

psychology and self-perception; and, in chapter 7, she discusses changes in consciousness and practice as Methodism entered the new century.

This book is a valuable study for students within Adventist studies, because it provides a new vignette and revisionist perspective to draw from for understanding Methodism; which is one of the significant and formative influences impacting the formation of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Perhaps what is most helpful is chapter 6 on the “culture of dreaming.” Many of the pioneers of Adventism had dreams that they understood as having spiritual significance. Wesley both affirmed the reality of supernatural events, yet denied assurance as to their interpretation beyond the dreamer’s own changed life; yet, dreams “constituted an absolutely vital unifying discourse” (227). Such dreams personified “heart religion” through emotion and action, with men and women viewing such dreams differently: male leaders viewed dreams as a way to allay anxiety, while female leaders viewed their dreams as visionary and telepathic, and as revelatory of their own inner natures (232). When male leaders gained prominence as circuit preachers, they interpreted fewer dreams, argues Mack, which she suggests reflects “pressure to present Methodism as a respectable movement” (243). Thus the most significant aspect of dreaming was “the power of dreams to generate individual reflexivity and to assist the religious seeker in shaping her own autobiography” (257).

Mack offers a compelling read into the ordinary men and women who embraced the Methodist project of self-transformation. In this journey, individuals, and notably women, had an opportunity to shape their response to life experiences. Methodist theology and discipline promoted a new self-awareness that earlier religious seekers could not have imagined (263).

Wichita, Kansas

MICHAEL W. CAMPBELL

Moore, Marvin. *The Case for the Investigative Judgment: Its Biblical Foundation*. Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 2010. Paper, \$19.99.

Marvin Moore, Editor of *Signs of the Times* magazine, has written more than thirty popular books on various religious subjects. His recent book, *The Case for the Investigative Judgment: Its Biblical Foundation*, is considered by the author to be “the most complex writing project I have ever attempted” (12). Moore devoted more than two years to researching and writing the book, during which time he digested the major monographs and doctoral dissertations written on the subject by Adventist scholars. This book is the author’s attempt to “bridge the gap between the scholar and the lay person” and “bring everything [on the subject] together in one place” (ibid.) so that readers can understand clearly the sanctuary and investigative judgment (16).

The first section of the book (chaps. 2-4) gives an overview of the biblical doctrine of the investigative judgment, shows its compatibility with

righteousness by faith, and notes its contribution to the overarching Great Controversy theme in Scripture. A second section (chaps. 5-7) surveys the history of the development of the investigative-judgment doctrine from its Millerite roots to its present-day understanding, while acknowledging a growth in understanding of the topic and including a review of notable critics of this foundational doctrine and Adventist responses to such criticism.

The succeeding sections of the book explore issues in Daniel 7 (chaps. 8-11), Daniel 8 (chaps. 12-17), the investigative judgment and the sanctuary (chaps. 18-22), issues in Daniel 9 (chaps. 23-27), and issues in Hebrews (chaps. 28-33). Moore then provides some concluding thoughts regarding Ellen White and the investigative judgment, gives a synthesis of the doctrine, and suggests ways in which the investigative judgment is relevant for today (chaps. 34-36). An epilogue presents Moore's personal conviction after his thorough review of the biblical evidence: "the basic framework of our historic teaching about the investigative judgment truly is biblical—and it makes sense" (346).

Moore is to be commended for wading through scores of scholarly studies on the subject of the investigative judgment, synthesizing the material, and making it understandable to the average educated layperson. His summaries of the biblical arguments of various Adventist scholars are generally accurate and clearly presented. He has been especially helpful in clarifying how the investigative judgment is not in contradiction with righteousness by faith and does not rob the believer of the assurance of salvation. Although recognizing our accountability in the judgment and the need for God's people "to be loyal—to *commit* to obey Him and to *try* to obey Him" (30), he makes clear that "In the judgment, the standing of those who are saved will always be based upon their being covered with Christ's righteousness, never upon their own success in obeying God's laws" (33).

Moore also makes a special contribution by emphasizing the role of Satan as the "Accuser of the brethren" in the judgment and by highlighting issues of theodicy (the justification of God). He shows how the investigative judgment is not for the sake of informing God (who already knows who are his), but to reveal to the unfallen heavenly intelligences the truth about his people, vindicating them (and thus himself) against the charges of Satan. "The reason why those who have accepted Jesus as their Savior need have no fear of the judgment is that Jesus, their Mediator, is responding to every one of Satan's accusations against them" (46). In the investigative judgment, God is shown to be fair, reasonable, just, and on the side of his people!

The average (motivated) reader should be able to clearly follow the various exegetical steps taken by Moore as he works his way through the issues in Daniel 7-9, which are seen in light of the sanctuary services described in the Pentateuch. More advanced students of Scripture will also benefit by seeing the various pieces of the sanctuary puzzle brought together to form the complete picture. Moore marshals powerful biblical evidence to support the

various interlocking parts of the investigative-judgment doctrine, including points such as the basic hermeneutical principles of historicism and the year-day principle; the reference to Rome (pagan and papal) in the little horn of Daniel 8, and not Antiochus Epiphanes; the general pre-Advent timing of the investigative judgment, according to Daniel 7; the specific timing for the end of the 2300-day prophecy and commencement of the investigative judgment (22 October 1844), according to Dan 8:14 (utilizing the same starting date for the seventy-weeks prophecy of Dan 9:24-27); the identity of the sanctuary as the heavenly sanctuary in Daniel 8; and the polyvalent meaning of the “cleansing” of the sanctuary, which includes especially the vindicating of the saints against the false charges of Satan.

Moore also provides popular access to new exegetical data that have been forthcoming in Adventist scholarship in the last few years regarding the book of Hebrews. Most Christian scholars dealing with Hebrews claim that the various “entrance” passages in Hebrews (e.g., 6:19-20; 9:12; 10:19-20) refer to Christ’s entering into the heavenly Most Holy Place to engage in his antitypical Day of Atonement work. If this interpretation is correct—that Christ, already in the first century, started the antitypical Day of Atonement, then there is little or no room for the Adventist understanding of the antitypical Day of Atonement beginning on 22 October 1844. Moore responds to this problem by synthesizing the work of several Adventist scholars, showing that, according to Hebrews, Christ entered the heavenly sanctuary at his ascension to *inaugurate* its services, not to begin his Day of Atonement work. The book of Hebrews presents Christ’s work of investigative judgment of God’s professed people as still future from the perspective of the first century, in harmony with the typology of Leviticus and the prophecies of Daniel and Revelation.

There are a couple of additional pieces of the investigative-judgment puzzle that I wish Moore had been able to include in his study. One is the striking evidence throughout Scripture of God’s regular procedure of conducting an investigative judgment (legal trial proceedings, often termed by scholars as a covenant lawsuit), starting already in Eden (Genesis 3) and evident before God’s executive judgment at the flood (Genesis 6), the Tower of Babel (Genesis 11), and the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah (Genesis 19). There are actually more than two hundred examples of a divine investigative judgment in Scripture, and most of the time the result of the judgment brings vindication of God’s people! If God regularly conducts an investigative judgment before his executive judgment; if he regularly opens the books, as it were, to show that he has done all he can to save all that he can, and that his people stand vindicated against the accusations of their enemy—then it should not be at all surprising to find a final investigative judgment at the end of history to vindicate God’s people against Satan’s accusations.

Another piece of the puzzle that I miss in Moore’s study is the evidence showing that the investigative judgment is only one part of a multiphase

theology of judgment in Scripture. An important study by Jiří Moskala has shown that there are actually seven phases of divine judgment in salvation history, each rooted in the judgment at the cross, and each having a different purpose in revealing the truth about God and his people to a different audience! (“Toward a Biblical Theology of God’s Judgment: A Celebration of the Cross in Seven Phases of Divine Universal Judgment: An Overview of a Theocentric-Christocentric Approach,” *JATS* 15/1 [2004]: 138-165). Moore’s discussion does uphold the cross and the gospel in presenting the investigative judgment, but it could have been strengthened by pointing to this sevenfold cross-centered development of the theology of judgment in Scripture.

Some of the interpretations included in Moore’s book are his own suggestions of how to reconcile difficult biblical data. For example, the book of Hebrews, on one hand, presents Christ as “sitting at the right hand of Majesty/God” (Heb 1:3, 13; 8:1; 10:12; 12:2), presumably on his throne in the Most Holy Place, while at the same time Christ intercedes in the “Holy Place” (Heb 7:25). Furthermore, Dan 7:9-10 implies that both the Father and the Son move to a new location for the commencement of the investigative judgment. Moore attempts to reconcile these seemingly contradictory portrayals by suggesting that (1) the heavenly sanctuary is not divided by a veil into two compartments (Holy Place and Most Holy Place), but rather is comprised of a single throne room; and (2) this heavenly throne room has two parts. “Each one can be considered heaven’s Holy Place, and each can also be considered heaven’s Most Holy Place” (282). Moore acknowledges the tentativeness of his proposal, asking: “Is this what heaven is really like? I don’t know; it’s just a suggestion” (*ibid.*). An intriguing suggestion! But I’m not sure all will be convinced of its cogency (I am not . . . yet!). I agree with Moore that “it’s a mistake for us to argue overly much about heavenly architecture” (282). At the same time, I think we also agree that, in opposition to the view of much of the Christian world that still accepts the Platonic notion of a God who has no form and does not dwell in space and time, the Bible insists upon the spatiotemporal reality of the heavenly sanctuary.

Despite the few additional points that I might wish to be included in this book, and the few areas where arguments might have been stated more precisely (from a scholarly point of view), overall I believe this book has immense potential for dispelling doubts and questions about the Adventist doctrine of the investigative judgment. I consider this book the best synthesis of the major biblical arguments in favor of the investigative judgment, and highly recommend it to scholars and laypersons alike, both to those who are Seventh-day Adventists and to those of other Christian traditions who wish to read an evenhanded treatment of this foundational, distinctive doctrine of the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

Andrews University

RICHARD M. DAVIDSON