

“Watchman, what of the night ?”



“The hour has come, the hour is striking, and striking at you, the hour and the end!” Ezekiel 7:6 (Moffatt)

► THIS ISSUE'S READING

**“THE TRUE HISTORICAL
FOUNDATION OF THE
SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST
MOVEMENT'S SANCTUARY
DOCTRINE”** pg. 2

Editor's Preface

In the last issue of WWN (# 62), we set forth the primary biblical order and significance of the “judgment” scene introduced in the prophecy of Daniel, Chapter 7. Beginning in verses 9-10, we noted that:

“It was the sitting of the Ancient of days that set the judgment and caused the books to be opened. To this session were called the angelic hosts. For what purpose? ... Too often, we have pictured the assembled hosts of heaven as merely 'traffic cops' verifying the citations they gave to the speedsters of earth on the highway of life. There are other questions of far more import involving man ... ”

With this bimonthly's thought paper, we are going to take a closer look into the historical understanding that actually formed the basis of the Adventist sanctuary truth. As the above idiomatic expression indicates, we have had a tendency to view the final atonement as “the assembled hosts of heaven ... merely ... verifying the citations they gave to the speedsters of earth” like some kind of 'celestial' “traffic cops.” Of course, this is referring to our comprehension of what we have termed “the investigative (or pre-advent) judgment.” For the record, Daniel 7: 9-10 does indeed envision a heavenly courtroom session, presided over by Our Heavenly Father, which seating caused the books to be opened in view of the assembled angelic hosts for an investigation of the contents in a judgment setting.

The purpose of this write-up is to examine the historical and theological evidence concerning the primary meaning of this heavenly tribunal. Many have come to believe that the final atonement is merely a final verification of humanity's salvific status.



“ THE ‘ROOTS’ OF THE SANCTUARY TEACHING ”

On September 5, 1822, William Miller signed a statement of 20 beliefs which constituted his faith. Article XV read – “I believe that the second coming of Jesus Christ is near, even at the door, even within twenty-one years, — on or before 1843.”¹ In so concluding, Miller had studied carefully various prophecies of the Bible. He found seven line prophecies which by applying the Biblical rule – a prophetic day equals one literal year – terminated in 1843 according to his calculations. (Arasola, *The End of Historicism*, Appendix III, pg. 220).² One of these seven was Daniel 8: 14. Connecting this prophecy with the explanation given by Gabriel (Ibid. 9: 24-27) he began the prophetic reckoning from 457 B.C. with the terminus date, 1843.

As the year commenced, Miller detailed the time more specifically. In the Millerite movement's flagship publication, *Signs of the Times* (January 25, 1843), he wrote:

“I believe the time can be known by all who desire to understand and to be ready for his coming. And I am fully convinced that some time between March 21st, 1843, and March 21st, 1844, according to the Jewish mode of computation of time, Christ will come, ... ”³

When the date March 21, 1844, passed and Christ did not come, Miller wished to keep the return of Christ imminent, with no specific date set. Not so, many of his supporters. Dr. Kai Arasola, in his doctoral dissertation submitted to the Theological Faculty of the University of Uppsala notes the results which followed:

“In February 1844 two men, Samuel Snow and George Storrs began promoting a typological solution to the problem of time. By the summer of 1844 they had concluded that October 22, 1844 was the exact date of the end and in an August camp meeting they attained massive support for their calculations against feeble polemic by Miller and his associates. They thus launched the final fervent phase of

the revival, called the “seventh-month movement” or the “midnight cry.” In its exegesis as well as in its emphasis this stage of Millerism has to be distinguished from the earlier revival. Snow and Storrs boosted the revival off to its Waterloo.

“Literature on Millerism shows a general confusion in interpreting this stage of the revival. Miller is unfairly blamed for the failure of the October calculation in spite of his remaining unsympathetic to it, except for a fortnight before the disappointment. A comparison between Miller's exegesis and that of the seventh-month movement compels one to make a clear separation between original Millerism and this last stage of the revival. The seventh-month movement singled out one of Miller's many arguments and exegeted it with a method different from Miller's. Traditional historicist expositions, developed and advocated by Miller, became secondary to sanctuary typology. The Levitical festal calendar was promoted by implication as the most important prophecy in all of the Bible.

“The basic method remained unchanged while emphasis changed. Because the former leaders of the movement were no longer in control, as the arguments of Snow and Storrs swayed the faith and the emotions of the group, this interval in Millerism has been called a sectarian turn. The adoption of an exact date was a built-in explosive for the revival. During the late summer and early autumn the commitment, zeal, sacrifices, and number of supporters exceeded everything that had been seen so far in the history of this revival. The gravity of disappointment was to match the enthusiasm of expectation. As the morning of October 23 dawned it was again true that ‘the hour knoweth no man.’ Millerism had come to an end. As it died it gave birth to Adventism.” (Arasola, *The End of Historicism*, pgs. 16-17).⁴

Arasola in his research presses this point. In a footnote he states – “The birth of Seventh-day Adventism was dependent on the Seventh-month movement” (Ibid., pg. 90).⁴ This move-

ment was not led by William Miller but rather by Samuel Snow and George Storrs. The first thing that Snow did was to straighten up Miller's error in his calculation of the time prophecies such as the 2300 days. Miller had "overlooked the non-existence of a year zero, which (as Arasola further comments) indicates that no Millerite before 1844 did his home work thoroughly" (Ibid., pg. 144).⁴ Secondly, Miller himself had introduced a year earlier, in May 1843, the idea borrowed from Joshua Spalding that –

"All the ceremonies of the typical law that were observed in the first month, or vernal equinox, had their fulfillment in Christ's *first* advent ...

"The feasts and ceremonies in the seventh month or autumnal equinox can only have their fulfillment at his second advent." (Ibid., pg. 154).⁴

Applying this to the year, 1844, Snow was able to establish the 10th day of the 7th month, October 22, 1844, as the time of the Second Advent. Thus the typology of the Old Testament and the prophecy of Daniel 8: 14 were fused. To this horizontal typology, Adventism would add the vertical typology as found in the book of Hebrews.

In his research, Arasola devoted a brief section to New Testament typology bringing both, the horizontal and vertical together. He wrote:

"The typology of the New Testament is both horizontal, referring to historical fulfillments, and vertical, illustrating things considered as heavenly realities. ... 1 Corinthians 10: 6, 11 (is cited). ...

"It was this horizontal typology that Snow employed in his calculations of the day of the end. Some of the clearest examples of vertical typology are found in the book of Hebrews. Modern scholarship usually disassociates itself strongly from this form of typology. ...

"The New Testament thus sowed the seeds for both historical and heavenly antitypes. ...

"During the period of Protestant orthodoxy 'Types were regarded as OT facts which were

ordained by God to adumbrate or foreshadow aspects of Christ or the Gospel in the NT.' ...

"It is still regarded as the true concept on the subject by many with a Biblicist view of the Scriptures." (Ibid., pgs. 162-163).⁴

THE MORNING AFTER

October 22, 1844, passed, and Jesus did not come as expected; however, when the day arrived, groups had gathered in different homes to await His coming. One such group was at Port Gibson, New York, at the farm home of Hiram Edson, a mile south of the community. Closely associated with Edson, was Dr. Franklin B. Hahn who lived some fifteen miles southwest of Port Gibson. These two men had between them provided a home for an orphan boy named Owen R. L. Crosier. He was now in his early twenties and showed talent in research and writing. During 1844, Edson and Hahn published irregularly a paper, *The Day Dawn*, for which they invited Crosier to write.

When midnight passed, and Jesus did not come, doubts were expressed by some of the group: "Was the Bible false? Could it be there is no God?" To this Edson responded:

"Not so, brethren," ... "There is a God in heaven. He has made Himself known to us in blessing, in forgiving, in redeeming; and He will not fail us now. Sometime soon this mystery will be solved. We shall know what God's purpose is, and this dark secret shall be made as plain as day." (A. W. Spalding, *Origin and History of Seventh-day Adventists*, Vol. 1, pg. 99).⁵ (Spalding then continues the narrative) –

"As the dawn came most of the believers slipped away to their now desolate homes. To those who remained, Hiram Edson said, 'Let us go out to the barn and pray.' ...

"After breakfast Edson said to one who remained (some say it was Crosier), 'Let us go out to comfort the brethren with this assurance.' Perhaps because it was a short cut to their first destination, perhaps because they shunned the road, where they might meet mocking enemies, they struck back through the farm, crossing a field where Edson's corn

still stood in the shocks. About midway across the field Hiram Edson stopped as if a hand had been placed on his shoulder. As he lifted his face to the skies, there flashed upon his understanding the meaning of the sanctuary in heaven. Recalling the arrangement of the Mosaic sanctuary, he saw it as a type of the sanctuary in heaven, and realized that as Christ was the minister of the heavenly sanctuary, His ministration would change in due course of time from the holy place to the most holy. He wrote of this occasion: 'I saw distinctly and clearly that instead of our High Priest coming out of the most holy of the heavenly sanctuary to come to this earth on the tenth day of the seventh month, at the end of the 2300 days, He for the first time entered on that day the second apartment of that sanctuary; and that He had a work to perform in the most holy before coming to this earth.'

"His companion, not noticing his pause, had reached the other side of the field. At the fence he turned, and seeing Edson far behind, he called, 'Brother Edson, what are you stopping for?' And Edson replied, 'The Lord was answering our morning prayer.' Then, rejoining his friend, he told him of his conviction. They went on their way, discussing the subject, recalling what little study they had made of the sanctuary, and shaping up the Bible evidence of the revelation.

"Without doubt Edson and his company had received the new view of the sanctuary, as being in heaven, which came with the seventh-month movement." (Ibid, pgs. 99-102).⁵

Spalding cites various publications available to the Port Gibson group which advocated "the seventh-month movement" and comments:

"Edson and his friends were doubtless in great debt to Fitch, Snow, and others who had begun to study the sanctuary question and who had led in the great step forward of correctly identifying the sanctuary. With the background of this advanced position, the gap between the early Adventists' understanding of the sanctuary and that revealed in Edson's

vision, which became the Seventh-day Adventist position, was lessened." (Ibid., pg. 102).⁵

This harmonizes with the research of Dr. Arasola as to the roots of Seventh-day Adventism being in the seventh-month movement, rather than in the original Millerite movement. In fact, Arasola states that "in Miller's view the sabbatarian Adventists who kept hold of the seventh-month movement exegesis were illegitimate children of Millerism" (Arasola, *The End of Historicism*, pg. 19).⁶ Actually, all that Seventh-day Adventism has taken from Millerism is the time prophecy of Daniel, Chapters 8 & 9, and that as corrected by Samuel Snow. The basic sanctuary teaching came out of the seventh month movement which was led by others than Miller. To this was now added the vertical typology set forth in the book of Hebrews, that the "priests" of the earthly "serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things." (Hebrews 8: 5).

Recognition of this basic split which came the "morning after" is critical if we would understand our spiritual heritage — the origins of the Adventist church were rooted in the 'seventh-month movement' rather than in Millerism.

The days following the "morning after" found Hiram Edson, Dr. Hahn, and Crosier in some serious study of the typical sanctuary and how it related to the reality of Christ's ministry. Finally, in 1846, an article by Crosier appeared in the *Day Star Extra* summarizing their study.⁷ In 1850, a Publishing Committee headed by Hiram Edson and including James White published a 48-page special of *The Advent Review*. The final article was Crosier's study taken from the *Day Star Extra*. In 1853 a leaf was tipped into all unsold copies of this 1850 48-page pamphlet. It was written by James White. The last paragraph read:

"The article on the sanctuary, by O. R. L. Crosier, is excellent. The subject of the sanctuary should be carefully examined, as it lies at the foundation of our faith and hope."

Why, this noting of the various dates bring-

ing us up to 1853? This was the ninth year of "the morning after" the great disappointment, and there had not been a suggestion of an investigative judgment in connection with 1844. That was still four years away. Don F. Neufeld, associate editor, wrote in the *Adventist Review* (February 14, 1980),⁸ – "it required some 13 years after the passing of time in the autumn of 1844 before the subject of the investigative judgment was fully developed" (pg. 14). He counseled – "One should not, therefore, equate the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary with the investigative judgment." (pg. 15). Into this picture must also be introduced a paragraph from a letter written by Ellen G. White to Eli Curtis, April 21, 1847. It read:

"I believe the Sanctuary, to be cleansed at the end of the 2300 days, is the New Jerusalem Temple, of which Christ is a minister. The Lord shew (sic) me in vision, more than a year ago, that Brother Crosier had the true light, on the cleansing of the Sanctuary, &c; and that it was his will, that Brother C. should write out the view which he gave us in the *Day-Star, Extra*, February 7, 1846. I feel fully authorized by the Lord, to recommend that *Extra*, to every saint." (*A Word to the Little Flock*, pg. 12).⁹

The first obvious fact is that the "true light" Crosier presented focused on "the cleansing of the sanctuary" and made no reference to an "Investigative judgment." But how much is to be included in the words "the Sanctuary, &c," especially the "&c."? There can be no question that the identification of the sanctuary was the differing point between Miller and those who enlarged on the 'seventh-month' views both before and after October 22, 1844. To this issue, – to what is the word, "sanctuary" applied in the Bible – Crosier devoted the first part of his article.

THE CROSIER ARTICLE⁷

Crosier began his analysis by declaring, "The Sanctuary was the heart of the typical system," and then observes that while in the Old Testament the term, "Sanctuary" is applied to "several different things," the New Testament

applies the term "only" to the typical tabernacle built by Moses, and the tabernacle "which the Lord pitched, and not man." (Hebrews 8: 2).

There is in the New Testament a concept which Crosier overlooked. While not called "the sanctuary," the concept is projected. John, in the prelude to his Gospel, presents the incarnate Word as becoming a "tabernacle." The Greek text reads literally – "The Logos flesh came to be and tabernacled (ἐσκήνωσεν) in us (ἐν ἡμῖν). Paul, speaks of the true Christian as "the temple of the living God" and recipient of the promise, "I will dwell in them and walk in them" (2 Corinthians 6: 16; see also 1 Corinthians 3: 16). The wilderness sanctuary not only prefigured the Word becoming flesh; but also the revelation through which "God desired His people to read His purpose for the human soul." (Ed., pg. 36).¹⁰ Is not this, that which is in need of the most cleansing? Have we, as well as Crosier, overlooked the point that the services of the sanctuary were an "example" (ὑποδείγμα – Hebrews 8: 5) and "pattern" (ὑποδείγμα – Hebrews 9: 23, same Greek word in both passages); as well as a "figure" (παραβολή – Hebrews 9: 9) of that redemption?

The second section of the article considers "The Priesthood of Christ." He introduced the section by stating:

"The priesthood of the worldly Sanctuary of the first covenant belonged to the sons of Levi; but that of the heavenly, of the better covenant, to the Son of God. *He fulfils (sic) both the Priesthood of Melchisedec and Aaron.*" (Emph. his).

Crosier's emphasis dare not be overlooked. Christ was of the first – the Melchisedecian while the second – the Aaronic – was the "example and shadow" of that priestly ministry. Citing the admonition given to Moses – 'See that thou make all things according to the pattern showed to thee in the Mount', He emphasized:

"None can deny that, in obedience to this admonition, Moses made or instituted the Le-

vitical priesthood; it was then "according to the pattern" which the Lord showed him, and that pattern was of heavenly things, Hebrews 9: 23. If there was not another text to prove that the Levitical priesthood was typical of the Divine, this would abundantly do it. Yet some are even denying this obvious import of the priesthood; but if this is not its import, I can see no meaning to it. It is [then] an idle round of ceremonies without sense or use; ... *but looked upon as typical of the heavenly*, it is replete with the most important instruction. As this is the application made of it in the New Testament, so we must regard it, while we examine the atonement made under the Levitical priesthood." (Emph. his).

Following the New Testament application, Crosier examined the atonement, dividing it by the terms, "daily" and "yearly," or "Individual" and "national." He began his discussion of the daily atonement with the morning and evening sacrifice as defined in Exodus 29: 38-42. There is a linguistic connection between this text and Daniel 8: 14. The latter – "Unto two thousand and three hundred days, then shall the sanctuary be cleansed" – is an answer to a question with three parts – "How long the vision, the daily, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot?" (ver. 13). The word, "daily" (Hebrew – תָּמִיד, *Tamid*) is first used in the Bible in Exodus 29: 38-42, and translated either as an adjective, "continual," or as an adverb, "continually," in Exodus.

Here is where the problems begin. In passing from the morning and evening sacrifice to the individual sin offering, Crosier failed to differentiate between the high priest who ministered the blood of the sin offering of confession for the congregation, and the common priest who ministered the atonement of forgiveness for the individual. In so doing he has the blood taken into the Holy Place in all instances. He entirely overlooks the placing of the blood on the horns of the Altar of Burnt Offering in the Court, and concludes that

come the Day of Atonement "the entire work of cleansing the Sanctuary was performed within the tabernacle," which was not the case in the type.

Further, Crosier believed that by this blood "the iniquity was communicated to the sanctuary." He did not perceive that the sin was already on record, and having been brought to the consciousness of the sinner, he responds by confession and seeking forgiveness. Instead of defilement resulting, Jesus said there was "joy . . . in heaven over one sinner that repenteth" (Luke 15: 7). The repenting sinner remained defiled by his uncleanness, but the type indicated that the Day of Atonement was for removal of the uncleanness of the Children of Israel. Crosier's misinterpretation of the type was carried forward into Adventist theology, and gives us the problem as footnoted in PP., p. 354.¹¹

Further, while recognizing that an atonement was involved in the daily ritual on behalf of the individual, Crosier contrasts between the "forgiveness of sins" and the "blotting out" of sin:

"The atonement is the great idea of the Law, as well as the Gospel; and as the design of that Law was to teach us that of the Gospel, it is very important to be understood. [*To this we can say, 'Amen'*] The atonement which the priest made for the people in connection with the daily ministrations was different from that made on the tenth day of the seventh month. In making the former, they went no further than in the Holy; but to make the latter they entered the Holy of Holies – the former was made for individual cases, the latter for the whole nation of Israel collectively – the former was made for the *forgiveness of sins*, the latter for *blotting them out* – the former could be made at any time, the latter only on the tenth day of the seventh month. (Emph. his).

In this conclusion, Crosier fails to recognize that in the typical provision for forgiveness, there was for Israel collectively a ministrations by the High Priest in which the blood was taken into the Holy Place; and also a ministrations

for individuals by the common priests in which the blood was marked on the Altar in the Court. See again Leviticus, Chapter 4. In the reality, the same blood that provided forgiveness by the Cross, is the same blood that Jesus as High Priest ministers in the heavenly. (Hebrews 9: 23-24).

Using his contrasting picture between the "daily" and the "yearly," Crosier challenges the teaching that "the atonement was made and finished on the Cross." Here we come to the core of the ongoing current problem involving the doctrine of the Sanctuary. If the atonement was "made and finished" at the Cross, the final atonement is meaningless. If, as the type presents two atonements, one resulting in forgiveness, the other in cleansing, there is a dual atonement flowing from the death of Jesus on Calvary.

It should be obvious, even to a casual observer that we have some things to learn as well as things to unlearn in order to bring our concepts of the heavenly in line with the type which God gave to Moses as an "example and shadow" of those heavenly things. But in so doing, there is neither the need to ignore nor to discard the doctrine of the sanctuary which was basic to original Seventh-day Adventism. It should also be recognized that not once during the time of "the basic roots" is there even suggested the concept of "an investigative judgment." The original emphasis was "the cleansing of the sanctuary" as it related to the atonement. ❖ **WHG (GLP)**

1. Sylvester Bliss, *Memoirs of William Miller* (Boston, MA: Published by Joshua V. Himes, January 1853 - A signed

and dated "compendium of [William Miller's] belief, Low Hampton, Sept. 5, 1822"), 79. <https://archive.org/details/memoirswilliamm00blisgoog/page/n95/mode/2up>

2. Kai Arasola, *The End of Historicism* (Uppsala, Sweden: Department of Theology, Uppsala University - Datum Publishing, Sigtuna 1990), 220.

3. Joshua V. Himes, *The Signs of the Times* (Boston, MA: Vol. 4, No. 19, "Synopsis of Miller's Views" - January 25, 1843, HST # XIV), 147.13. <https://m.egwwritings.org/en/book/1656.3780?hl=january+25%2C+1843>

4. Kai Arasola, *The End of Historicism* (Uppsala, Sweden: Department of Theology, Uppsala University - Datum Publishing, Sigtuna 1990), 16-17, 90, 144, 154, 162-163.

5. Arthur Whitefield Spalding, *Origin and History of Seventh-day Adventists*, volume 1 (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1961), 99, 99-102, 102.

6. Kai Arasola, *The End of Historicism* (Uppsala, Sweden: Department of Theology, Uppsala University - Datum Publishing, Sigtuna 1990), 19.

7. O.R.L. Crosier, *The Law of Moses* (Cincinnati, OH: The Day-Star Extra, Published by Enoch Jacobs, February 7, 1846), <https://adventistlegacy.com/crosier/index.htm>

8. Don F. Neufeld, *Adventist Review* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, February 14, 1980), 14-15. <https://documents.adventistarchives.org/Periodicals/RH/RH19800214-V157-07.pdf>

9. Ellen G. White, *A Word to the Little Flock* (Topsham, ME: (Letter) "To Bro. Eli Curtis, New York City" - April 21, 1847), 12. <https://m.egwwritings.org/en/book/1445.15#15>

10. White, *Education* (Boise, ID: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1952), 36.

11. White, *Patriarchs and Prophets* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1958 - Note 6. Page 354), 761.

*All Scripture quotations are from the King James Version unless otherwise indicated.

"Watchman, what of the night?" is published by the Adventist Laymen's Foundation of Iowa, Inc., P.O. Box 665, Nora Springs, IA 50458-0665, USA.

Founder Elder William H. Grotheer
Editor, Publications & Research Gary L. Patrick
Associate Editor Dennis J. Tevis
Proofreader Bill Caloudes

WEBSITES

www.alfiowa.com
www.adventistlaymen.com

E-MAIL

Editor - alfia@myomnitel.com

Webmaster - webmaster@adventistlaymen.com

This Thought Paper may be duplicated in its entirety without permission. Any portion(s) can be reproduced by adding the credit line - "Reprinted from WWN, ALF of Iowa, Nora Springs, IA, USA."

Current copy free upon request; previous and duplicate copies - \$0.75 ea. (USA) ; \$1.50 ea. USD (outside of USA).

Office phone # (641) 749-2684.



Follow us and like us on Facebook @ <https://www.facebook.com/wniowa>