

Brazil SotP 2019 Notes:

24. 2520 (Part 3) - (25-01-19)

We saw that the 2300 and the 2520 both take us to 1844 - Dan 8:14 and Lev 26:18-28 -> Hab 2:1-3

The verses are structured as if the 2nd punishment comes straight after the 1st, but that would be unfair. Before He punishes, He tests. We could say "Probationary time" instead of test.

Ch. 25 Punishment 1 Test Punishment 2 Ch. 25(vs 34 - 70 years)

So the whole of this language is couched in the captivity of God's people. We discussed the fact that in the NT all the 27 books (100%) are all to do with the captivity of God's people. The Gospel's are introduced with that imagery and backdrop. Whether it is the birth of Christ or the ministry of John the Baptist, they are connected to External events that are connected to the captivity of God's people. The last book - Revelation - is the Island of Patmos, and what is Patmos? An Island in the Mediterranean which was used as a prison island. So the NT begins and ends in captivity. You can read it in the backdrop of nearly every single book. Acts 27 is all about the captivity of Paul.

OT is 39 books = 60% captivity

This is what Lev. 26 is about. It is a prediction of the Babylonian captivity and I'm suggesting this is the original intent of Moses and it happened nearly a thousand years later.

Q. Isn't the 70 years just after the 490?

Remember that what I've done is give a stylised version of how the ch. is structured. I have said that the 490 doesn't end at vs. 18. What I want us to see is that this P 2 is connected to this time of probation. I'm not trying to line up the historical years, but trying to see it as a punishment that comes after testing.

When the Millerites approach this ch. what they decided to do was to take this 7 times and take the time to = a year. Therefore he said:

7 Times = 7 years

1 year = 360 days

360 x 7 = 2520

That is how Miller gets this number. What we understand is that when you start looking at these punishments, each of those verses and the punishment connected to it is associated with the reign of a king.

Manasseh Jehoiakim Jehoiachin Zedekiah

There are studies that go into the verses and show how you can link them to the reigns of those kings.

We know the punishment begins with Manasseh and we can bring it to a particularly year --> 677 BC

What the Millerites did was they realised that the punishment of God's people began with the punishment of Manasseh. What did EW say about that? She called it an earnest. PK 382.3

What does the word 'earnest' mean?

(S) Like a guarantee; down-payment; type

If we think about doing some kind of business deal we might think of it as a deposit. A deposit is a payment of money. If you make a \$1000 purchase you might give an earnest or deposit of \$100. \$100 is the same as a \$1000 --> They're both money.

Brother Gabriel told us that shaking hands was a guarantee of a contract. Or we have the Christian concept that my word is my bond or guarantee.

Mat 5:37 But let your communication be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil.

Jas 5:12 But above all things, my brethren, swear not, neither by heaven, neither by the earth, neither by any other oath: but let your yea be yea; and your nay, nay; lest ye fall into condemnation.

So what happened to Manasseh would happen to the last king - that they would be taken to Babylon.

(Student) Eph 1:14 talks of the HS being an earnest of our inheritance

Eph 1:14 Which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory.

Tell us what the earnest is, or guarantee or down payment?

What does vs. 14 tell us? I'll leave it because the Portuguese doesn't read the same as the English. But what it says is 'this thing is a guarantee of the inheritance that we are going to have. And this guarantee is going to be in place until the God has actually purchased this thing, which is to His glory. So whatever that thing is, it is the guarantee that we have this inheritance and that guarantee will remain until the thing has been purchased. So you see something in the shops - washing machine - and they only have 1 left and you don't have the money. You can get the money but he won't hold the washing machine for it. So you offer him the keys to your car which is worth much more. It isn't about some little deposit but a big issue. Now the important thing becomes the guarantee until you actually make the purchase. What is the purchase? What is the "which is":

(S) Holy Spirit; Gospel; Christ

I think it is the Holy Spirit but I'm open to correction

The most important thing is the HS and how that verse is being used. (Sister Rose) :

2Co 1:22 Who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts.

So we saw the word "earnest" and saw that Manasseh was the guarantee that this punishment was going to move forward. Then we went to his grandson (Josiah) and we read another quote from PK and here we have a prophet (Huldah) - the prophetess is going to tell him that whatever they do now is a punishment that can't be reversed. He still repents and tidies up the kingdom but it isn't going to have any effect. I just want to add (you can't prove this) but I think there is strong circumstantial evidence that this female prophet is the person who teaches and trains Daniel before he gets taken captive to Babylon... all in the same kind of time period. I think that is prophetically significant that the premier figure in the captivity story was trained by a female prophet who was the same prophet that dialogues with Josiah and explains to him what is about to happen.

So the Millerites are going to take this 677 and they are going to add 2520 and get to 1844. That is how they are going to use this chapter. They aren't going to do all the detailed work that we just did. It is worth studying Miller's material to understand his logic. We understand that this prophecy is part of a cluster. And that cluster (3 prophecies) is given on this chart. He bases it on 677, 457 and 538. They all end in 1843 that he is going to base his whole message upon. When we began to pick up this story about the 2520 14 years ago (around 2005) we researched the Millerite logic and basically accepted it. There is a bit more to the story that I will add later. but when we took up their logic and started promoting the 2520 we began to receive resistance from the church. They had a couple of arguments - 1 is grammatical or context, and the other is the argument that if it was such an important argument then why wouldn't EW mention it? You might be familiar with the 2nd argument but not the 1st. The 1st of grammar is basically the one we have been addressing here. We can break it down into 2 words: duration or intensity) or "time." Most SDA scholars say that this is intensity not duration and this movement has argued against the church on this issue for a number of years. I wanted to demonstrate how easy it is to come to an incorrect conclusion - at least what I think is incorrect. I'm assuming that a fair proportion of us in this room have never been confronted with these arguments. You know others have. But how would you describe what that "time" was? Intensity or duration? The church argues that it is intensity and we argue that it is duration... and we base that on the link to ch. 25 --> all connected to the yearly Sabbaths. I think I've demonstrated that ch. 26 is connected to ch. 25. It starts and ends with time. It is specifically connected with the land Sabbaths. We discussed that.

(Chimene) I understand the intensity, but when I look at the chart it says duration, and 2 Chron. says duration. So I am confused.

If you go to Lev 26:34 - begins with the word "then." What does that "then" place you

(C) To something previous - I guess vs. 33. It is previous

So sister C is saying that the "then" in vs. 34 is preceded by vs 18-33.

Vs. 34 says that "then the land will enjoy rest." When is that?

(C) ch. 25

Go to vs. 34... Then = "after this thing" - what will happen "after this thing?"

(C) The land will have its Sabbath

How will the land have its Sabbath? How? Why? What causes that?

(C) The people will be in captivity

So if you go to vs. 18, 21, 24, 28, do you see all the people being rounded up and sent into captivity? Do they all leave the land? In which curse? They don't leave in Manasseh. It can't start there. So vs. 34 doesn't go all the way back to vs. 18. If you read vs 28 it says what the punishment is and then afterwards describes that it looks like - they eat the flesh of their children. If you look at the context of this, when it says that they will eat the flesh, it is talking of the death of Zedekiah's children. vs. 30 --> All the places of their idol worship are going to be destroyed. vs. 31 --> All the cities will be laid waste. We read 2 Chron. 36:21- if we were to read vs. 19 we would see that they were to burn the house of God, the palaces etc. That is what happened in vs. 31. Vs. 32 speaks of desolation and the enemies will be surprised. Vs. 33 says that they will be scattered among the heathen or taken out of their land. Vs. 34 says that once they left they were to have the 70 years. So all I'm saying that at the end of all of this punishment that you have 70 years of captivity. Therefore all of 18 etc. is not duration but punishment after punishment that ends in a 70 year captivity that is based upon a 490 probationary time. The context of this is based upon ch. 25. But the 7 times is not duration. The chart doesn't talk about any of this information. You said that the chart is duration and that my demonstration is intensity. But I'm demonstrating what the verses teach.

Do you agree that the 2520 is not in Lev 26? You can't see that in the Hebrew.

(S) Where do you find the 2520?

On the chart - you don't find it in Lev 26.

(S) In Daniel 4 it says "7 times."

Daniel 4 is 2 words - 7 times. In Leviticus it just says "7" - they are not the same subject matter.

(S) 7 is a symbol of complete - oath - promise... but if we go to the rule of 1st mention is the 7 days of creation. So 7 is also associated with time. Also the history of Joseph could see the years.

He made it up, but he doesn't get a cow he calls 'year.'

(S) I want us to see that the number also means time.

Is that a correct use of the rule of 1st mention? The first mention of the word "seven"

Gen 5:7 And Seth lived after he begat Enos eight hundred and seven years, and begat sons and daughters:

Explain the use of 1st mention... This is the 1st use.

Gen 2:2 And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made.

So you want to connect 7th day with time. Another example...

Gen 3:22 And the LORD God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever:

This is the first mention of the word "hand." I'm going to use your system and what is that hand being used for? Picking fruit. So the symbol of hand = gardening? So every time you see hand does it mean gardening? Because when you took the word 7 you saw it in the 7 days of creation you want to say that 7 is to do with time.

(S) then how do we get the idea that 4 is destruction?

We see its contextual use. If you see the "7th" in 2:2 what happens? He ends his work. That is the symbol of completion that we already have. Not connected to the symbol of time, but to do with rest. It isn't to do with time. How you would prove that is that you should be able to get that concept and apply it every single time you apply the word 7. When you use the rule of 1st mention you have to be careful how you use it. What is the symbol of hand? Hand = Power It becomes the extension of your will. That is the proper use of 1st mention. 7 is a completion of a work - and even that is simplistic because creation was finished in 6 days not 7.

The other argument was that Joseph would say a cow = a year. That is like me saying that 7 Times is a year as well when everyone knows it doesn't mean year.

My question is à "What was Moses doing?"

What did Moses mean?

I'm well aware of those arguments that we use, but the way that they're given can look seductively charming. But on closer examination are they legitimate. If I have a theory that it was 2520 years I'm going to look in the Scriptures to try and defend and bolster it, and that is what we have done.

(S) What does this mean for us as a movement? We spend years/decades defending the application of duration. The point I get out of this is that the application was forgotten and brought back into focus by the movement, so we were making a strong point against the idea of intensity. So my question again - for us as a movement is how do we stand when we have made years of effort for having only the element of time.

Let me summarise the question: When we started discussing the 2520 (2005ish) the studies were relatively straight forward. What it essentially did was introduce the charts into this movement's message. I'm not saying that this is the 1st time we had awareness but they became a subject of conversation or controversy because we began to push them. We did that particularly because of the 2520. Not long afterwards another chart was introduced - the 1863 which was designed to counter what we were teaching. So when we started talking about the 2520 it caught people in the church by surprise and they began to investigate how this thing could have been missed for so long. The 1st thing people would do was to not only consult theologians but also the SoP. When they did that they realised that she never really mentioned this prophecy. So there was a discussion about her silence on this subject. We were forced to give a response to that. The 2nd line of attack was this theologian response and that was based upon grammar and how the structures of these verses are tied together and we began to fight on that issue. As you said we spent a lot of time doing that and today it really isn't an argument any more. Not it is used as a litmus test. No-body really argues whether it is true or false. They

just disfellowshipped you if you believe that - the arguments have been made. What are the implications of our self-awareness then about the last decade of fighting we have had? What do we do with that? My initial argument is that I have no idea. The 1st thing we need to assess is whether this is correct. We have a really bad habit, like most human beings, of wanting to know the consequences before we know what truth is. Most of us are unwilling to say whether it is duration or intensity until we know the consequences. That is a dangerous way to approach study as well as life.

Let me give a parable/story. You tell someone about the 2520. They say "that sounds interesting." What will they more than likely do? They will go their pastor and ask for an explanation. The pastor will say it is crazy and don't believe it because the consequences are bad. And what is our argument to the people? We would say 'you sinful selfish person' how dare you go to a man to understand the word of God. Read it for yourself. We need to consider the truth and not the consequences. But because we have this self-awareness that we are God's chosen movement we get worried about consequences.

I think it is a legitimate question - but also for the Adventist member to ask their pastor. But more often than not we chastise people for doing that. But we do exactly the same. I think the issue there is not doctrinal but philosophical.

My answer to brother G - is that I have confidence that whatever the truth is it will look good at the end, and it will look better than the position that we might be holding if it is incorrect. So if we say that this was all about duration and it looks good but is incorrect, and we say it is intensity it might be embarrassing and might hurt, but at the end we will come up with a much nicer and more comprehensive and sophisticated answer.

(S) Example of stones and temple... they were quarried.. Are we refining them?

We have this temple made of carefully put together stones in an intricate stones which we call a foundation. The way this has been put together has integrity. They fit together perfectly. I think what is behind the question is if we say that 7 times is not time but intensity does that move some of these blocks or did we see that we were forcing something in where it didn't fit.

The way I understand it is that we climb up this stepladder and stand on the platform. Looking down we see the pattern of the stones. It is almost like Ezekiel's vision of these wheels within wheels. It doesn't change what the pattern is. It is our sight of it. I don't think these questions rip up the foundations but that they explain them but in a way that describes what this pattern looks like and how they integrate and how they explain one another. If you've understood what I've said, I'm not arguing that anything on this chart is wrong. I fully believe in the Millerites authority to make application. What I'm questioning is that when we approach the problem our approach wasn't systematically done. We took their words and without considering them carefully we said that their understanding of Leviticus 26 was correct. It has ramifications about what we are doing in our present situation. I don't see this as undermining our foundations - but relabelling the pattern that we have observed. And things fit much better than you had thought. But before I should give such a defence, I think it more appropriate that we agree that it is intensity. In a group this size, if everyone is in the same standing, when we start talking about what the movement believes for this many people to agree on a complex subject such as this and if people are to bring questions and we are to answer them together, we could be all settled that

this is correct. And then we could come to an explanation of what it all means. But I think you can only do that honestly if you believe. If you don't then all you try to do is justify something - or as Elijah would say 'why halt ye between 2 opinions.'