, the father of missiology. For him, not only was there no missionary action in the age of the Refor-

1 Ellen G. White, *The Great Controversy* (Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 2009), 111.

2 Peter M. van Bemmelen, "Justification by Faith: An Adventist Understanding," *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 20.1-2 (2009): 177.

3 Glenn S. Sunshine, "Protestant Missions in the Sixteenth Century," in *The Great Commission: Evangelicals and the History of World Missions*, ed. Martin I. Klauber, Scott M. Manetsch, and Erwin W. Lutzer (Nashville, TN: B&H, 2008), 12.

mation, "even the idea of mission" was absent.[4] Twentieth-century mission historians (including Kenneth S. Latourette, Stephen C. Neill, J. Herbert Kane, Ralph Winter, and Ruth Tucker) perpetuated this claim that the Reformers were indifferent to mission.

Yet, there is some evidence in Luther's writings that challenges this negative assumption about mission on the part of Luther and other Reformers. For instance, in his commentary on Zech 10:9, Luther describes what missiologists call the centrifugal force of mission (i.e., the scattering of missionaries among unbelievers):[5]

> They will be scattered among the nations ... they will be sent by God among the nations as preachers and thus draw many people to themselves and through themselves to Christ.... "They shall remember Me in far countries ... they shall preach and teach of Me, and thus they shall be increased and shall convert many others to Me."[6]

In Luther's metaphorical interpretation of Zech 12:6, he not only points to the global scope of mission but also to the power for its accomplishment: "The Christians shall also, through the Word, harvest much fruit among all the Gentiles and shall convert and save many.... The fire of the Holy Spirit ... shall devour the Gentiles ... and prepare a place everywhere for the Gospel and the kingdom of Christ."[7]

Luther also had a grasp of the integration of ministry (internal) and mission (external). In his explanation of the Lord's Prayer (1529), Luther writes,

> We pray ... *that all this may be realized in us* and that God's name may be praised through his holy Word and our Christian lives ... *that it may gain recognition and followers among other people and advance with power throughout the world.*
>
> God's kingdom comes to us ... through the Word and faith, and ... through the final revelation. Now, we pray for both of these, *that it may come to those who are not yet in it, and that it may come by daily growth here and in eternal life hereafter to us who have attained it.* All this is simply to say: "Dear Father, ... *give us thy Word, that the Gospel may be sincerely*

[4] Gustav Warneck, *Outline of a History of Protestant Mission from the Reformation to the Present Time*, ed. George Robson (New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1901), 8, 9.

[5] Ingemar Öberg, *Luther and World Mission: A Historical and Systematic Study*, trans. Dean Apel (St. Louis, MO: Concordia, 2007), 123.

[6] Martin Luther, *Lectures on the Minor Prophets 3: Zechariah*, vol. 20 of *Luther's Works*, ed. Hilton C. Oswald (St. Louis: Concordia, 1973), 305, 306, quoted in Öberg, *Luther and World Mission*, 123 (emphasis added).

[7] Luther, *Minor Prophets 3*, 20:326, quoted in Öberg, *Luther and World Mission*, 123.

preached throughout the world and that it may be received by faith and may work and live in us."[8]

Another evidence of Luther's missional vision is his recognition and attempt to interact with the Jews and the Muslim Turks. To reach the Jews, Luther published his book *That Christ Was Born a Jew* (1523). Luther did not believe in crusades against Muslims; instead, he suggested that evangelists were sent to reach them. Luther studied Islam and wrote apologetic tracts for Muslim Turks. He also encouraged the study of the Koran.[9]

Such evidence suggests that Luther recognized the missionary mandate of the church. So why do many scholars believe that Luther was not involved in mission?

2. A Definition of Mission

Scholars overlook the missional motif in Luther's writings because of a difference in defining the terms *mission, missionary,* and *mission field.* These words were not used during the time of the Reformation. The words *mission* and *missionary* were first used in English literature in 1598 and 1644 in describing the work of the Jesuits.[10] The terms *world mission* and *mission* only became familiar in Protestant literature two centuries after Luther's death.[11] Apparently, Gustav Warneck and his successors were imposing late eighteenth-century terms on Luther and the other reformers. As Michael Parsons observes, Luther is judged "guilty" for not following a definition of mission that did not exist during his lifetime.[12] Foreign missionary activity did not have a tangible form among Protestants in the sixteenth century—even among the Anabaptists.[13] The intention of mission historians to raise awareness about the importance and urgency of foreign missions is com-

[8] Öberg, *Luther and World Mission,* 132 (emphasis added).

[9] Ibid., 495-496.

[10] Elias Medeiros, "The Reformers and 'Missions': Warneck, Latourette, Neill, Kane, Winter, and Tucker's Arguments—Part 1," *Fides Reformata* 18.1 (2013): 121.

[11] Pekka Huhtinen, "Luther and World Mission: A Review," *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 65.1 (2001): 17.

[12] Michael Parsons, ed., *Text and Task: Scripture and Mission* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2006), 66.

[13] Sunshine, "Protestant Missions," 12 (emphasis added).

mendable.[14] However, as David J. Bosch notes, "Mission ... should never be incarcerated in the narrow confines of our own predilections."[15]

Warneck advocated that *missions* should only be understood as the sending of missionaries to non-Christian nations. However, that view is no longer how *missions* is defined today. In fact, there is a consensus among missiologists that *missions* should be understood widely or holistically. Missiologists no longer see *missions* as the activity of the Church "overseas." Instead, they recognize that the frontiers of mission are not only geographical. They can also be religious, ethnic, or cultural boundaries.

The understanding of mission has radically changed over the past century.[16] The earliest change had to do with distinguishing between *mission* (singular) and *missions* (plural). Before the mid-1900s there was no distinction between the two. Contemporary missiologists now describe *mission* as *missio Dei*. This Latin phrase refers to God's purposes and activities in and for the entire universe.[17] The central idea of *missio Dei* is that "God is the One who initiates and sustains mission. At most, then, the church is God's partner in what is God's agenda ... mission is God-centered rather than human-centered, but without neglecting the important role that God has assigned to the church in that process."[18]

Gailyn van Rheenen further defines mission as "the work of God in reconciling sinful humankind to himself."[19] *Mission* is not limited to the activities of the church because God has been actively ministering to the world. God initiated His mission through patriarchs, prophets, priests, and judges in OT times. In the NT, He reached out to the world through Jesus Christ and His disciples. Today, God continues His mission through the church. *Mission* refers to what the church is mandated to do—starting right where the church is located. Another definition of mission is "the task, obligation

[14] A. Chadwick Mauldin, *Fullerism as Opposed to Calvinism: A Historical and Theological Comparison of the Missiology of Andrew Fuller and John Calvin* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2011), 35.

[15] David J. Bosch, *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission*, 20th anniversary ed. (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2011), 9.

[16] A. Scott Moreau, Gary R. Corwin, and Gary B. McGee, "Missions in the Modern World," in *Introducing World Mission: A Biblical, Historical and Practical Survey*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2013), 17.

[17] J. Andrew Kirk, *What Is Mission? Theological Explorations* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2000), 25.

[18] Moreau, Corwin, and McGee, "Missions in the Modern World," 18.

[19] Gailyn van Rheenen, *Missions: Biblical Foundations and Contemporary Strategies* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996), 20.

or commission, adopted by the Church to spread the Christian faith throughout the world."[20]

The idea of *missions* (plural) refers to activities in which the church participates in the *missio Dei*.[21] It also refers to the plans of committed Christians to accomplish God's mission.[22] *Missions* is anchored in the mission of God and it is the implementation of the mission of God. With this corrective lens, we may now look at missiological lessons from Luther's thought and practice.

3. Missiological Lessons for Adventist Mission

At least seven lessons can be learned from the Reformation for the Seventh-day Adventist Church today.

First, mission must be God-centered. Luther articulates three concepts as the starting point for mission: *missio Dei* (God's mission), *missio Christi* (Christ's mission), and *missio ecclesiae* (the church's mission). He believed that the church and mission are all ultimately *missio Dei*.

As Ruthven Roy points out, Adventists must remember that Adventist mission is "God's enterprise from beginning to end."[23] It does not belong to the Adventist denomination—it is God's mission. Adventists simply recognize and seek opportunities to participate in it. Adventists must not let human pride get in the way as if mission is about our plans and accomplishments. The success of mission does not merely depend on us nor is mission about statistics or missiometrics. Indeed, the "field is the world" (Matt 13:38)[24] and we are "God's fellow workers" (1 Cor 3:9), but God is "the Lord of the Harvest"—not us (Matt 9:38). It is He who "will finish the work, and cut it short in righteousness" (Rom 9:28, KJV).

Second, Adventists must understand their mission. Luther knew that his movement was a missionary movement.[25] He understood his mission but

[20] David B. Barrett, George T. Kurian, and Todd M. Johnson, *World Christian Encyclopedia: A Comparative Survey of Churches and Religions in the Modern World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 1:29.

[21] Bosch, *Transforming Mission*, 10.

[22] Van Rheenen, *Missions*, 20.

[23] Ruthven Roy, A *Challenge to the Remnant: Designing Our Mission Strategy to Impact the Real World* (Frederick, MD: Network Discipling Ministries Books, 2002), 19.

[24] Unless otherwise noted, all Scripture references in this article are from the ESV.

[25] Parsons, *Text and Task*, 66.

not in the definition of nineteenth-century-mission historians. His mission was to re-Christianize Europe—a continent that, during his time, was no longer authentically Christian. Once Luther understood his lifelong mission, he never let go of it. Adventists believe they are a movement called out for a specific purpose. Adventist biblical scholar Jiří Moskala observes, "There is no election without a commission" because "God's call presupposes a call for action."[26] Adventists must understand what mission is because their answers to the many challenges of contemporary mission—such as the new forms of missions and strategies—depend on their understanding of their mission.[27]

Third, Adventists must understand their message. Despite his criticisms, Warneck admits that the reformers helped the cause of missions by restoring the Gospel message. Indeed, mission is incomplete without the proclamation of that message. Luther understood his mission and he also understood his message. His theology, with its emphasis on God's redemptive purpose, was ideally suited for mission. Adventists may differ from Luther on some doctrines, but one thing they have in common with him is the doctrine of justification by faith. The Adventist Church must proclaim that message. As Eric Webster observes, "Justification by faith is not a preamble to the third angel's message; it is not introductory or preparatory; it is the very heart and core of the [Adventist] message."[28] Understanding and proclaiming that message is crucial. Russell Burrill thus contends, "Adventists must not preach a new gospel. If we are to fulfil Revelation 14:6-12, then we must preach the eternal gospel of salvation by grace alone. We may do it in the setting of Christ's soon return, but we must not, dare not, add anything as the basis of salvation, which is faith in Christ alone."[29]

Fourth, theology must lead to mission. One valid criticism against the reformers was that they did not engage in foreign missions. This lack of overseas missions is due to the many obstacles they faced.[30] The first obstacle is that most foreign countries were then under Roman Catholic monarchies. The second obstacle has to do with the reformers rejecting monasticism without developing their own missionary-sending structure.

[26] Jiří Moskala, "The Mission of God's People in the Old Testament," *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 19.1–2 (2008): 40.

[27] Gottfried Oosterwal, *Mission: Possible; The Challenge of Mission Today* (Nashville, TN: Southern Publishing Association, 1975), 12.

[28] Eric Webster, "The Third Angel's Message in Verity," *Ministry* 53.8 (1980): 4.

[29] Russell Burrill, *Radical Disciples for Revolutionary Churches* (Fallbrook, CA: Hart Research Center, 1996), 92.

[30] Bosch, *Transforming Mission*, 250.

The third obstacle may be attributed to the fact that the churches of the Reformation were under siege and struggling just to survive. However, the most difficult obstacle was the internal conflicts that drained their energy and unintentionally impeded missionary outreach.[31] Because of the endless theological disputes and dissensions, the reformers had little energy left to turn to those outside the Christian fold.[32] They were too busy debating the "what is" and they lost sight of the "so what." As Gordon Doss points out, "What good is excellent theology if it does not produce strong mission?"[33] The Adventist Church must not allow issues to result in energy-draining disputes. Instead, Adventists must develop a commitment to the mission of God among non-Christian peoples that goes beyond mere intellectual assent to impact their time, influence, and resources.

Fifth, eschatology must fuel Adventist mission. Contrary to what some scholars suggest, Luther's eschatology did not hinder his missiology.[34] In the same way, Adventist eschatology is crucially linked to the missionary work of the church. At its core, Adventist theology is missional and belief in the parousia should be a major motive for Adventist mission. As Rick McEdward suggests, missions should be "eschatology with feet."[35] Adventist eschatology should increase our motivation for mission because while Revelation shows a beast that has authority over every tribe, people, language, and nation, it also depicts the redemption of "a great multitude that no one could number, from *every nation, from all tribes and peoples* and *languages*" (Rev 7:9, emphasis mine).

Sixth, Adventist message and mission must be relevant. God's mission is the same throughout earth's history. The mission task, however, depends on the time and place where churches and individuals live. Luther discerned his time, and he had a vision of the response required.[36] Understanding the context of his message and mission, he went about his task with zeal, planted a new faith, and denounced the obstacles that stood in his way. The Adventist message and mission must be contextualized to be relevant. Gottfried Oosterwal observes, "Each generation of believers .... must reassess

[31] Abraham Kovacs, "Protestant Churches," in *Encyclopedia of Missions and Missionaries*, ed. Jonathan Bonk (New York: Routledge, 2007), 356.

[32] Bosch, *Transforming Mission*, 250.

[33] Gorden Doss, "Viewpoint: Reforming Christians or Converting Non-Christians?" *Journal of Adventist Mission Studies* 6.2 (2010): 111.

[34] Bosch, *Transforming Mission*, 246.

[35] Rick McEdward, "Adventist Mission Theology: Developing a Biblical Foundation," *Journal of Adventist Mission Studies* 7.1 (2011): 75.

[36] Parsons, *Text and Task*, 67.

the task of presenting Christ to the world so that it can fulfil its mission in its own particular way."[37] Hence, Jon L. Dybdahl suggests that theologians "learn to read not only historic theology but also their Bibles and their society and then take steps to create out of their matrix a theology that allows Jesus to be seen and understood clearly in their setting."[38] Ellen White similarly notes, "There was a present truth in the days of Luther,—a truth at that time of special importance; there is a present truth for the church today."[39] We must understand the time and be seized by the urgency to accomplish our God-given task.

Seventh, every member must embrace Adventist mission. Luther believed that every believer is an evangelist who should teach the gospel to others.[40] Luther taught that the function of the priesthood, which includes the proclamation of the gospel and concern for the salvation of others, belongs to every Christian.[41] The danger is that churches buy into a "consumer" church model whereby pastors become performers or providers of a certain kind of service, while the people of God (the *laos*), as customers, sit back to be served.[42] It is essential that the Adventist Church fully implements a sound theology of the priesthood of all believers so that every member will become involved in mission.[43] As Oosterwal points out, such a "rediscovery of the Biblical role of the laity is essential ... to the finishing of God's mission on earth."[44]

[37] Oosterwal, *Mission*, 15.

[38] Jon L. Dybdahl, "Adventist Responses to Mission Challenges Through Theology and Contextualization," *Journal of Adventist Mission Studies* 5.2 (2009): 31.

[39] White, *The Great Controversy*, 143.

[40] Information is taken from Luther's exposition on the "herald of good tidings" (Isa 40:9). Martin Luther, *Lectures on Isaiah Chapters 40–60*, vol. 17 of *Luther's Works*, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan (St. Louis, MO: Concordia, 1972), 13-14, quoted in Parsons, *Text and Task*, 74. All believers "have the right and duty to confess, to teach, and to spread God's Word." Martin Luther, *Lectures on Galatians 1535 Chapters 5–6*, vol. 27 of *Luther's Works*, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan (St. Louis, MO: Concordia, 1964), 394.

[41] Parsons, *Text and Task*, 75.

[42] Monte Sahlin, foreword to *Revolution in the Church*, by Russell Burrill (Fallbrook, CA: Hart Research Center, 1993), v.

[43] Daniel Kewley and Sven Ostring, "Can Church Planting Movements Emerge in the West? Case Studies of Three Church Planting Strategies in Western Australia," *Journal of Adventist Mission Studies* 8.1 (2012): 29.

[44] Oosterwal, *Mission*, 13.

Journal of Asia Adventist Seminary 18.1–2 (2015): 59–69

Islam in Luther and Seventh-day Adventism

Nikolaus Satelmajer
General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, USA

Europe faced many challenges in the 1500s. Martin Luther was a major headache to the Holy Roman Empire, specifically to Emperor Charles V and the papacy. Luther and his followers refused to submit to the emperor and the pope but continued to spread their message. Yet, there was a challenge faced by all—the emperor, pope, Luther, and, in fact, all of Europe—and there was no agreement on what to do. This challenge was the ongoing aggression from the Ottoman Empire.

The Ottoman Empire—Turks[1] as Luther refers to them—threatened the very existence of Europe. For Luther, it was not only an issue of invasion by another empire, it was the fact that another faith—Islam—challenged Europe and Christianity. Luther, as on many other topics, had much to say and said it in his characteristic strong language.

We will explore Luther's response to Islam and then look at the Seventh-day Adventist response to it. Furthermore, how have Adventists tried to fulfill their mission to bring their message to the whole world, including Islam? What are the lessons to be learned?

1. Europe under Siege

In the 1300s, Europe lost many to the Black Death and its consequences impacted the continent for many years. On the other hand, there were positive events in the next century. For example, Johannes Gutenberg, around 1440, developed the moveable printing press. The printing press was a major and lasting innovation. Several years after the Gutenberg

[1] It is difficult to be consistent in the use of the terms Ottoman, Turk, and Islam. Luther usually referred to them as Turks and for him their faith was Islam. Even today, in some parts of Europe, the word *Turk* is used for Muslims, even though these individuals are not Turks.

event, Constantinople, the capital of the Byzantium Empire, fell in 1453 to the Ottoman Turks. By 1463, Bosnia[2] was conquered and Hercegovina fell in 1482.[3]

While Luther was at the imperial Diet at Worms in April 1521, Ottoman ruler Süleyman I (r. 1520–1566), also known as Süleyman the Magnificent, marched westward and, by August 1521, had taken Belgrade. That conquest exposed Vojvodina, Hungary, Slavonia, and Croatia to the Turks. Süleyman focused on the rest of Europe and in 1526, at the Battle of Mohacs, killed King Louis II of Hungary. Only three years later, in September and October 1529, Süleyman went even further west and attacked Vienna, Austria.[4] The Holy Roman emperor, Charles V (r. 1519–1556), the pope, and Francis I of France (r. 1515–1547) were busy fighting each other. Ferdinand I (r. 1558–1564), brother of Charles V, held Vienna against the Turks[5]; otherwise, Vienna would have been lost.

How serious were these Ottoman incursions into Europe and its political and religious situation? Ahmed Essa (with Otham Ali) attempts to minimize the scope of these invasions: "After Spain and Sicily, the Muslims made no further efforts at major conquests and expansion. This is important when judging the ensuing events involving the Muslims in Europe and the distorted views of their history."[6]

The same writers maintain that the Europeans benefitted from these invasions: "History is full ironies. The European Christians, who most wanted to destroy Islam and the Muslim world, were the same people who benefited most from the achievements of Islamic civilization."[7]

[2] The conquest was complete even though Bosnia is rather mountainous and has numerous secluded villages. During a lecture tour in Bosnia in the fall of 2016, my wife, Ruth I. Satelmajer, and I toured some of these secluded villages that were supposedly the last ones to be conquered. The villages are located near Konjic, a small city between Mostar and Sarajevo. Some of these villages are only accessible via small one-lane mountain roads.

[3] Today, both areas are part of Bosnia and Herzegovina with about 50 percent Muslims, 30 percent Serbs, and about 15 percent Croats. http://www.worldatlas.com /articles/largest-ethnic-groups-of-bosnia-and-herzegovina.html.

[4] http://www.newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/Siege_of_Vienna.

[5] Paula Sutter Fichter, *Emperor Maximilian II* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2001), 2.

[6] Ahmed Essa and Othman Ali, *Studies in Islamic Civilization: The Muslim Contribution to the Renaissance* (Herndon, VA: The International Institute of Islam Thought, 2010), 37.

[7] Essa and Ali, *Studies in Islamic Civilization*, 243.

Although it is outside the scope of this chapter to ascertain whether and how European Christians benefited from Islamic civilization, at least some of the invaders saw their mission as something other than spreading Islamic civilization or sharing their culture with the Europeans. At the University of Oxford's Ashmolean Museum, the following description, found on a talismanic shirt, shows the Ottomans were prepared for war:

> In an often-quoted letter written in the 1530s Hürrem Sultan urged her husband, the Ottoman Sultan Süleyman [r. 1520-66], to wear the shirt she had dispatched to the battlefield as it would "turn aside bullets" and protect him from death. Fabricated by a holy man inspired by a vision of the Prophet Muhammad himself, this powerful garment was explicitly intended to be worn in the cause of Islam, deriving its efficacy from the sacred names that decorated it.[8]

Another source implies the Ottoman invasions of Europe were joint operations between Muslims and Christians. The title of the book, *Two Faiths, One Banner: When Muslims Marched with Christians across Europe's Battlegrounds*,[9] argues that the Ottoman military forays were joint operations between Muslims and Christians. The author Ian Almond, states,

> The whole point of this chapter will be to dismantle some of the myths concerning the Turkish march on Vienna, especially the manner in which it is enrolled into some form of East-West conflict between Christian Europe and a Muslim Orient—an interpretation which is, in the end, nothing more than a Disney version of history .... Thousands of Greeks, Armenians and Slavs in the Ottomans' own armies who loyally fought for the sultan to the Transylvanian Protestants and disaffected peasants who, tired of the Habsburg's yoke (or their own Hungarian aristocracy) moved over to the Turkish side.[10]

Like most wars, armies pick up mercenaries and others, who may, at times, even fight against their own country. That, however, does not adequately explain Almond's point that these military actions were joint operations. Croatian historian, Rudolf Horvat, points out that the Ottomans took back with them many prisoners. According to Horvat, in 1532 the sultan took fifty thousand Croats to Turkey and a few years later another sixty thousand prisoners from Slavonia (the region east of Zagreb and

[8] Francesca Leoni and Christiane Gruber, *Power and Protection: Islamic Art and the Supernatural* (Oxford: Ashmolean Museum, 2016), 58.

[9] Ian Almond, *Two Faiths, One Banner: When Muslims Marched with Christians across Europe's Battlegrounds* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009).

[10] Ibid., 140.

north of Bosnia).[11] Often, the prisoners were youth who were trained as soldiers for the Ottoman Empire and some became part of future invading armies.

Luther and his contemporaries lived in a Europe whose religious situation was unstable and, at the same time, was facing a powerful external adversary. When the Ottoman armies tried to take Vienna, they were only about 375 miles from Luther's city of Wittenberg. Luther's pilgrimage to Rome was nearly 900 miles. If he could travel that distance, surely Süleyman the Magnificent, should he succeed in taking Vienna, could travel another 375 miles to Wittenberg and other parts of Germany. Further invasions were real possibilities faced by Luther and his contemporaries.

2. Luther and Islam

With this background in mind, what did Luther write about the ongoing threat posed by the Ottoman Empire? As early as 1518, Luther stated, "To fight against the Turk is the same as resisting God, who visits our sin upon us with this rod."[12] Some held Luther "responsible both for the Turkish advance itself as well as for the unwillingness of many to resist the foe of Christendom."[13]

While Luther was concerned about the Turkish invasions, he was in some ways an indirect beneficiary of their military action. Emperor Charles V needed the support of the fragmented empire—the kings, princess, electors, and bishops—in order to mount a defense. Some of these rulers supported Luther and he, to some extent, benefited from the Turkish invasions. Charles V, for example, needed the support of Frederick III (r. 1486–1525), Elector of Saxony and Luther's protector. If Charles V did not need the support of Frederick, Luther's fate at the Diet at Worms in 1521 may have been different. Francis I of France did not help the situation and eventually entered into an alliance with the Turks. These were some of the complex issues facing Europe and Luther, specifically.

Luther's friends urged him to write on the topic, but other than making brief comments, he did not do so until 1528, two years after the decisive victory by the Ottoman forces at Mohacs, Hungary. His most exten-

[11] Rudolf Horvat, *Povijest Grada Varaždin* (Varaždin: Hrvatska Akademija Znanosti I Umjetnosti, 1993), 67, 68, 69.

[12] Introduction to "On War Against the Turk," *Luther's Works*, 46:158. Hereafter *LW*. For the German text, see "Vom Kriege wider den Türken," in WA 30ii, (81), 107-148. (My primary source and focus is this tract.)

[13] *LW* 46:158.

sive piece on the topic, *On War against the Turk,* was written by October 9, 1528 and printed on April 23, 1529[14] just six months before Süleyman's siege on Vienna started. Luther addressed his treatise to Philip I of Hesse (1504–1567) who, while a youthful ruler of seventeen, supported Luther at Worms. This is the same Philip whose later bigamous marriage caused problems for Luther and the Protestant movement.[15] What are the main points of Luther's message?

It is not Luther's fault. Luther knows the urgency and is also upset that "some stupid preachers among us Germans ... are making people believe that we ought not and must not fight against the Turks."[16] Luther rails against those who want the Turks to come and "rule because they think our German people are wild and uncivilized—indeed, that they are half-devil and half-man."[17] Without a doubt Luther would not agree with a recent source already quoted in this chapter stating "that the European Christians ... were the same people who benefited most from the achievements of Islamic civilization."[18] Finally, Luther lashes out against those who blame him "for every bad thing that happens in the world."[19]

The pope is not doing his work. Luther is upset because Pope Leo X (r. 1513–1521), who put Luther under a ban, condemned him for writing that fighting the Turk is the same as resisting God.[20] In response, Luther acknowledges such a statement but claims that it is not fair to use it against him because when he took the position, the situation was different.[21] At the time he wrote the pamphlet, Luther had no sympathy for the Turkish invasion, for "the Turk certainly has no right or command to begin war and to attack lands that are not his."[22]

While the pope is criticizing Luther for his position about the Turks, Luther charges that the pope only "pretended to make war on the Turk."[23] According to Luther, the pope "used the Turkish war as a cover for their

[14] Ibid., 159.

[15] Ibid., 161.

[16] Ibid.

[17] Ibid.

[18] Essa and Ali, *Studies in Islamic Civilization,* 243.

[19] *LW* 46:161.

[20] Ibid., 162.

[21] Ibid.

[22] Ibid., 170.

[23] *LW* 46, 163.

game and robbed Germany of money by means of indulgences."[24] As far as Luther was concerned, the pope and cardinals had many sources of income, such as vacant benefices, if they were serious about fighting the Turks.[25]

Luther not only criticizes the pope for not doing anything about the Turks, he also passes judgment on the character of the popes. According to Luther, Pope Julius III (r. 1503–1513), the pontiff when Luther made his 1511 pilgrimage to Rome, was "a wicked iron-eater" and "half devil."[26] Some considered Pope Clement VII (r. 1523–1534), the pope at the time Luther wrote his treatise, "almost of a god of war"[27] but not Luther. As far as Luther is concerned, the "pope pays as little heed to the gospel or Christian faith as the Turk, and knows it as little."[28]

Who should fight the Turks? The editors to the English translation *On War against the Turk*, provide a helpful summary. According to them, it is the "Christian, who by prayer, repentance, and reform of life takes the rod of anger out of God's hand and compels the Turk to stand on his own strength."[29] Luther writes that the Christian is to fight under the banner of the emperor and not under the banner of bishop, cardinal, or pope.[30] He does not urge anyone to go against the Turks but if they do, they first must repent "and be reconciled to God."[31]

The Christian is the first man to fight against the Turks and the second is the emperor. Luther writes, "The second man who ought to fight against the Turk is Emperor Charles, or whoever may be emperor; for the Turk is attacking his subject and his empire, and it is his duty, as a regular ruler appointed by God, to defend his own.[32]

The emperor's role is to protect his people, and one's fighting should be under the "emperor's command, under his banner, and in his name."[33] Luther laments that the emperor has been seen as the head of Christen-

[24] Ibid., 164.

[25] Ibid.

[26] *LW* 46, 168.

[27] Ibid., 169.

[28] Ibid., 199.

[29] *LW* 46, 159.

[30] Ibid., 169.

[31] Ibid., 184.

[32] Ibid.

[33] *LW* 46, 185.

dom and protector of the church and the faith. He vehemently objects this concept:

> Not so! The emperor is not the head of Christendom or defender of the gospel or the faith. The church and the faith must have a defender other than emperor or kings. They are usually the worst enemies of Christendom and of the faith as Psalm 2[:2] says and as the church constantly laments.[34]

If the emperor was the defender of the faith and was to destroy non-Christians and unbelievers, he "would have to begin with the pope, bishops and clergy, and perhaps not spare us or himself."[35] The emperor should not fight the Turks because of their idolatry, for idolatry exists in his own empire. Then, to make certain that he does not leave out anyone, Luther takes a broad swipe because "there are entirely too many Turks, Jews, heathen, and non-Christians among us with open false doctrine and with offensive, shameful lives."[36] He wants the emperor to protect the people from the invading Turks but as far as the faith of the Turks is concerned, Luther gives them freedom: "Let the Turk believe and live as he will, just as one lets the papacy and other false Christians live."[37] While there is not even a hint of theological approval of Islam, Luther is willing for them to believe and live as they wish.

Luther's view of Islam. In his treatise, Luther addresses the question of how to deal with the invasion by the Turks and who should respond to those invasions. In more detail and in stronger language, he gives an assessment of Islam, the Turkish faith. Not what one might expect.

Luther is familiar with the *Koran* and he would like to translate it into German so that "everyone may see what a foul and shameful book it is."[38] While Christ is presented as a holy prophet, Christ is not recognized as the savior of the world,[39] and that is not acceptable to Luther.

Luther objects strongly to Islam's view of government and marriage. According to him, the Turkish man is a destroyer and blasphemer who "ruins all temporal government and home life or marriage."[40] In his

[34] Ibid.

[35] *LW* 46, 186.

[36] Ibid.

[37] Ibid.

[38] *LW* 46, 176.

[39] Ibid.

[40] Ibid., 195.

strongest indictment on marriage he not only condemns the Turks but, for good measure, includes the pope: "Since they [pope and Turks] think lightly of marriage, it serves them right that there are dog-marriages (and would to God they were dog-marriages), indeed, also 'Italian marriages' and 'Florentine brides' among them; and they think these things are good."[41]

Luther is never shy in expressing his views. What makes him use such strong and judgmental expressions about the Turks and at times adding the papacy? For Luther, it is not sufficient that Turks praise "Christ and Mary as being the only ones without sin" and that Christ "is a holy prophet." The Turks, according to Luther, believe that Christ is *nothing* more than a prophet and that is not acceptable to him.[42] He acknowledges that Turks allow the Christian belief in the resurrection to stand, but that is not enough for him. If that is the only article of belief allowed, then "Christ is no redeemer, savior, or king; there is no forgiveness of sins, no grace, no Holy Ghost."[43] Everything is destroyed, he maintains, because "Christ is beneath Mohammed."[44]

Did Luther understand Islam's view of Christ? It seems that his assessments are accurate and that the Islam's views of Christ have not changed. In a recent interview, Muslim theologian Zeki Saritoprak calls Jesus "one of the five [Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jesus, Muhammad] great messengers of God." Nevertheless, Saritoprak states, "But for Muslims, Jesus is neither God nor the Son of God."[45] Saritoprak sees some hope because "by understanding who Jesus is in Islam, Christians might find common ground with Muslims."[46] It seems that Luther *did* understand Islam's view of Christ and that view, according to Saritoprak, is still the same. It is because Luther understood Islam's view of Christ that he rejected it. It was not acceptable to him.

Luther's response to the Turks and Islam was theological, not political. The emperor had the responsibility to defend the empire, but Luther was interested in sharing the Christian faith with the Turks. He seemed to "have envisioned missionary work amongst Muslims being carried out

41 *LW* 46, 198. Luther is referring to homosexual unions.

42 Ibid., 176.

43 *LW* 46, 177.

44 Ibid., 178.

45 Zeki Saritoprak, "Who Is Jesus for Muslims?" *Christian Century* (June 2017): 32.

46 Ibid., 33.

discreetly through Christian prisoners and slaves of the Ottomans."[47] Yet, interestingly, about two years after he wrote his treatise on Turks, Luther did not pursue "an opportunity for an audience with Süleyman in 1530 when a former member of the Habsburg ambassadorial party informed him that the Turkish sultan made friendly inquiries about the German Professor."[48]

More than thirty years later, Hans von Ungnad, a convert to the Reformation faith, also wanted to bring Christianity to the Turks. His approach was a Serbian NT translation printed in Cyrillic. His goal was to distribute it to the Turks as far as Constantinople. Some contacts, though limited and few, were made with the Turks.[49]

3. Seventh-day Adventists and Islam

Luther has had a significant impact on Seventh-day Adventists. Adventists have a high view of Luther even though there are areas of disagreement. Luther is mentioned in Adventist literature more than any other reformer. It is thus natural to compare the Adventist view on Islam with those of Luther. We will look at the Adventist view of Islam from two perspectives—the prophetic view and the mission view.

Prophetic view of Islam. From the earliest days, Seventh-day Adventists have emphasized biblical prophecies, especially those in Daniel and Revelation. Two of the denominations' websites: www.adventistdigitallibrary .org and www.ministrymagazine.org[50] list numerous entries on Islam or Turkey in prophecy, although we will review only two sources. W. A. Spicer (1865–1952), a church leader and author, addresses the issue of Turkey in one of his books. In reference to Dan 11 and 12, Spicer rather

[47] Adam S. Francisco, *Martin Luther and Islam: A Study of Sixteenth-Century Polemics and Apologetics* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 93.

[48] Ibid., 94.

[49] Nikolaus Satelmajer, "A Bold Sixteenth-Century Mission: The First New Testaments for Croats, Bosnians, Serbs, Bulgarians and Turks," (S.T.M. Thesis, The Lutheran Theological Seminary), 2014, 85. Also, see other chapters in this book by the same author.

[50] www.ministrymagazine.org. June through December 1972 *Ministry, International Journal for Pastors,* published a seven part series titled "The Challenge of Islam." This is just one example of the ongoing effort of Seventh-day Adventists to find ways of reaching the Muslim world with the Adventist message.

cautiously refers to Turkey in connection with these prophecies.[51] Uriah Smith (1832–1903), a long-term editor and writer, authored interpretations on Revelation (1867) and Daniel (1873).[52] His commentaries on these apocalyptic books have been republished numerous times. His views on Turkey are more specific than those of Spicer. Smith, for example, held the position that the king of the north in Dan 11:40 is Turkey.[53] According to Adam S. Francisco, Luther also connected the Turks to prophecies in Daniel, though Luther related the vision in Dan 7, rather than chs. 11 and 12, to Islam. According to Luther, the little "horn's [Daniel 7:8] blasphemous mouth was synonymous for the false teachings of Islam."[54]

Mission view of Islam. The missional response of Seventh-day Adventists to Islam reaches back to the earliest days of the church. Spicer gives a positive review of mission activity to Turkey by William Goodell in the early 1800s, even though Goodell was not an Adventist. According to a Boston University posting, Goodell was ordained in 1822 and sent to Syria and the Holy Land under the auspices of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. In 1831, he published an Armeno-Turkish NT. He moved to Constantinople where he served until 1865.[55] According to Spicer, Goodell encountered major difficulties in Constantinople: "In 1839 the rage of the opposition had reached the point of uncontrollable fury. The Greek patriarch, the Armenian bishop, and the sultan, as caliph of the Moslem religion, joined to quench the little light of Protestant truth being kindled."[56]

Adventists since the 1870s have provided enormous human and financial resources to proclaim their message to the world, and that proclamation includes Muslims. In 1989, the church established the Seventh-day Adventist Global Centre for Islamic Studies. The first objective is "to study ways, means, methods, and approaches meaningful for willing Muslims

51 W. A. Spicer, *Beacon Lights of Prophecy* (Washington, DC: Review & Herald, 1935), 132, 133.

52 *Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia*, s.v. "Smith, Uriah," 11:618.

53 Uriah Smith, *Daniel and the Revelation* (Nashville, TN: Southern Publishing Association, 1944), 307.

54 Francisco, *Martin Luther and Islam*, 82.

55 http://www.bu.edu/missiology/missionary-biography/g-h/goodell-william-1792-1867/.

56 W. A. Spicer, *The Hand That Intervenes* (Washington, DC: Review & Herald, 1918), 327.

in their varied cultural and social contexts."[57] The implementation has been governed by available opportunities in light of the fact many areas are not open to Christianity or Christianity faces major limitations.

4. Conclusion

Luther left the matter of military incursions by the Turks to the emperor. Seventh-day Adventists are not facing the same situation. Yet, generally, the church has not attempted to influence government functions, unless it or certain principles are directly impacted.

Luther and Seventh-day Adventists have looked at Islam from a faith perspective. Luther was not willing to compromise theologically and Seventh-day Adventists uphold their theological perspectives. They continue to believe that the Seventh-day Adventist message must be presented to all "nations, tribes, and peoples" and that includes Muslims. Luther hoped that Christian captives or slaves would share the gospel with the Turks. Adventists have attempted, through friendship and service, to share their message with Muslims. Mission is key to understanding Luther's response to Islam and that is also true for Seventh-day Adventists.

[57] *Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia*, s.v. "Seventh-day Adventist Global Centre for Islamic Studies," 11:585. In order to understand Islam and not relate to it in the context of mission, other resources have been made available. For example, see Hans Heinz and Daniel Heinz, *Das Christentum begegnet dem Islam: Eine relgiöse Herausforderung* (Zürich: Advent-Verlag, 2007).

Journal of Asia Adventist Seminary 18.1–2 (2015): 71–76

A Reflection on Leadership Development and Conflict Management in Light of Acts 15:36–41

Boubakar Sanou, Ph.D.
Andrews University, USA

1. Introduction

Acts 15:36–41 is the narrative of a sharp disagreement between Paul and Barnabas, two of the greatest missionaries of the early church. The contention between them was so sharp that it resulted in the splitting of their missionary team. This article examines the passage from a leadership and missiological perspectives and draws some implications for leadership development and conflict management in ministry settings.

2. The Setting

Paul and Barnabas had completed their first missionary journey into Asia Minor and were back in Antioch after the first Jerusalem Council. After having spent some time strengthening the church at Antioch, Paul thought it wise to get back to the mission field. He suggested the following to Barnabas: "Let us return and visit the brethren in every city in which we proclaimed the word of the Lord, and see how they are" (Acts 15:36). Barnabas agreed to Paul's suggestion except that he was determined to take John Mark with them (Acts 15:37). Paul disagreed with the suggestion to include John Mark in their team because the young man had deserted them during their first missionary journey (Acts 15:36–39; See also Acts 13:13). The contention between them became so sharp that they parted from one another (Acts 15:39).

3. My Perspective

The purpose in addressing the disagreement between Paul and Barnabas over John Mark's participation in their missionary team is not to decide

who was at fault. It is suggested that the Greek word for *disagreement* (*paroxysmos*) "is so neutral as not to touch on the question of responsibility."[1] Besides, the Bible does not mention the reasons why John Mark abandoned the missionary team. My goal is to approach this text from a leadership and missiological perspective and then draw some lessons applicable to ministry and mission today.

For Howard Marshall, Acts 15:36–41 "is a classic example of the perpetual problem of whether to place the interests of the individual or of the work as a whole first."[2] The issue at the heart of the disagreement between Paul and Barnabas over John Mark was the following: "Should a person who has deserted a team be given a second chance?" Paul's opinion was "absolutely not" while Barnabas' opinion was "yes." Although Luke does not comment on Paul's and Barnabas's motivations, it is apparent that they approached the issue from different perspectives. While Barnabas may have argued his case from a pastoral concern, Paul appeared to have focused on the requirements of missionary work.[3] In this particular instance, whereas Paul focused on human weaknesses that could potentially prevent the successful achievement of a missionary task (he probably viewed John Mark as unreliable), Barnabas's concern was to mentor younger Christians despite their weaknesses and help them grow in their faith as well as in their commitment to serve God just as he previously did for Paul. There is no indication that Barnabas disagreed that what Mark did was wrong. Accepting to give a second chance to John Mark says a lot about Barnabas's high level of acceptance of risk in mentoring others. He may have taken John Mark on board during their first missionary journey, ready to accept the possibility that the young man might fail. He is a good example of godly leaders who do not neglect the real growth needs of people for the sake of meeting agendas and abiding by policies. He seemed to have been of the opinion that strong stands should not be taken on issues of no salvific significance while minimizing issues of greatest significance in mission and ministry.[4]

Pleading that a second chance be given to people was consistent with who Barnabas was. It was Barnabas himself who pleaded with the church to give Paul a chance when they were very suspicious of his past persecution of believers and his sudden conversion to their faith (Acts 9:26, 27).

1 Richard N. Longenecker, *Acts*, EBC 10 (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2007), 956.

2 Howard Marshall, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1980), 258.

3 Eckhard J. Schnabel, *Acts*, ZECNT (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2012), 662.

4 Ken Blue, *Healing Spiritual Abuse: How to Break Free from Bad Church Experiences* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1993), 89.

This makes Paul's response to John Mark ironic. One could say that while Barnabas was people-oriented and a compassionate builder of people who looked at life from the viewpoint of the overall good for both individuals and God's mission, Paul was more of a task-oriented person who looked at things from the viewpoint of the overall good of his mission.[5]

Following are five lessons from this study of Acts 15:36–41 that have a direct implication for leadership development and conflict management:

1. Conflict is an unavoidable fact of life even among godly church leaders. Eckhard Schnabel suggests that "since personal initiatives involve subjective evaluations of facts and factors that are relevant for both pastoral ministry and missionary work, disagreements are the natural result of different opinions regarding the most effective missionary strategies."[6] This emotionally-filled conflict between Paul and Barnabas shows us that the early church "was not an ideal church, with saints whose perfect lives leave us panting with frustration over our failures and imperfections. It was a church with people just like us but who nevertheless were available to God and were used to do great things for him."[7]

2. Although this example should not be used as an excuse for Christian quarreling,[8] or lead us to assume that division is the norm in the event of disagreement among believers,[9] the fact still remains that in his providence God can work through human imperfection, especially when the reasons for disagreements or separation "are not personal prestige and power but considerations connected with the proclamation of the gospel."[10] In his providence, God brought something good out of Paul and Barnabas's vigorous disagreement. Their temporal irreconcilable disagreement led to two successful missionary teams. The Seventh-day Adventist Church has a lot to learn from this precedent in regards to current and persistent vigorous disagreements on the subject of women's ordination to pastoral ministry. Although conflicts are not necessarily bad things, church leaders need to be careful about how they handle them. A conflict can have both functional and dysfunctional outcomes depending

5 Dan R. Dick and Barbara Dick, *Equipped for Every Good Works: Building a Gift-Based Church* (Nashville, TN: Discipleship Resources, 2001), 58–60.

6 Schnabel, *Acts*, 671.

7 Ajith Fernando, *Acts*, NIVAC (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1998), 434.

8 John R. W. Stott, *The Message of Acts* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1990), 253.

9 Fernando, *Acts*, 434.

10 Schnabel, *Acts*, 671.

on how it is handled. When handled effectively, conflict can lead to increased insights on how to achieve one's goals without undermining others; better group cohesion and stronger mutual respect and renewed faith in each other (Acts 6:1–7; 15); and improved self-awareness leading to careful examination of personal goals and expectations. However, when handled ineffectively, conflict can lead to personal dislikes, teamwork breakdown, and loss of talents and resources as people disengage or leave.[11] Each person needs to carefully consider the impact of their position on others and on the mission and ministry of our beloved church.

3. No matter the intensity of a conflict, people should never lose sight of the hope and possibility of reconciliation. The Greek word *paroxysmos* suggests that although the contention was severe, it was temporary rather than long-lasting.[12] After some time, Paul and Barnabas undoubtedly became colleagues in ministry again (1 Cor 9:6; Gal 2:1, 9). Furthermore, "Paul had not only come to appreciate Mark but also to depend on him so much that he asked for him to come to him towards the end of his life (2 Tim 4:11; Col 4:10)."[13] David Goetz and Marshall Shelley remind us that it is in a fantasy land that disagreements never surface or contrary opinions are stated with force. What is needed is for us to face our disagreements and deal with them in a godly way. They stress that "the mark of community—true biblical unity—is not the absence of conflict. It's the presence of a reconciling spirit."[14] Leaders motivated by a true reconciling spirit never consider punishment as the next option if they fail in their first attempt to build bridges of understanding with disagreeing parties. They are also aware that true reconciliation does not always mean that others must necessarily espouse their ideas and opinions. Speed Leas lists six different styles for managing conflicts: persuading, compelling, avoiding/accommodating, collaborating, negotiating, and supporting.[15] He insists that each style "can be an appropriate style, and none should be thought of as 'bad' or inferior. A certain style can cause a problem if it is

[11] Richard Hibbert and Evelyn Hibbert, *Leading Multicultural Team* (Pasadena, CA: William Carey, 2014).

[12] Francis D. Nichol, ed., *The Seventh-Day Adventist Bible Commentary* (Review & Herald, 1980), 6:317.

[13] Fernando, *Acts*, 431.

[14] David Goetz and Marshall Shelley, "Standing in the Crossfire: Interview with Bill Hybels," *Leadership* 14.1 (1993): 14.

[15] Speed B. Leas. *Discovering Your Conflict Management Style* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2014).

used inappropriately."[16] Therefore, to keep the hope and possibility of reconciliation alive, the choice of a conflict management style needs to be contextual and appropriate no matter how long the prospect of reconciliation might take (Matt 18:21–22). This approach is displayed by God in his relentless effort to reconcile the world to himself since the Fall (Heb 1:1–2).

4. Past failures and defections do not preclude future faithfulness and success in ministry. The story of John Mark convinces me that leaders can be grown. As such, a second chance should be given to those desiring to grow in their spiritual journey. Their first failures should never be interpreted as continued failures. Because John Mark was given another opportunity to demonstrate his fitness for service, he grew into a significant person in the history of the early church (1 Pet 5:13; 2 Tim 4:11). Scholars seem to be in agreement that it was John Mark who wrote the second gospel after having been Peter's interpreter.[17] Ironically, Barnabas redeemed John Mark for Paul's benefit. Another vivid example is Peter to whom Jesus graciously gave a second chance after he vehemently denied knowing him (Matt 26:69–75). Jesus not only forgave Peter but also recommissioned him to the office of apostle (John 21:15–17). In his later years, Paul seemed to have softened his ways of dealing with human imperfections. In reading 1 and 2 Corinthians, we discover a Paul who refuses to give up on the Corinthians despite their moral weaknesses. This is an invitation for us to look at people with the eyes of hope grounded in the unlimited possibilities of God's grace.[18] In spite of our past mistakes, God can still use us if we allow him to reshape us. A hand of fellowship and service opportunity, devoid of any suspicion, should be extended to those who have failed, repented, and learned valuable lessons from their mistakes.

5. I personally believe that with hindsight, Paul would have handled this conflict differently. In 1 Cor 1:10, he appeals to believers to avoid divisions in their disagreements. First Corinthian 13:11 appears to be the testimony of growth and maturity that he experienced in his life journey. There he writes, "When I was a child, I spoke as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child; but when I became a man, I put away childish things" (1 Cor 13:11). This is an indication that the way people handle conflict depends to a large extent on their worldview and level of exposure and maturity. As such, leaders need periodic training on effective conflict management. Also, in handling conflict, leaders should avoid fo-

[16] Ibid., 4.

[17] Fernando, *Acts*, 434.

[18] Ibid., 435.

cusing only on the conflict management styles that are convenient to them and take into consideration the perspective and level of understanding of other parties involved in the conflict.

4. Conclusion

As human beings, we do not have a choice about whether or not conflict will arise between us and others. However, we do have a choice about how to deal with conflict, in both the short and long terms. The challenge for us is how to be more of a Barnabas by encouraging others and investing ourselves in them and to help them make progress in their spiritual journey. Forgiveness leading to reconciliation is an incredible triumph, even when we are faced with extraordinary ministry-related conflicts. We should also be like Paul, who made mistakes, admitted them, learned from them, and grew as a result. We need a balanced perspective on our ministry agendas and policies, on one hand, and the spiritual growth needs of all those who are impacted by those agendas and policies, on the other hand. It seems that leaders should always err on the side of second chances.

Journal of Asia Adventist Seminary 18.1–2 (2015): 77–92

Towards an Adventist Theology of Dreams and Visions with Missiological Implications

Bruce L. Bauer, D.Miss.
Andrews University, USA

1. Introduction

Sung Ik Kim wrote his PhD dissertation on the missiological implications of the Book of Daniel.[1] In an article based on his research he wrote:

> Although dreams and visions are one of the dominant mediums of *missio Dei* (God's Mission) in the Bible, it is unusual to find Christians who pay much attention to dreams and visions in the Western Christian world today. The subject is not even treated seriously in academic theological circles in spite of being evident in Scripture that God uses supernatural dreams and visions to reach and save unreached people.[2]

I also have noticed in my research and interaction with Sabbath School members when I present on dreams that Adventists, even those who have had what they believe is a God-given dream, are extremely reluctant to share with other members of the body of Christ for fear of being laughed at or thought to be slightly crazy. For example, if I stood here today and said, "last night God spoke to me in a dream," many of you would begin to smirk and question my academic grounding. So we have skepticism by many Western theologians towards God speaking and revealing himself to people today through dreams and visions during the very time in history when God is sending hundreds and thousands of dreams and visions to Muslims that result in many of them beginning a journey of faith and commitment to Jesus Christ.[3]

1 Sung Ik Kim, "Proclamation in Cross-Cultural Context: Missiological Implications of the Book of Daniel" (PhD diss., Andrews University, 2005).

2 Sung Ik Kim, "Missiological Implications of Nebuchadnezzar's Dreams," *Journal of Adventist Mission Studies* 12.2 (2012): 110.

3 Tom Doyle, *Dreams and Visions: Is Jesus Awakening the Muslim World?* (Nashville, TN: Nelson, 2012); Adam Harwood, "Does God Speak Today through Visions and

In response to this situation, I offer this paper to begin and encourage dialogue on an Adventist theology of dreams and visions. The paper will have five sections: Dreams and Visions in the Old Testament, New Testament, and Writing of Ellen G. White; the Purpose of God-Given Dreams and Visions; Warnings about Dreams and Visions Not Inspired by God; Missiological Implications of Dreams and Visions among Muslims; and Practical Suggestions.

2. Definitions

Webster's New World Dictionary defines a dream as "a sequence of sensations, images, thoughts, etc. passing through a sleeping person's mind."[4] A vision is defined as "something supposedly seen by other than normal sight; something perceived in a dream, trance, etc. or supernaturally revealed, as to a prophet."[5] Dreams are usually thought of as taking place while a person sleeps while a vision could take place while a person is awake. However, some visions in Scripture specifically state that they took place in the night.[6]

3. Dreams and Visions in the Old Testament, New Testament, and the Writings of Ellen G. White

3.1. Dreams and Visions in the OT

Dreams and visions play a prominent role in the OT, perhaps because so much of the OT is narrative, in contrast to the NT where most of the

Dreams?" 2015, http://www.bhacademicblog.com/does-god-speak-today-through-visions-and-dreams/; J. Dudley Woodberry, ed., *From Seed to Fruit: Global Trends, Fruitful Practices, and Emerging Issues among Muslims*, 2nd ed. (Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library, 2011); Nabeel Qureshi, *Seeking Allah, Finding Jesus: A Devout Muslim Encounters Christianity* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2016); Randal Scott, "Evangelism and Dreams: Foundational Presuppositions to Interpret God-Given Dreams of the Unreached," *Evangelical Missions Quarterly* 44.2 (2008): 176–184.

4 *Webster's New World Dictionary*, 2nd college ed., s.v. "dream."

5 Ibid., s.v. "vision."

6 Scott Breslin and Mike Jones, *Understanding Dreams from God* (Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library, 2004), 13.

material is of a teaching nature.[7] Notice some of the more prominent narratives where dreams and visions play such an important role:

1. Abimelech warned not to touch Abraham's wife (Gen 20:1–7).
2. Jacob instructed on sheep mating techniques (Gen 31:10–12).
3. Laban warned not to harm Jacob (Gen 31:24, 29).
4. Joseph given information about his future—his family would bow before him (Gen 37:5–11).
5. Joseph interprets two prisoner's dreams (Gen 40:5–23).
6. Joseph interprets Pharaoh's two dreams (Gen 41:1–36).
7. Gideon is encouraged by overhearing a Midianite's dream (Judg 7:9–15).
8. Solomon is asked by God in a dream what he desires for his kingdom (1 Kgs 3:5–14).
9. Nebuchadnezzar is given information about the future of the world empires (Dan 2:1–45).
10. Nebuchadnezzar is warned about his pride in a dream of a fallen tree (Dan 4:4–33).

3.2. Dreams and Visions in the NT

The NT has fewer narratives concerning dreams and visions, but the purpose and types remain constant with OT narratives. Notice the most prominent ones:

1. Joseph is encouraged to marry his pregnant fiancée (Matt 1:18–25).
2. The wise men are warned not to return home through Jerusalem (Matt 2:9–12).
3. Joseph is warned to flee to Egypt to escape the anger and wrath of Herod (Matt 2:13, 14).
4. Joseph is given directions when to return home with Mary and Jesus (Matt 2:19–23).
5. Pilate's wife had a nightmare and warned Pilate not to harm an innocent man (Matt 27:19).
6. Saul, the killer of Christians, makes a u-turn in his life after his vision (Acts 9:1–9).
7. Ananias is instructed through a vision to meet killer Saul (Acts 9:10-19).

[7] Flanvis Johnson, "Towards a Biblical Theology of Dreams," 2016, https://soundfaith.com/sermons/19616-towards-a-biblical-theology-of-dreams.

8. Cornelius is told in a vision to send some men to Joppa (Acts 10:1–8).
9. Peter has a vision that instructs him that people are not unclean (Acts 10:9-16).
10. Paul is told through a vision where to minister next (Acts 16:9, 10).

3.3. Dreams and Visions in the Writings of Ellen G. White

Seventh-day Adventists have readily accepted that White received instructions and messages from God through visions and dreams. In addition to the references to how God gave her warnings and councils for the young Adventist Church she has also listed a few principles that should guide other people in deciding whether or not a dream or vision is from God.

3.3.1. Guiding Principles

In the second volume of *Selected Messages*, White indicates that God-given dreams are used by God as a medium of communication[8] and in the first volume of *Testimonies for the Church*, she says that the meaning and message of dreams are "proofs of their genuineness."[9] However, many dreams are from natural causes and have nothing to do with a message from God.[10] There are also dreams and visions that are inspired by Satan[11] that need to be tested by the teachings and principles of God's Word. If any message that comes through a dream or a vision opposes anything in God's Word, it is not a God-given dream or vision.[12]

> I would say to our dear brethren who have been so eager to accept everything that came in the form of visions and dreams, Beware that you be not ensnared. Read the warnings that have been given by the world's Redeemer to His disciples to be given again by them to the world. The Word of God is solid rock, and we may plant our feet securely upon it.... Take heed ... for delusions and deceptions will come ... as we near the end.[13]

[8] Ellen G. White, *The Story of Patriarchs and Prophets* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1958), 683.

[9] Ellen G. White, *Testimonies for the Church* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1948), 1:570.

[10] Ibid., 1:569.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Ellen G. White, *Selected Messages* (Washington DC: Review and Herald, 1958), 2:98.

[13] Ellen G. White, Manuscript 27, 1894, quoted in *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, ed. Francis D. Nichol, rev. ed (Hagerstown, MD: Review & Herald, 1980), 7:952.

3.3.2. Narratives

White also shares several narratives that illustrate that God sends dreams and visions to encourage and guide his people. John Huss, when imprisoned, had a dream that encouraged him that even if his work was destroyed there would be many more people that would lift up the name of Jesus.[14] William Miller received a dream that showed him that many who professed to follow the truth were in danger of being lost—that they only looked like genuine believers.[15] John Matteson had a dream that showed that in spite of the attempts of those opposed to the work of James and Ellen White that God would help them withstand the attacks, and in the end they would even give a stronger witness to the truth.[16] J. N. Loughborough, when faced with a decision, prayed and asked God for guidance. In response God sent him a dream showing him what to do in that situation.[17]

The evidence from the OT, NT, and from the writings of White indicates that God guides and directs through dreams and visions; yet, many Christians, especially Westerners, are skeptical of people who even talk about God giving them a dream. It seems that the effects of the Enlightenment, a strong belief in the scientific method, and a struggle to accept personal experience as a valid way through which God reveals himself to people today leave some Western Christians with a very deistic perspective of God—they believe God is there but that he is distant and does not interact with his creation.

3.4. Summary of Principles from Dreams and Visions in the OT, NT, and Writings of Ellen G. White

There are several important principles in the dream and vision narratives in Scripture and in what White has to say on this topic:

1. God speaks to people in the faith community—Jacob, Joseph, Solomon, Joseph, Ananias, and Paul.
2. God also speaks to people outside the faith community—Abimelech, Pharaoh, the Midianite soldier, Nebuchadnezzar, Pilate's wife, and Saul the persecutor of Christians.

[14] Ellen G. White, *The Great Controversy between Christ and Satan* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1911), 108.

[15] Ellen G. White, *Early Writings of Ellen G. White* (Washington DC: Review & Herald, 1945), 81–83.

[16] White, *Testimonies for the Church*, 1:597–98.

[17] Ibid., 1:601–2.

3. God sends dreams and visions to important heads of state to guide their nations and to keep them from going in the wrong direction—Pharaoh and Nebuchadnezzar.
4. God even sends dreams and visions to those who hunt down and kill God's people—Saul.
5. The meaning and message of dreams and visions indicate if they are genuine or not.
6. Dreams can have several sources: natural causes, Satan, and God.
7. *Most important*: all dreams and visions need to be tested by the Word of God.

4. Purpose of God-Given Dreams and Visions

Dreams and visions in the Bible were two ways God's prophets received God's messages for his people. "And the Lord said to them, 'Now listen to what I say: If there were a prophet among you, I the Lord, would reveal myself in visions, I would speak to them in dreams'" (Num 12:6).

The purpose of this paper, however, is not to discuss the relationship of dreams and visions as a medium God used to communicate his messages to his prophets. Rather, the focus is on the current context where God is sending dreams and visions to people who are often antagonistic towards the Word of God and the Christian faith. One OT passage lists four reasons why God sends dreams and visions to people other than prophets. It often is not wise to quote Elihu from the Book of Job to help establish a theology of any kind; however, in this case the scriptural evidence from other passages supports what he says.

> For God speaks again and again, though people do not recognize it. He speaks in dreams, in visions of the night, when deep sleep fall on people as they lie in their beds. He whispers in their ears and terrifies them with warnings. He makes them turn **from doing wrong; he keeps them from pride. He protects them from the grave, from** crossing over the river of **death** (Job 33:14–18, NLT, emphasis mine).

God gives dreams and visions in order to (a) help people turn from doing wrong, (b) keep people from pride, (c) protect people from the grave (points them in the right direction), and (d) protect people from death. Most of the dreams in both the OT and NT fulfill one or more of these purposes. Notice the biblical examples:

1. *Help people turn from doing wrong*: King Abimelech's dream in Gen 20, Saul's vision on the Damascus road in Acts 9:1–9, and Laban's dream warning him not to harm Jacob in Gen 31:29.

2. *Keep people from pride*: Nebuchadnezzar's dream in Dan 4:10–18.
3. *Protect people from the grave (point people in the right direction)*: Two visions given to Cornelius and Peter in Acts 10:1–8.
4. *Protect people from death*: Pharaoh's dream about the coming famine in Gen 41:14–24 and the magi's and Joseph's dreams that saved Jesus's life in Matt 2:1–18.

4.1. Dream Narratives in Scripture

The New International Bible Concordance lists 108 references to dreams. This section will only look at the narratives and not individual references to dreams. Joseph and Daniel are the two Bible figures who by far have the most references, with Joseph being associated with twenty-two of those references and Daniel having a connection with an additional twenty-six.[18] Notice the purpose for the following narratives:

Text	Story	Purpose
Gen 20:3, 6	Abimelech takes Sarah	Guidance and warning not to sin
Gen 28:12	Jacob and the stairway to heaven	Promise of protection and blessing
Gen 31:10, 11, 34	Jacob cheated by Laban	Encouragement and warning
Gen 37	Joseph's two dreams	Foretelling the future
Gen 40	Pharaoh's cupbearer and baker	Foretelling the future
Gen 41	Pharaoh's dream of cows and grain	Foretelling and warning of famine
Judg 7:13, 15	Midianite soldier's dream	Encouragement to Gideon
Dan 2	Nebuchadnezzar's image	Foretelling the future
Dan 4	Nebuchadnezzar's tree	Warning against pride
Dan 7	Four beasts	Foretelling the future
Matt 1:20	Joseph engagement to Mary	Encouragement to marry Mary
Matt 2:12	Wise men told to return home	Guidance and warning not to return to Herod

[18] Edward W. Goodrick and John R. Kohlenberger III, *The NIV Complete Concordance: The Complete English Concordance to the New International Version* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1981), 226.

Matt 2:13	Joseph told to flee to Egypt	Guidance and warning about Herod intention
Matt 2:19	Joseph instructed to return home	Guidance
Matt 2:22	Joseph warned to leave Galilee	Guidance
Matt 27:19	Pilate's wife warns Pilate	Guidance

Table 1. Dream Narratives in Scripture

It is interesting to note that of the sixteen references listed above, most of them have an element of guidance where God showed people what to do or how to respond to local situations. Eleven of the sixteen God-given dream stories consisted of information that had only local significance and meaning and did not have any universal application. Perhaps these are two principles to be learned from the God-given dream stories—listen to what God is saying to you personally, but do not automatically think that the message has universal application.

4.2. Vision Narratives in Scripture

In addition to dreams, *The New International Bible Concordance* lists 106 references to visions.[19] Again, I will only make reference in this paper to the narrative stories. It is interesting to note that while Joseph and Daniel had the most references to *dreams*, only Daniel also had *visions* and leads all other Bible characters in the number of visions mentioned in connection with his life and work—twenty-six. The apostle Paul had the second largest number of visions with six references.

Text	Story	Purpose
Gen 15:1	Abram promised protection and a heir	Encouragement and guidance
Gen 46:2	Jacob encouraged to go to Egypt	Encouragement and foretelling the future
1 Sam 3:15	Samuel given a message for Eli	Warning of coming destruction to Eli's sons
Isa 1:1; 21:2; 22:1	Isaiah received messages through visions	Warning and guidance of Israel and Judah
Ezek 8:4	Ezekiel shown the detestable sins of Judah	Warning of destruction to come

[19] Ibid., 979–80.

Ezek 11:24	Ezekiel told that Israel would return	Warning and encouragement for exiled Israel
Ezek 43:3	Ezekiel sees the Lord's glory return	Encouragement for God's remnant
Dan 2:19, 45	Meaning of the image revealed	Encouragement & guidance
Dan 7:2, 7, 13	Vision of the four beasts & the Son of Man	Foretelling the future
Dan 8:1, 2, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19, 26, 27	Vision of the ram and goat, the 2,300 evenings and mornings & the explanation	Foretelling the future to give guidance to God's people
Dan 9:21, 23, 24	Meaning of vision of Dan 8 revealed	Foretelling future events
Dan 10 and 11	Vision of the kings of the south and north	Foretelling future events
Obad 1:1	Edom's destruction foretold	Foretelling coming destruction
Mic 1:1	Visions of Samaria and Jerusalem	Warning of coming destruction
Nah 1:1	Nahum's visions	Warnings for Nineveh
Zech 1:8	Zechariah's visions	Encouraged people to continue rebuilding the temple in the face of opposition
Luke 1:22	Zachariah's vision about his son, John	Foretelling John's birth
Acts 9:10, 12	Ananias and Saul have a vision	Guidance and direction for Ananias and Saul
Acts 10:3, 17, 19; 11:5	Peter and Cornelius receive guidance through separate visions	Guidance and direction for Cornelius and Peter
Acts 16:9, 10	Paul receives a call to go to Macedonia	Guidance in ministry
Acts 18:9	Paul encouraged to speak out in Corinth	Encouragement to be bold in witness
Rev 9:17	John receives information about the future	Foretelling future events

Table 2. Vision Narratives in Scripture

Visions seem to be more closely associated with the prophetic function of giving warnings and foretelling future events. Only the two dreams in Dan 2

and 7 had a universal application, but when God wanted to share the meaning of the dreams in those chapters, he gave Daniel a vision to explain their meaning. Again, many of the vision narratives listed above were only for personal guidance for a local situation and did not have universal application.

4.3. Summary of Purposes of Dreams and Visions

Several purposes are suggested by the dream and vision narratives in Scripture: (a) they help people turn from doing wrong, (b) they keep people from pride, (c) they protect people from the grave by pointing them in the right direction, (d) they protect people from death, and (e) most visions and dreams have local and personal, not universal, application. In addition, dreams and visions are ways God has communicated his messages to his prophets, showing them future events; however, this is not the focus of this paper.

5. Warnings about Dreams and Visions Not Inspired by God

The Bible also has quite a bit to say about dreams and visions that do not have their source in God. Notice this long passage in Jer 23.

> I have not sent these prophets, yet they run around claiming to speak for me. I have given them no message, yet they go on prophesying. If they had stood before me and listened to me, they would have spoken my words, and they would have turned my people from their evil ways and deeds....
>
> I have heard these prophets say, "Listen to the dream I had from God last night." And then they proceed to tell lies in my name. How long will this go on? If they are prophets, they are prophets of deceit, inventing everything they say. By telling these false dreams they are trying to get my people to forget me, just as their ancestors did by worshipping the idols of Baal.
>
> Let these false prophets tell their dreams, but let my true messengers faithfully proclaim my every word. There is a difference between straw and grain....
>
> Therefore, says the Lord, "I am against these prophets who steal messages from each other and claim they are from me. I am against these smooth-tongued prophets who say, 'This prophecy is from the Lord!' I am against these false prophets. Their imaginary dreams are flagrant lies that lead my people into sin. I did not send or appoint them, and they have no message at all for my people. I the Lord have spoken!" (Jer 23:21, 22, 25–28, 30–32)

It is clear that there are both dreams from God and dreams from natural and satanic sources. The principles listed above should give guidance to the Adventist Church in discerning the true from the false. Other biblical texts further reinforce the concept that there is a lot of deception out there among those who have dreams and are interested in knowing their meanings.

> This is what the Lord of Heaven's Armies, the God of Israel says, "Do not let your prophets and fortune-tellers who are with you in the land of Babylon trick you. Do not listen to their dreams, because they are telling you lies in my name. I have not sent them," says the Lord. (Jer 29:8, 9)
>
> Household gods give worthless advice, fortune-tellers predict only lies, and interpreters of dreams pronounce falsehoods that give no comfort. So my people are wandering like lost sheep, they are attacked because they have no shepherd. (Zech 10:2)
>
> Suppose there are prophets among you or those who dream dreams about the future, and they promise you signs and miracles, and the predicted signs or miracles occur. If they then say, "Come, let us worship other gods"—gods you have not known before—do not listen to them. The Lord your God is testing you to see if you truly love him with all your heart and soul. Serve only the Lord your God and fear him alone. Obey his commands, listen to his voice, and cling to him. The false prophets or visionaries who try to lead you astray must be put to death, for they encourage rebellion against the Lord your God, who redeemed you from slavery and brought you out of the land of Egypt. Since they try to lead you astray from the way the Lord your God commanded you to live, you must put them to death. In this way you will purge the evil from among you." (Deut 13:1–5)

We may not have modern-day false prophets walking the streets claiming to have received a dream from God to guide a nation or individuals, but there are plenty of false sources out there seeking to lead people astray. I looked at Amazon.com and found many authors willing to guide in interpreting a person's dreams. Notice the titles of just three offerings: *The Dreamer's Dictionary: From A to Z ... 3,000 Magical Mirrors to Reveal the Meaning of Your Dreams*, *Llewellyn's Complete Dictionary of Dreams: Over 1,000 Dream Symbols and Their Universal Meanings*, and *12,000 Dreams Interpreted: A New Edition for the 21st Century*.[20]

[20] Steam Robinson and Tom Gorbett, *The Dreamer's Dictionary: From A to Z ... 3,000 Magical Mirrors to Reveal the Meaning of Your Dreams* (New York: Grand Central, 1974); Michael Lennox, *Llewellyn's Complete Dictionary of Dreams: Over 1,000 Dream Symbols and Their Universal Meanings* (Woodbury, MN: Llewellyn, 2015); Gustavus Hindman Miller, Linda Shields, and Lenore Skomal, *12,000 Dreams Interpreted: A New Edition for the 21st Century* (New York: Sterling, 2011).

Muslim also have all types of websites where they can have their dreams interpreted. I again list only three of them: (a) www.edreaminterpretation.org/islamic-dream-interpretation, (b) www.myislamicdream.com/, and (c) www.dreamislamic.org/. Movies and TV are filled with plots and stories about dreams and visions that create a curiosity and interest in this topic, while 1-900 psychics are willing to take your money as they give their interpretation of your dreams. The message from all this is "be warned." There are both God-given dreams and dreams that are inspired by Satan for the great controversy is played out in every area of life including a person's dreams.

6. Missiological Implications of Current Dreams and Visions among Muslims

Fortunately, the Seventh-day Adventist Church does not have to contend with the cessationist perspective that some denominations struggle with. White clearly demonstrated that God continued to send dreams, visions, healings, and other miraculous gifts long after the apostolic era. Instead, some in our church struggles with skepticism towards experience, some have Enlightenment and modern rationalistic thinking and a deistic perspective when it comes to things like dreams and visions. Yet, God continues to send dreams and visions to Muslims in great numbers. Randal Scott estimates that at least 50 percent of the Muslim background believers he met had received a God-given dream as part of their journey to faith in Jesus Christ.[21]

Then there is the passage in Acts 2:17, 18 that says, "In the last days, God says, 'I will pour out my Spirit upon all people. Your sons and daughters will prophesy. Your young men will see visions, and your old men will dream dreams. In those days I will pour out my Spirit even on my servants—men and women alike—and they will prophesy." If the last days started when Peter uttered these words, then we are in the last of the last days.[22] So there is strong contextual support—God is speaking to Muslims through dreams and visions and there is strong biblical support for what God is doing. The question that we as Adventists face is what are we doing to prepare our people to know how to interact and utilize what God is doing in the Muslim world in this area? Are we training our members so they know how to interact with Muslims who have had a dream of a man in white who tells them that he is "the way, the truth, and the light?" Do our members know what topics are

[21] Scott, "Evangelism and Dreams," 176.

[22] Johnson, "Biblical Theology of Dreams."

initially non-controversial and what topics to talk about with Muslims after relationships are established and the person's faith in Christ is growing?

7. Practical Suggestions

Scott found in working with Muslims in the Middle East that many of them readily talked with him about the spiritual dreams they had and their desire to know what God was saying to them through their dreams. Over the years, he realized that many of those who had a God-given dream about Jesus went through a three-phase process: (1) a mystery phase, (2) a meaning phase, and (3) a response phase.[23] He developed the following chart to illustrate these three phases from the biblical examples of God-given dreams.[24]

Dreamer (non-believer)	Mystery Phase	Interpreter (believer)	Meaning Phase	Did Dreamer obey?	Response Phase
Cupbearer and Baker Gen 40:1–23	Cupbearer dreamed of vines and wine; Baker dreamed of birds Eating bread	Joseph	The cupbearer is restored and the baker is executed	n/a	The cupbearer forgot about Joseph
Pharaoh Gen 41:14–43	Dreamed of cows and stocks of grain	Joseph	7 years of bounty followed by 7 years of famine	Yes	Pharaoh obeyed and thousands saved from famine
Nebuchadnezzar Dan 2:1–49	Dreamed of a huge image	Daniel	Predictions of future kingdoms and their glory	Yes	Nebuchadnezzar responded in praise of God and promoted Daniel

[23] Scott, "Evangelism and Dreams," 178.

[24] Ibid., 180.

Nebuchadnezzar Dan 4:10–37	Dreamed of large beautiful tree that is cut down to a stump	Daniel	The tree represented Nebuchadnezzar	No	Nebuchadnezzar was to humble himself and act justly. He refused, became insane and lost his kingdom for a time
Belshazzar Dan 5:1–30	Writing on wall with mysterious words	Daniel	Pending judgment for wickedness	n/a	No record that Belshazzar repented. Judgment came immediately
Saul of Tarsus Acts 9:1–26	Blinded by light and heard Jesus speak	Ananias	Told to go to Damascus and wait for instructions. Ananias explained the gospel	Yes	Saul called to repent and believe the gospel. He repented from persecuting followers of Jesus and became a believer himself
Cornelius Acts 10:1–48	In a vision, Cornelius was told to send for a man named Simon, but he did not know why	Peter	Peter explained the gospel	Yes	Cornelius and his family responded in faith to Peter's message and became followers of Jesus

Table 3. Examples of Believers Interpreting God-given Dreams and Vision for Non-believers

Dreams and visions are only the first step in a Muslim's journey to faith in Jesus Christ as his or her personal Savior and Lord. God still needs boots on the ground in most cases. Our people need to partner with what God does through dreams and visions; otherwise, many of those who receive a dream or vision of Jesus will never become committed followers.

How can we apply the three-phase process to ministry? First, by understanding these three phases, Adventists can be better prepared to respond when they hear that a Muslim friend or neighbor has had a dream. We know that God is not willing that any should perish (2 Pet 3:9), and this

understanding gives the Christian witness an advantage and helps them understand that maybe God sent the dream to move the person closer to God. The Bible has given believers information that God is compassionate and loves people even while they are living in sin. When believers understand God's great love for the lost they have an advantage for they know that God uses many means, even God-given dreams, to draw people to himself. So, when believers hear of a dream they do not start from zero, but with definite presuppositions that point to possible meanings and responses.[25]

Second, believers are promised the guidance of the Holy Spirit who gives discernment. "Discernment is informed and developed by a working understanding of scripture. While God's love for the non-believer is perfectly clear, the manner (or technique) in which God communicates or personalizes his love may not be."[26] Often in a dream or a vision "God is personalizing a message to the dreamer that will speak"[27] to the area of need, catch the person's attention, warn the person of danger, or turn the person from sin.[28] If you are unsure of the meaning of the dream, pray for wisdom and discernment. If you continue to draw a blank—pray. God will often give you wisdom and insight. Also ask the question: "How is God revealing his love for this person through this dream?" "How is the kingdom of God being revealed to the dreamer?" Ask a lot of questions. Listen to what the dreamer is saying and pray.

In May of 2012, I taught a group of church planters in Kyrgyzstan on this topic of dreams. We discussed how difficult it is to find the Muslims in society who are open to knowing more about the biblical Jesus. I suggested that one of the ways Adventists can find receptive people is to find those people God has blessed with a dream of Jesus. We worked together as a class to develop a plan. They committed to pray for a little Kyrgyz village for two or three weeks where they were presently studying with a family that was close to being baptized. At the end of the period of prayer they would go door to door and conduct a survey to find out if anyone had received what they believed was a God-given dream. The survey instrument was very simple, only asking the following questions:

Introduction: I am conducting a survey, looking for people who have had God given dreams. Would you be willing to answer a few questions?

[25] Scott, "Evangelism and Dreams," 181.

[26] Ibid.

[27] Ibid.

[28] Ibid.

1. Have you had what you believe is a God-given dream? ____Yes? ____No?
2. When did you have the dream?
3. Can you tell me a little about the dream?
4. What do you think the dream meant?
5. Do you know anyone else in your community who has had a God-given dream? ____Yes? ____No?
6. If yes, would you be willing to introduce me to that person?

The students who went door-to-door were amazed that the night before they conducted the survey God send a dream of a man in white to two of the families. I have never heard what happened after that, but if I was involved in witnessing in a Muslim context, I would definitely make dreams and visions a prominent part of my strategy. I would encourage all my members to pray that God would give a dream of Jesus to their Muslim friends and neighbors. I would encourage them to follow up by asking from time to time if they had received a God-given dream.

Dreams can never take the place of biblical revelation, but they illustrate the mighty power of the Holy Spirit drawing all people to a curiosity and hunger for the gospel message. Many of these spiritually hungry Muslim dreamers will never meet anyone who can explain to them the meaning of their dreams or the good news of salvation in Jesus Christ. Without gospel messengers on the ground, the dreamers will remain ignorant of salvation in Jesus. "How then shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed? And how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard?" (Rom 10:14, NKJV).

Finally, every group of Adventists working in a Muslim context should recruit and train a dream team. Help them review all the dream and vision stories in the Bible. Encourage them to watch the video entitled *More Than Dreams* where five Muslims tell their stories of how a dream of Jesus started them on a journey to faith in Jesus as their Lord and Savior and to go online and read other dreams stories. This is important to overcome the innate skepticism that seems to exist in many quarters of Adventism. Pray and seek God's wisdom in developing an approach to help them find those in their neighborhoods who have had a dream of Jesus, for such people seem to qualify as the person of peace of Luke 10. A possible approach may include a survey coupled with prayer as was done in Kyrgyzstan or it might be an ad in the newspaper or a sign with a telephone number encouraging anyone who has experienced a dream of a man in white to call. God is sending Muslims dreams of Isa; we need to find a way to help them along their journey so they can become committed disciples of Jesus Christ.

Journal of Asia Adventist Seminary 18.1–2 (2015): 93–102

THESIS AND DISSERTATION ABSTRACTS

Theological Seminary, Adventist International Institute of Advanced Studies

"The Relationship Between Divine Foreknowledge and Human Salvation: A Comparative Study Between Millard Erickson, Richard Rice, and Norman Gulley"

Researcher: Vasco Chinate, M.A., January 2015
Advisor: Remwil Tornalejo, Th.D.

This study explores the relationship between two main doctrines in Christian theology. The study seeks to establish the relationship between divine foreknowledge and human salvation in the theologies of three contemporary theologians: namely, Millard J. Erickson, Richard Rice, and Norman R. Gulley. To be able to accomplish its task, the work uses a descriptive comparison after describing the theology of each subject. The present work is structured into six chapters. After the introductory chapter, chapter 2 describes Erickson; chapter 3 describes Rice; and chapter 4 describes Gulley. Chapter 5 contains a descriptive comparison of the views of Erickson, Rice, and Gulley. Chapter 6 contains the summary and conclusion of the findings. In the process of data collection, the present work used primary sources.

It is evident that Erickson, Rice, and Gulley have a significant contribution in the theological discussion of divine foreknowledge and human salvation. Their theologies are directly shaped by their methods and presuppositions in such way that their conclusions, in reference to the subject in study, can be predetermined just by understanding their background and methods of doing theology. The results demonstrated that one's construction of God has a direct effect in how he/she perceives God's action in history.

Erickson, Rice, and Gulley agree through their theological construction that the Bible teaches divine foreknowledge and that it is because God has the knowledge of the future that the provision of salvation is made sure.

"The Last Adam as 'a Life-Giving Spirit' in 1 Corinthians 15:42-49"

Researcher: Warren Suya Simatele, Ph.D., February 2015
Advisor: Richard A. Sabuin, Ph.D.

In light of conflicting views regarding the background, interpretation, and the time when the last Adam became a life-giving spirit, one objective of this study was to show that the OT, more than any other historical source, provided the background for this difficult passage by Paul. The study also sought to determine the meaning of the last Adam as a life-giving spirit, and the exact time he assumed this role. The third objective was to draw theological implications of the passage that impinge on the believer's faith and practice today. Lastly, as one of its goals, the study suggested a literary structure for understanding the book of 1 Corinthians with the resurrection as the central message.

A wide range of sources were consulted during the process of the investigation. Articles from various journals, theological dictionaries, lexicons, commentaries, monographs, and other books that bear on the study invariably yielded relevant information which contributed to the development of the dissertation and ultimately to the conclusion reached. An exegetical study of the passage using the historical-grammatical method was undertaken to achieve the goal. The actual sifting of the text used such literary devices as comparative frames, natural information flow, the use of the coordinating conjunction ἀλλα, key words and phrases (e.g., πνευμα, ψυχη, ζωή, πνεῦμια ζῳοποιοῦν, γράμμα ἀποκτέννει, and πνεῦμα ζῳοποιει), and intertextuality.

The study identified seven arguments in support of the OT as the appropriate background of the text. The argument from grammatical parallels, argument from theological continuity with the OT faith on life after death, and argument from theological discontinuity with other historical interpretations supported the OT background. Other points in favor of the OT included the argument from Paul's own historical background, argument from his use of Scripture, argument from the linguistic difference in the usage of some terms, and argument from methodological differences between Paul and other historical interpretations.

For the meaning of the last Adam as a "life-giving spirit," the study spoke for the risen Christ. The grammar, context, and other interpretive devices favored this view. However, it was recognized that there is a sense in which the Holy Spirit plays a role in the Pauline passage, especially in the transformation of hearts and the building up of the eschatological body of Christ. Creative energy as an option was completely rejected unless it is connected to a divine being. Finally, theological implications covered such

themes as proctology, anthropology, ecclesiology, missiology, and eschatology.

"An Analysis of Empowerment and Effectiveness of Leadership: Towards the Development of Leadership Empowerment Training Program of Jakarta Local Conference of the Seventh-day Adventist Church"

Researcher: Maysony Leonard Situmorang, D.Min., February 2015
Advisor: Reuel Almocera, D.P.S.

Jakarta Local Conference (JLC) is the largest conference in West Indonesia Union Mission. It has 149 pastors, 40 pre-intern pastors, 152 churches, and 41 branch Sabbath schools. It is a big challenge to all the church pastors in JLC to nurture and to serve the church members with different education background, culture, and social status. In the last 2 years, it seems that there is a testing problem in JLC regarding the leadership of the pastors. There is a significant decrease in the number of baptisms since 2010.

The purpose of this study is to identify the potential cause of this problem and to develop an empowerment leadership training program for all the pastors in JLC in order to be effective ministers in their local churches. Before proceeding to the main parts, it first examines the biblical, theological, and theoretical foundations of leadership empowerment in pastoral ministry. In order to accomplish this purpose, the study first examined the geography, culture, and context of Jakarta. Secondly, through assessment survey, the study interviewed 44 church pastors who have served as a minister for less than 15 years. In this research, the spiritual and ethical leadership, visioning leadership, evangelism, and the art of delegation and communication are discussed as essential aspects in the empowerment leadership program. Based on the findings of this study, several effective suggestions, recommendations, and an intervention program regarding empowering leadership and church growth are proposed for the church pastors and leaders of JLC of the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

"A Study of the Doctrine of the Trinity in Seventh-day Adventist Theology and Roman Catholic Theology"

Researcher: Agenilton M. Côrrea, Ph.D, March 2015
Advisor: Oleg Zhigankov, Ph.D.

A common argument within some circles of Seventh-day Adventism is the suggestion that the denomination should return to the anti-trinitarian position of the early Adventist pioneers concerning the nature of God. The

argument is based on the assumption that the Adventist trinitarian position is the same as the Roman Catholic understanding of the Trinity. The present study examines and compares the doctrine of the Trinity between these two traditions.

This dissertation seeks to accomplish this goal by using the descriptive-analysis methodology. It compares and contrasts the concept of the Trinity as generally understood by Adventists and Roman Catholics. The descriptions of the trinitarian views of each church are based on primary sources drawn from the writings of significant theologians.

The introductory chapter defines the problem, purpose, significance, delimitations, and methodology of the dissertation. The thesis briefly summarizes the historical development of the doctrine of the Trinity in Christian theology from the post-apostolic period up the present. Chapters 2 and 3 analytically describe the respective Seventh-day Adventist and Roman Catholic doctrines of the Trinity. Each chapter seeks to identify their main philosophical presuppositions and hermeneutical determinants as related to their doctrines and concept of the Godhead.

Chapter 4 studies both the commonalities as well as the differences between the trinitarian theology of each tradition. The findings that emerged from Chapter 5 demonstrate that the source of this divergence lies in a different explanation about how to define God's reality. As a consequence, it is impossible to say that their understanding of the Trinity is identical. On the most basic level, both the Seventh-day Adventist and the Roman Catholic Church affirm the historic stance on the Trinity as three separate persons, while at the same time affirming the Jewish understanding of one God. Yet the ontological dimensions, particularly those developed by Roman Catholic theologians during the Middle Ages, demonstrate that their understanding of the Trinity is not the same. Thus, the arguments presented by fringe anti-trinitarian Adventists are unsubstantiated. The final chapter briefly summarizes the main points of the research and presents conclusions and recommendations for further study.

"Empowerment Leadership Program: Enhancing Workload Management Capabilities for Pastoral Leadership Effectiveness in North-East Tanzania Conference"

Researcher: David D. Mpwani, D.Min., March 2015
Advisor: Bienvenido G. Mergal, Ph.D.

Leadership is an important management function in the church. Hence, pastors play an important role in local church leadership. However, the

district pastors (DP) at North-East Tanzania Conference (NETC) have to take care of multiple churches with a ratio of one pastor to 1,539 church members. Considering the DP's workload in terms of administrative assignments, church programs, evangelism, visitation, pastoral care, social service, and personal family care, the DP at NETC seem to be overloaded with these responsibilities and thereby become less effective in their pastoral leadership. Moreover, due to lack of studies, the factors that foster pastoral leadership effectiveness (PLE) such as visioning, strategizing, delegating, listening, communicating, training, collaborating, serving, resolving conflict, assessing situations, growing spirituality, guiding, persuading, and organizing may not have been being observed at NETC. Hence, there is a need for an intervention program that will enhance the DP's workload management capabilities (WMC) to achieve PLE.

This study addressed the overall problems of DP at NETC by proposing empowerment leadership program. By getting the respondents' perceptions, the study examined (1) the extent of a district pastor's workload (DPW) in terms of administrative assignments, church programs, evangelism, visitation, pastoral care, social service, and personal family care; (2) the extent of DP's effectiveness; (3) the relationship between DPW and their PLE; (4) the significant difference in PLE when demographic profiles are compared; (5) the significant predictors for PLE; (6) the general view of the respondents on DPW for PLE; and (7) the proposed empowerment leadership program.

The study found that the overall extent of DPW was perceived to be *heavy* while the extent of DP's effectiveness was perceived to be *sometimes effective*. Using Pearson correlation coefficient, it was established that there is a moderate positive relationship between DPW and PLE. That is, there is a tendency for the DP to be less effective at their work once DPW increases. Using multiple regressions, DPW came out as the significant predictor for PLE. On DP's DPW to achieve PLE, the respondents viewed evangelism, delegating and training, fairness and equality, nature of work and the situation of the workplace, and the DP's growth as the main points that the NETC leaders and the DP have to consider. Furthermore, to enhance the DP's WMC for PLE, there was really a need for a contextualized program. This program is designed based on the findings of the study. Likewise, the biblical, theological, and theoretical principles were considered as foundational structure of the program in enhancing DP's WMC for effectiveness of pastoral leadership at NETC.

"The Resurrection of the Wicked: A Biblical-Theological Evaluation of Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox and Protestand Perspectives"

Researcher: Esso Jean Christian, Ph.D., May 2015
Advisor: Kyung Ho Song, Ph.D.

This study purposes to evaluate biblically and theologically the various views held by Roman Catholics, Eastern Orthodox, and Protestants on the resurrection of the wicked. Chapter 1 focuses on the background of the study and survey of relevant literature that was written on the resurrection of the wicked and various comparative studies done among major Christian traditions. Chapters 2, 3, and 4 present and analyze the views of Roman Catholics, Eastern Orthodox, and Protestants in a descriptive line.

Chapter 5 evaluates Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, and Protestant teachings of the resurrection of the wicked based on the biblical-theological perspectives offered. The evaluation reveals that these three traditions can be categorized into two main groups. The first group is the immortalist-monoresurrectionists which includes Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, and Protestant traditions (Lutheran, Methodist, Presbyterian, and Baptist to some extent). This group believes that there is only one single general resurrection of all the dead at the Second Coming (monoresurrection); the resurrection of the wicked is a literal bodily resurrection because the soul is immortal, and the resurrected body of the wicked is changed into immortal and incorruptible in order to endure endless (immortalist) punishment in the hellfire. This view hardly harmonizes with Scripture which rather supports the mortalist-polyresurrectionist view, the position that Seventh-day Adventist comes closer to. This second group believes in a two-phase resurrection where the resurrection of the wicked is separated from that of the righteous by a millennium. According to that position, the resurrected wicked with their unchanged state are simply annihilated by the hellfire that is the second death. Chapter 6 is allocated for the conclusion of the study with recommendations for further areas of study.

"The Pauline Concept of New Covenant and Its Ecclesiological Implications in Light of the Expression *diakonus kainēs diathēkēs* in 2 Corinthians 3:6"

Researcher: Angel Guzman, Ph.D., August 2015
Advisor: Richard A. Sabuin, Ph.D.

The aim of this dissertation is to highlight the exegetical and ecclesiological implications of the expression minister of the new covenant in 2 Cor 3:6 as

the exegetical and linguistic key for the understanding of the Pauline concept of new covenant. Most of the approaches to the covenant in Paul come from theological interpretations based either on the contrast between letter and Spirit (v. 6) or the figure of the veil of Moses (vv. 12-16). Through the expression minister of the new covenant, Paul defines the new covenant in light of his ministry and his ecclesiological understanding. The ecclesiological emphasis of the new covenant accurately fixes with the flow of Paul's rhetoric and the linguistic context of 2 Cor 3:1-18.

The methodology combines exegetical-historical analysis of the biblical text as well as the theological definition of the problem. In the first two chapters the historical positions, problems, current interpretations, challenges, and academic gaps of the problem investigation are presented. Then the next two chapters develop a wide exegetical analysis of the text and its context. The most basic context of the text is presented through the study of the covenant and new covenant in the Old Testament and Second Temple period literature. This deductive perspective of the background leads to the correct establishment of the Pauline frame of thought. The next chapter switches the emphasis to the inductive analysis of the passage within its New Testament and intertextual context. The investigation is made from the most important exegetical and linguistic flanks in order to have an objective result of the interpretation.

The main finding of the investigation is that Paul was not developing a doctrinal exposition about the new covenant in 2 Cor 3. He rather used several metaphorical and linguistic figures to define how the new covenant has affected his ministry and his definition of the church as people of God. Therefore, the main point of the passage is not what Paul said about the covenant, but what he said about his ministry and his ecclesiology using the Old Testament covenantal language.

"Developing Biblical Servant Leadership Course in the Context of Myanmar for Students of Myanmar Union Adventist Seminary"

Researcher: Thang Lam Mung, D.Min., October 2015
Advisor: Reuel Almocera, D.P.S.

A biblical leadership model is in great demand for Christian churches in Myanmar where the traditional hierarchical system is embedded in the society. The Seventh-day Adventist Church is no exception and has not been immune to the cultural influence. This crisis exists because there is a lack of evaluation within the church on its administration and leadership performance. Moreover, the administration of Myanmar Union Adventist Seminary, the only higher educational institution in the territory of Myanmar

Union Mission, seems to be paying little attention in developing students to be future church leaders. Offering only one leadership course for theology students to meet the significant challenge of the Adventist Church appears as an educational oversight.

There is then a need to introduce a biblical leadership model to the Adventist Church. In order to address the need, this study attempts to develop a biblical servant leadership course for students of MUAS. In doing so, documentary research and need assessment survey are utilized to evaluate the immediate context of the study.

In the survey, 53 individuals completed the survey questionnaires. The respondents include the MUAS church members, including former MUAS board chairpersons and members; current students and alumni of MUAS; and current administrators, faculty, and staff of MUAS. Almost half of the respondents are studying outside the country by the time they completed the survey questionnaires.

The survey data indicated that the Adventist Church leaders have a hard time to follow biblical leadership model because of the great influence of the long dictatorial rule in the country, which had changed the whole social system. According to the data, the leaders are strong in spirituality, but they struggle to practice biblical leadership principles. This survey affirms the need of introducing a biblical servant leadership course in MUAS.

This study culminates with a biblical servant leadership model that is designed for a teaching course, with the eight most dominant servant leadership characteristics that come out as a result of the survey. The characteristics include spirituality, love, humility, integrity and trust, vision, developing leaders, teamwork, and service. Each leadership characteristic serves as a topic of the lessons of the course.

"An Evaluation of the Planting of New Chinese Seventh-day Adventist Churches by the Chinese Ministry Center in Jakarta, Indonesia From 2009 to 2012"

Researcher: Heince Rusli, D.Min., October 2015
Advisor: James Park, Ph.D.

Church planting is the fulfillment of the great commission of Jesus Christ. By observing Jesus' and Paul's model and through health evangelism, the Chinese Ministry Center in Jakarta (CMC-Jakarta) has been reaching out to the Indonesian Chinese and has established 4 new Chinese SDA churches from 2009 to 2012. This significant increase led to this study evaluating CMC-Jakarta health program.

By getting the perceptions of the church members and the church regular visitors, this study determined (a) the principles of church planting in the book of Acts and by the modern church planters; (b) the historical background of the Chinese SDA work in Jakarta; (c) the significant factors used by CMC-Jakarta that have apparently contributed to the planting of 4 Chinese SDA churches for the year 2009 to 2012; (d) importance of the significant factors; (e) effectiveness of the significant factors; (f) other necessary things needed to be considered in preparing the program; and (g) the contextualized program for CMC-Jakarta ministry as a result of its evaluation.

The significant factors that have contributed to the success of the ministry have been identified as health message, healthy grocery store, church location, radio and television broadcasting programs, ethnicity, and higher organization. By using descriptive statistics, the overall perceptions of the church members and the church regular visitors on the level of importance and effectiveness of the significant factors were found to be *very important* and *very effective* respectively. The respondents believed that Bible study, visitation, sermon, training, book evangelism, wellness center, music, charity clinic, Mandarin service, and promotion should also be considered by CMC-Jakarta. Health message was found to be the most interesting part of the program. They believed that 2 hours was enough for the program and they preferred Bahasa Indonesian to be used in the program. Friends and healthy grocery stores were found to be useful tools to promote CMC-Jakarta. Most of the visitors have been attending the program for less than 1 year and others for 1 to 3 years. Most of the visitors were looking for the application of Bible teaching.

In general, the overall result of the evaluation pointed to the development of a more enhanced contextualized program for CMC-Jakarta ministry. The program is aimed to consider more needs of the Chinese to be able to reach out to them and share to them the Gospel. The program is expected to help the churches in District 16 and even Jakarta Local Conference in giving birth to more Chinese SDA churches in Jakarta.

"Honor and Shame: An Exegetical-Thematic Analysis of the Narrative of Hagar and Sarai in Genesis 16"

Researcher: Douglas O. Ochanda, M.A., November 2015
Advisor: Carlos Mora, Th.D.

The purpose of this study is to ascertain the identity of honor and shame values in Gen 16. The narrative presents nuances of honor and shame particularly in verse 4 and clause in verse 13b. Most scholarly discussions on the narrative have construed the narrative as (a) ethnographic, (b)

theological, (c) personal event, and (d) birth narrative. The preliminary analysis of the Pentateuch shows that in ANE, the identity of honor and shame formed a key component of social values.

The semantic field of the term קלל within the Pentateuch also impinges on the understanding of the characteristics of honor and shame. The lexical analysis within various contexts in the Pentateuch indicates possible connotations of the values of honor and shame in Gen 16. Lexical definitions offer a wide range of overlapping meanings for honor and shame in the narrative.

EDITORIAL POLICIES

1. Each article submitted to *JAAS* for publication should be original and unpublished. The author should supply an electronic copy as a Microsoft Word™ document file, via e-mail attachment. Each submitted article must be double-spaced and include an abstract (100–120 words) and a list of relevant keywords. At this time, *JAAS* publishes only in English.
2. *JAAS* follows the reference style and abbreviations indicated in Billie Jean Collins, Bob Buller, and John F. Kutsko, eds., *The SBL Handbook of Style*, 2nd ed. (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014), 68–104, 117–264, and thus each article submitted for publication in *JAAS* should conform to this style. When using Greek, Hebrew, or Aramaic in the article the use of Unicode Hebrew (e.g., SBL Hebrew or Cardo) and Greek (e.g., SBL Greek or Cardo) fonts is preferred. All other ancient Near Eastern languages should be transliterated, following the conventions in the *SBL Handbook of Style*, 55–67.
3. Each submitted article is sent anonymously to at least two specialists in their particular field. For this reason all identifying information (name of author, academic affiliation, physical and e-mail address) should be submitted to *JAAS* on a separate sheet. The criteria that determine the acceptance of the manuscript include (a) original contribution; (b) argumentation, logic, style; and (c) adequate documentation. A final decision on whether or not an article will be published in *JAAS* is made by the editors.
4. *JAAS* publishes four different categories of research: (a) major research articles (5,000–10,000 words); (b) short research notes (1,000–4,000 words); (c) AIIAS Theological Seminary thesis and dissertation abstracts; and (d) critical book reviews (500–1,000 words).
5. Critical book reviews are assigned by the book review editor. The bibliographic reference of the review should comply with the following layout:

   ***Title of book*, by author/editor. Trans. by [if applicable]. Name of series [if applicable]. Place: Publisher, year. Number of pages [Roman numerals + Arabic numbers] + bibliography/appendices/indices [Arabic numbers]. ISBN. Price [together with currency].**

   The book review should contain a brief and objective description of the content of the book which is then followed by critical interaction, an evaluation of the contribution of the volume, and the audience for whom it is most suited. A list of book review guidelines is available by request.
6. Each author (and book reviewer) will receive proofs in electronic format before the final publication of the issue which should be carefully reviewed.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICES

Annual Subscription (Philippines)		Annual Subscription (International)	
Individual:	PhP500.00	Individual:	US$30.00
Institutional:	PhP800.00	Institutional:	US$45.00

EDITORIAL CONTACT INFORMATION

Editor *Journal of Asia Adventist Seminary*
AIIAS
P.O. Box 038
Silang, Cavite 4118
PHILIPPINES

editor: *jaas@aiias.edu*
associate editor: *ogabasiane@aiias.edu*
book review editor: *petrea@aiias.edu*
subscription manager: *irya@aiias.edu*
journal exchanges: *jaas@aiias.edu*
http://www.aiias.edu/jaas

www.aiias.edu/jaas

Adventist International Institute of Advanced Studies Theological Seminary