

*"Watchman,
what of the night?"*

*"The hour has come, the hour is striking, and striking at you,
the hour and the end!"*

Eze. 7:6 (Moffatt)

THEOLOGY OF THE SANCTUARY - II -

The Sin Offerings of the Daily Ministration

While Israel was still under the old covenant which provided no mercy, Moses was in the mount receiving from God the design for the sanctuary which would reveal the mercy of God. (Exodus 23:20-21; 24:18; 25:8-9) The structure of the sanctuary and its articles of furniture were all detailed to Moses during his first forty days in the mount. The establishment of the house of Aaron as the priests of Israel was confirmed. (Exodus 28:1) One offering was outlined, and it was to be a part of the daily ministration - the morning and the evening sacrifice. (Ex. 29:38-43)

The revelation of all the other offerings, both daily and yearly, was not given until after the tabernacle was completed and erected. Both by day through the morning sacrifice, and by night through the evening sacrifice, the individual Israelite was covered until he could bring his prescribed sin offering. Between the revelation of the glory of God within the tabernacle and the sinful Israelite was the Altar of the Court with its continual sacrifice.

It would be difficult not to see here a revelation of God's dealing with the human race. Man was placed in the garden of Eden under a commanded covenant - Obey: Live; Disobey: Die. (Genesis 2:16-17) Though man knew it not, there had been "a counsel of peace" by which the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world would stand between the Glory of God, and himself should he choose to disobey. That Lamb would also be a priest to minister the mercy of God. (Zech. 6:13). It was after man sinned that the provision was made known to him, the same as with Israel at Sinai. (Gen. 3:15, 21)

In the inauguration of the morning and evening sacrifice, is found language which is used in the prophecy of Daniel 8. In Exodus 29 is the first use of the word, tamid, "daily" or "continual" in the Bible. (verse 42). In the book of Daniel, tamid is used as a substantive with the word, "sacrifice" added by the translators in the KJV. (8:11-13) In Daniel 8:14 the



phrase "evening and morning" is substituted for the word, "days." (See Hebrew as noted in Margin)

THE SIN OFFERINGS

At the very beginning of the book of Leviticus are set forth rules with significance in regard to the sacrifices required of the individual, or a group of individuals. If it were to be a "burnt sacrifice," it first must be voluntarily offered and presented "at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation before the Lord." (Lev. 1:3) The offerer was to place his hand upon the head of the victim and it "shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him." (ver. 4)

Two things need to be noted: 1) The placing of the hand of the offerer upon the sacrifice was not just a laying of the hand upon the head as ordinarily perceived, but putting the full weight upon the victim. The Hebrew word is *sahmach*, and is translated in Amos 5:19 as "leaned." His total dependence was to be in the sacrifice. It would "uphold" him or "sustain" him, two other translations of the same word. (See Isa. 59:16; 63:5) 2) The sacrifice "shall be accepted for him." Here is substitution, one in place of the other, a transfer of the guilt to a sacrifice.

The offerer was to kill the sacrifice, and then the priest would mediate it, making "atonement for him." (ver. 5) The book of Leviticus, as the offerings are outlined, will reveal a dual atonement - one resulting in forgiveness, and the other, in cleansing.

The sin offerings are described in Leviticus 4. Before detailing them, we need to observe that the sins to be atoned for were sins of "ignorance." (4:2) When committed, they were not perceived by the one doing the act, but had nevertheless become a matter of record. When convicted, the sinner had a prescribed ritual to perform in connection with the priest so that confession could be registered against his name.

These sin offerings did not cover willful or premeditated sin. Paul in his discourse at Antioch in Pisidia preached "the forgiveness of sins" through Jesus that all who believe in Him "are justified from all things from which [they] could not be justified by the law of Moses." (Acts 13:38-39) Even David recognized that his willful sin of adultery compounded by a planned murder could not be atoned for by sacrifices at the sanctuary, or else he would have given them. (Ps. 51:14-17) Paul wrote that "those sacrifices

which they offered year by year continually" could not "make the comers thereunto perfect." (Hebrews 10:1) What then was their purpose? They served "unto the example and shadow of heavenly things." (Hebrews 8:5)

It should be obvious that the "sins of ignorance" were on record, and that the bringing of the required sacrifice, when convicted, was in recognition of that sin, and not a means of transfer of that sin to the sanctuary. It had already been recorded. If the sacrifices were the means whereby sin was transferred to the sanctuary, the way to keep sin from being registered against one's name, was not to offer the sacrifice. Such a position makes mockery of the whole ritual. Sin was transferred to another living creature in the sense that the condemnation for that sin was to be borne by an innocent victim. Acknowledgment was made by the offerer. (Lev. 5:5) The record of that confession and substitution was made in blood, finger printed on the horns of the altars. "Without shedding blood is no remission" of sins. (Heb. 9:22) It was the remission, and the record of that remission, not the sin, and the record of that sin which was symbolized by the typical sanctuary ritual.¹

The sin offerings which were a major part of the daily ministration involved corporate and individual sins. A different priest was involved in ministering the sacrifice of each of these categories. The registration of the confession was placed on different altars, but in every offering the blood was returned and poured at the base of the Altar of Burnt Offering in the Court. (Lev. 4:7, 18, 25, 30)

The corporate sins were of two categories: 1) A sin by the high priest which brought guilt upon the people, and 2) a sin which involved the whole congregation. Of the first, the text reads:

"If the anointed priest sins, bringing guilt on the people, then let him offer to the Lord for his sin which he has sinned a young bull without blemish as a sin offering. He shall bring the bull to the door of the tabernacle of meeting before the Lord, lay his hand on the bull's head, and kill the bull before the Lord." (Lev. 4:3-4 NKJV)

In regard to the second category, the instruction is given:

"If the whole congregation of Israel sin...then the congregation shall offer a young bullock for the sin, and bring him before the tabernacle of the

congregation. And the elders of the congregation shall lay their hands upon the head of the bullock before the Lord: and the bullock shall be killed before the Lord." (Lev. 4:13-15)

Once the bullock was killed, the ministration of the blood was the same for each of these categories of corporate sin. The high priest ministered, and the blood was taken into the tabernacle. There it was sprinkled "seven times before the Lord, before the vail of the sanctuary." (4:6, 17) Then the high priest would "put of the blood upon the horns of the altar of sweet incense before the Lord which is in the tabernacle of the congregation." (4:7, 18)

The balance of the service was performed at the Altar in the Court. The fat was removed from the victim, and with the two kidneys and "the appendage of the liver" (4:9 RSV), was burned on the Altar. The balance of the bullock was carried forth "without the camp unto a clean place, where the ashes are poured out," and there burned by fire on a wood pyre. (4:12)

The sin offerings for the individual were also of two categories, for the ruler and for the common person.² The ruler included not only the chieftains of the tribes, but also the priests as individuals. Of Eleazar, son of Aaron it is written that He "shall be chief over the chief of the Levites, and have oversight of them that keep the charge of the sanctuary." (Numbers 3:32) The word translated "chief" in this verse, nasi, is translated "ruler" in Leviticus 4:22. While the ruler was required to bring a kid of the goats, a male, the common people could bring either a kid of the goats, a female, or a female lamb for a sin offering. (4:28, 32)

The ritual followed for the offering of the individual's confession was the same whether he was a ruler or a common person. After laying his hand upon the animal's head, symbolizing both dependence and transfer, the victim was killed by the offerer, and the common priest took of the blood and "with his finger... put it upon the horns of the altar of burnt offering." (4:25, 30, 34) **The blood was not taken into the tabernacle.** The ritual for the sin offering of ruler or common person was consummated at the Altar of the court.

When the blood was not taken into the sanctuary, there was a law which was to be followed. It read:

"This is the law of the sin offering: In the place where the burnt offering is killed shall the sin

offering be killed before the Lord: it is most holy. The priest that offereth it for sin shall eat it: in the holy place shall it be eaten, in the court of the tabernacle of the congregation." (Lev. 6:25-26)

There are two declarations in this law which need to be carefully noted:

1) The priest ate of this sin offering brought by the individual. He carried the sin in himself; it became a part of him. Before Jesus could be High Priest, He had to "have somewhat also to offer." (Heb. 8:3) He became "sin for us, who knew no sin." (II Cor. 5:21)³ He partook of our fallen nature. (Rom. 8:3) He was our "sin offering." Even as the "sin offering" was declared to be "most holy," so Jesus was declared to be "that holy thing" though taking upon Himself our fallen humanity. (Luke 1:35)

2) The eating was performed by the common priest in the court, and this was declared to be "the holy place." The transfer of the penalty for sin for the individual stopped with the common priest in what became a holy place, even the court itself. There is no evidence of further transfer.⁴ Just so, the individual finds his acceptance at the foot of the Cross, the highest place he can attain. It is holy ground for there the foot of the ladder was placed that reached to heaven. (Genesis 28:10-17) Even as the individual was complete in the common priest, so we are "complete in Him" and "quickened together with Him," having been forgiven all our trespasses. (Col. 2:10-13)

The formula which closes the details of the prescribed ritual, with one exception, reads - "and the priest shall make atonement for him [or "them" in the case of the congregation as a whole] and it shall be forgiven him." (Lev. 4:20, 26, 31, 35). Again two points must be noted:

1) The Altar in the Court represents the Cross set up at Calvary. In the type, an atonement was made at that Altar in the daily ministration of the sin offerings. **There was an atonement at the Cross.** This cannot be denied.⁵ 2) It was an at-one-ment with God - resulting from the forgiveness provided by the ministering priest. The sin was taken into himself, the penalty paid, and the sinner could stand before God as if he had never sinned. O glorious provision!

Before Christ became High Priest, He ministered on earth as a common priest.⁶ In the Gospel of Luke, the incident is recorded of a man "taken with a palsy" who, when let down through the

roof into the presence of Jesus, heard Him say, "Man, thy sins are forgiven thee." This brought a reaction from the Jewish religious leaders who were present. They began to reason among themselves that this was blasphemy since only God can forgive sins. Jesus, perceiving their thoughts, asked a question: "Which is easier to say, 'Thy sins be forgiven thee,' or to say, 'Take up thy bed and walk?'" Then He added, "But that ye may know that **the Son of man hath power upon earth to forgive sins**, (he said unto the sick of the palsy) I say unto thee, Arise and take up thy couch, and go into thine house. And immediately he rose up before them." (Luke 5:24-25)

Again on the cross, to the thief who pled, "Lord remember me, when thou comest into thy kingdom," Jesus responded, "Verily, I say unto thee today, thou shalt be with Me in paradise." (Luke 23:42-43)

Summarizing, the daily ministration of the sin offerings involved two categories of penitents - corporate and individuals. The corporate sacrifice was ministered by the High Priest, while the individual sacrifice was mediated by the common priest. The confession of corporate sin was registered in blood on the horns of the Altar of Incense within the sanctuary, while the confession of the individual was finger printed on the horns of the Altar in the Court. This sin offering, mediated through the priest, brought to the penitent forgiveness, a restored at-one-ment with God.

NOTES:

¹What sin is, was the issue which caused Dr. E. J. Waggoner to abandon the sanctuary teachings of the Church. Waggoner wrote in his "Confession of Faith":

"Sin is a condition, not an entity. It exists only in the individual, and can be removed only by a new life in the individual. It is not like grain or wood or stone, that can be removed from a place and deposited somewhere else. It is like a disease; it is, in fact, a mortal disease. It can no more be removed from a person, and carried by another person and deposited in some place at a distance from the sinner, than a fever can be taken away from a sick man by a physician and stored away in some warehouse provided for the purpose." (p. 9)

What then was transferred? The condition led to a wrong act and brought guilt and condemnation to the individual. The act could not be transferred, because the victim never committed it. Only a record could be made which had been done. The guilt which demanded death could be transferred. In the ritual of the sin offering, confession

was made and by the laying on of the hand, the guilt was transferred. The victim was then slain, and the blood symbolizing that remission was recorded. This blood stood between the penitent, and the record of his sin. This still left the penitent a sinner, though forgiven. Something more had to be done. This was prefigured in the yearly service.

Waggoner's problem is still with us today - What is sin? Until the theology of the sanctuary is clarified, it will remain with us. We will continue to go about trying to establish our own righteousnesses, not only forgetting the question asked by Job - "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?" - but also ignoring the answer given - "not one"! (Job 14:4)

²There are those who would interpret the designation of "common people" as non-Israelites. It must be remembered that the sanctuary functioned for a people under the covenant. (Heb. 9:1) Only as "the sons of the stranger" took hold of God's covenant would "their burnt offerings and their sacrifices" be accepted on God's altar. (Isa. 56:6-7) "A common Israelite, 'the people of the land,' i.e. of the rural population," was "an Israelite belonging to the people as distinguished from the chiefs who ruled over the people (2 Kings xi, 18, 19, xvi. 15)." (Keil-Delitzsch, Commentary on the Old Testament, Vol.II, p. 309)

³In the Hebrew, the word for sin and the word for sin offering is the same, chatta'th. Thus Christ, made to be sin for us, was also the offering for sin.

⁴The final transfer of guilt for the individual sinner ended in the common priest who ate of the offerer's sin offering. The blood was not taken into the sanctuary, neither did the priest offer a sacrifice for himself to atone for the sins which he carried. It is true that the high priest and the common priests went into the first apartment of the sanctuary to trim the lamps of the Candlestick, to offer incense on the Altar therein, and to renew the cakes on the Table of Shewbread. (Ex. 27:21) On the Day of Atonement, on neither the head of the bullock, nor on the head of the Lord's goat, were any hands laid in confession. The blood of these two animals were mingled for the last act of cleansing at the Altar of Burnt Offering where the records of the individual's confession had been finger printed. (Lev. 16:18-20)

⁵Because Protestant and Evangelical theologians have discredited the concept of a final atonement, many of the early Adventist exponents of the ministry of Christ in the most holy place of the Heavenly Sanctuary denied that there was an atonement at the Cross. See Crosier's article, "The Sanctuary" in the Day Star Extra 1846. In the typical services, the ministry of the common priest did result in an atonement which brought forgiveness to the penitent. There was, however, another atonement, the

LET'S TALK IT OVER

In the typical offerings for sin as outlined in Leviticus 4, the import of the division drawn between corporate and individual sins has been only lightly regarded. In the individual sin offering, the blood of the sacrifice upon which the guilt was transferred remained recorded on the horns of the Altar in the Court. The final step of the transfer was to the common priest who ate of the victim. There it stopped. He bore in himself all that was signified in this typical act. He stood for the individual.

This was not so in the case of the sin offering for corporate Israel. The high priest carried the blood into the holy place, and after having sprinkled it before the veil which separated the most holy from the holy, left on the horns of the Altar of Incense the record of the transaction. The high priest did not eat of the sacrifice. The question arises, does this type mean that corporate entities face God directly, while the individual faces God through Him who is symbolized in the common priest?

It is a fact that in our Western society, the individual with his rights and privileges dominates. We recognize the freedom of speech, the press, and religious exercise as rights to be carefully guarded. In the Bible, however, there is another entity, the corporate, a covenant people in relationship before God. While the Old Testament is replete with illustrations of God's dealings with Israel as a nation because of its failure to honor its covenant with God, the New Testament also recognizes a corporate involvement. Paul writes, "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." (I Cor. 15:22) The facts of life are such that we have no choice in the first corporate identification, but we choose whether we remain in that corporate identity, or become a part of Christ. This is also a lesson found in the transfer symbolism of the individual sin offering. I become identified in Him for Whom the common priest stood.

As one continues to contemplate the force of the typical symbolism involved in the individual sin offering, he must recognize that the whole transaction for the individual centered exclusively in the Court of the sanctuary. To the Altar of Burnt Offering the penitent came. It was the furthest that he could come. He recognized himself a sinner, even though in ignorance he had committed the act. He was guilty, but could not

pay the penalty and live. To be forgiven, the priest had to mediate the sacrifice. The antitypical significance is well expressed in the Writings:

"Without the cross, man could have no union with the Father. On it depends our every hope. From it shines the light of the Saviour's love; and when at the foot of the cross the sinner looks up to the One who died to save him, he may rejoice with fullness of joy; for his sins are pardoned. **Kneeling in faith at the cross, he has reached the highest place to which man can attain.**" (AA, pp. 209-10)

Here is the very heart of the tragic situation which existed in Adventism in 1888, and which has again raised its deceptive head in many of the "independent" ministries today. What can man attain? All of his "righteousnesses are as filthy rags." (Isa. 64:6) He is unclean. He has no power in himself to attain the "ideal which in his inmost soul he accepts as alone worthy." (Ed. p. 29) But he can come to the foot of the cross, and accept Him who in type not only ate of the sin offering, but became **the** sin offering.

There is still the force of the corporate sin offering as required in the type to be considered. An interesting eschatological parable was spoken by Jesus: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory... before Him shall be gathered all nations; and He shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats." (Matt. 25:31-32) Here are corporate bodies - the nations. They are faced with a single question with various manifestations - How did they relate to Jesus Christ in the person of His saints (individuals)? Their response as given in the parable is not, "When saw I" but corporate, "When saw we." (25:37, 44)

We must keep in mind that the First Angel's Message which announces "the hour of God's judgment," is followed by the second which proclaims the fall of Babylon "because she made all **nations** drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication." (Rev. 14:7-8) The picture is further enlarged in Daniel where "judgment" was rendered in behalf of the saints against the "horn" who had made war upon them through the nations. (7:21-22)

The corporate sin offerings did not only involve the congregation as a whole, but also the high priest in his office. The KJV does not accurately render the force of Leviticus 4:3. The NKJV clarifies this. "If the anointed priest sins, bringing guilt on the people," then he brings a

sacrifice equal to what the whole congregation would bring should they sin. Keil and Delitzsch translate the Hebrew of "to the sin of the people," as "to the sinning of the nation" and comment - "If he sinned ...in his official capacity as representative of the nation before the Lord, and not merely in his own personal relation to God." (Vol. 2, p. 303) This is an interesting side aspect of the ritual and should suggest an important lesson to all religious leaders.

Religious leadership will be held accountable before God as to the direction they lead God's people. Further in this picture must be placed the fact that the formula which concludes all of the other sin offerings does not follow the prescribed ritual for the high priest who sins in such a way as to bring guilt on the people collectively. That formula was "and it shall be forgiven him." There is no suggestion that the sin removed the high priest from office because it was not forgiven, but the matter is left open to suggest the gravity of such an act.

Another aspect of the corporate sin offerings is that not only nations are corporate bodies, but also churches. Israel was not only a nation, but it was also "the church in the wilderness." (Acts 7:38) This brings us face to face with the clear statement of warning written by Ellen G. White immediately following the adjournment of the 1903 General Conference from Oakland to Battle Creek to complete its business. She wrote on April 21 as follows:

"In the balances of the sanctuary the Seventh-day Adventist church is to be weighed. She will be judged by the privileges and advantages that she has had. If her spiritual experience does not correspond to the advantages that Christ, at infinite cost, has bestowed on her, if the blessings conferred have not qualified her to do the work entrusted to her, on her will be pronounced the sentence, 'Found wanting.' By the light bestowed, the opportunities given, will she be judged." (8T:247)

This is corporate language and dare not be disregarded. Individual accountability comes into play for the individual must respond to God's findings.

As some read the study on the Theology of the Sanctuary in this issue, they will ask, "How do you harmonize the position taken with the statement in Patriarchs & Prophets which reads:

"The most important part of the daily ministrations was the service performed in behalf of individuals. The repentant sinner brought his offering to the door of the tabernacle, and placing his hand upon the victim's head, confessed his sins, thus in figure transferring them from himself to the innocent sacrifice... By this ceremony the sin was, through the blood, transferred to the sanctuary. In some cases the blood was not taken into the holy place; but the flesh was then to be eaten by the priest, ..." (p. 354)

In the 1931 edition of Patriarchs & Prophets, there is a footnote which directs the reader to - "See Appendix, Note 9." This note reads:

"When a sin-offering was presented...for the whole congregation, the blood was carried into the holy place, and sprinkled before the vail, and placed upon the horns of the golden altar ...

"When, however, the offering was for a ruler or for one of the people, the blood was not taken into the holy place, but the flesh was eaten by the priest, as the Lord directed Moses:..."

I wondered out loud to a brother who had a 1908 printing of Patriarchs and Prophets as to whether such a note was included in any edition prior to the death of Ellen G. White in 1915. He checked his book when he returned home and called me. It was also in this 1908 printing. Why was Ellen G. White not informed of this error and rather than a footnote being inserted have the text itself corrected by her? To search for an answer could raise other questions, as serious, if not more so, than this one. Thus the correction of our previous understanding of this typical ritual becomes a part of our learning and unlearning process as we seek to develop a theology of the sanctuary.

whg

"Christians would do well to study more diligently the sanctuary and its services. They contain precious lessons for the devout student. Too many have failed to give study to Christ's high priestly ministry and His session at the right hand of God. They are not acquainted with Him as High Priest, though this work is the very essence of Christianity, the heart of the atonement."

M. L. Andreasen

in Adventism, there have been those, who like Daniells, perceived of themselves as "monarchic bishops," and have related to men called of God as mere hirelings of the conference. In the day of judgment, many administrators will have a fearful accounting to meet.

It should be of interest in evaluating the history of the Kellogg era in Adventism that at the height of the crisis, A. T. Jones, who sided with Kellogg, wrote, Individuality in Religion. Though this book emphasized religious liberty from the world viewpoint, there were sections which called for religious liberty within the Church. This over the years has been strangely lacking in Adventist administration. At present we are willing to exercise "religious liberty" (pluralism) in the teaching and publishing of heresy in the Church, but still have problems with "individuality" in religion.

Returning now to the reproduced letter written by Kellogg in 1922, and his action after that date, one fact dare not be overlooked. Kellogg could not be reconciled to the Daniells type of church administration, but he was not alienated in thought from his former brethren. However, when the opportunity was given for them to fellowship with Kellogg once again, they did not know how to relate to Kellogg. They could partake of his hospitality, but they could not find the way to the heart of the man, a fellow for whom Christ died. How far from the cross do men wander, and yet believe themselves to be a "voice" of God to their fellow men.

#

Let's Talk It Over - From page 4, col. 2

Spiritual Gifts would be complete for a Seventh-day Adventist unless we addressed the role of Ellen G. White in relationship to the Community of Adventism" - we discussed her work and mission. Knowing that she stated, "I am not a prophet," we noted the why given, and in what capacity she was to serve according to divine directive. We asked, "How then has Ellen G. White become an inspired, infallible interpreter of Scripture?" This we forthrightly answered, leaving certain other questions involved open.

All in all, this concise position paper should challenge the thinking of every sincerely concerned Seventh-day Adventist. To say that it is the final word would be to overlook the humanity of the group formulating it. It is available for study. Send \$1.00 to cover postage and handling to P. O. Box 69, Ozone, AR 72854 if you desire a copy.

To the Editor:

We have just finished the pamphlet, "Jerusalem in Bible Prophecy," for morning devotions and I suppose it was the clearest explanation I have ever read in my fifteen years as a Seventh-day Adventist on the ministration of the sanctuary. The section on Jerusalem was fantastic as I have just finished reading Hershel Shanks book, The City of David.

AZ

In the Catskill area of New York State which is a largely populated Jewish area, they are hanging signs up saying "Messiah is coming." Everything is coming together for the reception of Satan as Christ. What a time to be alive! Praise God, it won't be long now.

NY

++++

"Ye are all children of light, and the children of the day; we are not of the night, nor of darkness. Therefore let us not sleep, as do others; but let us watch and be sober."

I Thess. 5:5-6

++++

Correction - In WWN, XXVII-11(94), p. 2 we noted the General Conference session as being in 1924 instead of 1922, the correct date.

++++

"Watchman, What of the Night?" is published monthly by the Adventist Laymen's Foundation of Mississippi, Inc., P. O. Box 69, Ozone, AR 72854, USA.

In Canada, write - The Adventist Laymen's Foundation of Canada, P. O. Box 117, Thorne, ON P0H 2J0.

In Australia, write - The Adventist Laymen's Foundation, P. O. Box 846, Belmont, Victoria 3216.

Editor

Elder Wm. H. Grotheer

Any portion of this Thought Paper may be reproduced without further permission by adding the credit line - "Reprinted from WWN, Ozone, Arkansas, USA."

First copy is free upon request; duplicate copies -- 50¢.

++++

Our 800 Number is 800-4-LAYMEN (800-452-9636)
FAX - 501-292-3745