



*"Watchman,  
what of the night?"*

*The watchman said, The morning cometh, and also the night: if ye will enquire, enquire ye: return, come. Isaiah 21:11-12*

# THEOLOGY OF THE SANCTUARY - I

## INTRODUCTION

In 1955, as Donald Gray Barnhouse and Walter R. Martin contemplated their up-coming talks with leaders of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, they perceived that the Adventist teaching of "the investigative judgment" would be one doctrine on which it would be impossible to come to any accord which would permit them to consider Adventists as Christians believing in the finished work of Christ. Why? Because "the doctrine of the 'investigative judgment' ... is a doctrine never known in theological history until the second half of the nineteenth century and which is a doctrine held exclusively by the Seventh-day Adventists." (*Eternity*, September, 1956) This evaluation is true on both counts.

One can trace other major doctrines of the Church, such as the observance of the Sabbath back through history, and in the record of salvation history back to Creation. Among those who observe the Sabbath, and there are many who do, other than Seventh-day Adventists, Seventh-day Adventists are the only Sabbath keeping group who teach the concepts of a judgment based on a theological understanding of the ancient Hebrew sanctuary ritual. Sanctuary theology constitutes the uniqueness of Adventism.

Adventism is rooted in the Great Second Advent Movement of the first half of the 19th Century. The name most prominently known in connection with this movement is that of William Miller's. Yet very little of what Miller taught was carried over in Seventh-day Adventism. He even objected to the specific date, October 22, 1844, for the coming of Christ until two weeks before that time. (Kai Arasola, *The End of Historicism*, p. 128) Joseph Bates in the first issue of *The Review & Herald* (November, 1850) published in Paris, Maine, wrote that the Laodicean Church period began in 1845 at a conference chaired by William Miller in Albany, New York. He advised his readers "to flee from the Laodiceans, as from

Sodom and Gomorrah." He declared their teachings to be false and delusive leading to utter destruction. (pp. 7, 8)

Actually, William Miller concluded that Jesus would come "sometime between March 21st, 1843 and March 21st, 1844." This is as specific as he really wished to be. His original concluding date for the 2300 Days of Daniel 8:14 was 1843. Miller overlooked the fact that there was no year zero. This was finally pointed out to Miller by Samuel Snow, the one who began "the seventh month" movement (Lev. 23:27) after the disappointment in the Spring of 1844. Following this disappointment, Miller was no longer in control of the direction of the Movement. The tenth day of the seventh month as the day for the coming of Jesus based in Hebrew sanctuary typology was not Miller's exegesis but rather that of Snow and Storrs. (Arasola, *op. cit.*, p. 148) The birth of Seventh-day Adventism is rooted in this Seventh-month movement. (See *SDA Encyclopedia*, RV edition, "Midnight Cry," p. 885; "Seventh-Month Movement," p. 1337)

"For some reason Snow or other Millerites never realized that they were no longer interpreting Daniel when they got involved with the festal calendar. The interpretation was rather that of Leviticus 16. Daniel's prophecy was only secondary. It showed the year, but the day as indicated by the Jewish festal calendar. Leviticus 16 was presented as the primary interpreter of Daniel 8, while in fact focus was on an eschatological *jom kippurim* which was timed with Daniel 8:14" (*ibid.*, p. 156)

While the Millerite Movement went no further than the implantation of the date of the day of atonement upon their eschatology, Seventh-day Adventism became a combination of typology and historicism. This is its uniqueness, and the heart of the present attack on its validity. Either the

basis for Adventism is substantiated, or there exists no reason for its continued existence.

### TYPOLOGY

Is typology an acceptable hermeneutic? Is it Biblically based? This must be first determined. The Christian Church perceived of themselves as the new Israel of God (Gal. 6:16), hence, God's dealings with ancient Israel foreshadow God's dealings with the new Israel, only on a greater scale as Christ was greater than Moses. As "the fathers" were baptized unto Moses (I Cor. 10:2), so "the disciples" were baptized into Jesus Christ (Matt. 28:19 Gr.; Rom. 6:3). From this relationship, experiences from Israel's history became types of warnings to Christians. One such example is found in Paul's letter to the Corinthian Church. He cites events from Israel's "wilderness" history, and declares:

"Now these things were our examples (tupoi), to the intent we should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted... Now all these things happened unto them for examples (tupikos): and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come." (I Cor. 10:6, 11)

It should be noted that Paul restricts his "typology" in this comparison to the wilderness wanderings. Thus our understanding of events, people, and things as to their typological significance should be strictly governed by the designations of the Bible itself.

A few examples will illustrate this guideline. Jesus Christ is noted as the second or "last Adam." (I Cor. 15:45) Paul specifically designates the first Adam as "the figure (tupos) of Him that was to come." (Rom. 5:14) How are we to interpret this type? Is the typology between the first Adam who was given "dominion" (Gen. 1:28), and the second Adam to whom the "first dominion" is to be restored (Micah 4:8)? Or is the typology teaching that the same nature with which the first Adam was created is the nature taken by the second Adam in the Incarnation? To answer this question, other texts must be considered, lest the interpretation given to the type be contradictory to the plain Word of God. (See Romans 1:1, 3-4)

Consider Melchizedec. In the letter to the Hebrews, Jesus Christ is set forth as having become an High Priest after the Order of Melchizedec which priesthood is superior to the priesthood of Aaron. (Heb. 7:22, 27) This priesthood of Christ is stated to be "after the

similitude of Melchizedec." (7:15) But the basis that Paul<sup>1</sup> uses for the conclusion is taken from a Messianic Psalm. (110:4) Thus even in the Old Testament, there is an inferred typology between Melchizedec and Jesus Christ. This typology would be vertical, the earthly a type of the heavenly.

In considering Moses as a type, we have both prophecy and typology mingled. Moses was told that God would raise up a Prophet from the midst of Israel, of his brethren, and one "like unto thee," meaning Moses. (Deut. 18:15-18) Further, we find Paul in Hebrews, as he begins his dissertation on the High Priestly ministry of Jesus, writing that He "was faithful to Him that appointed Him, as also Moses was faithful in all his house." (3:2) The purpose of this faithful witness of Moses was to be "a testimony of those things which were to be spoken after." (3:5)

Here is a very interesting typology. When Israel broke the "old" covenant which they made at Sinai, a covenant without any provision for forgiveness (Ex. 23:20-21), God made a covenant with Moses and through him with Israel. (Ex. 34:27) It was under this covenant that the sanctuary service functioned, offering the provision of mercy, forgiveness and cleansing (Heb. 9:1). Moses became the mediator for Israel (Gal. 3:19). The transition of this mediatorship is seen in the emphasis the Scripture places on the communion in the Mount of Transfiguration between Moses and Jesus. Moses and Elijah spoke to him "of His decease (Gr. - exodos) which He should accomplish at Jerusalem." (Luke 9:31) This "way out" - and that is what exodos means - is represented as the "new and living way, which He has consecrated for us through the veil, that is to say His flesh." (Heb. 10:20)

Moses stands as a type of the One who became the mediator between God and man when Adam broke the covenant of life which likewise had no provision for forgiveness. It was obey: live; disobey: die. (Gen. 2:16-17) The bondage of God's chosen people in Egypt, their exodus beginning the night of the Passover, the leadership and pleadings of Moses, all are placed in the New Testament as a type of the work and ministry of Jesus Christ. The bondage in sin (Heb. 2:15), the deliverance through the Passover Lamb (I Cor. 5:7), the new "house of Israel" with the appointed High Priest (Heb. 3:6; 5:9-10), are perceived as typified in the man, Moses, and his work "as a servant" (Heb. 3:5).

With no specific statement to be found in the Old Testament that such an event, or such a

person was a type of some event or Person to come; yet in the New Testament there is such direct testimony, how can such conclusions on the part of the New Testament writers be justified? The Old Testament is history, but not secular history per se; rather it is salvation history. Only a small fragment of what occurred in human history or in the history of Israel is recorded in the Old Testament, but those things which were "written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through the patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope." (Rom. 15:4) The Old Testament is a directed record. Its records, its prophecies, its biographies were all directed by "the Spirit of Christ." (I Peter 1:11) Before Jesus returned to the Father, He opened His disciples' "understanding, that they might understand the scriptures." (Luke 24:45) These "scriptures" were the Old Testament. Upon His return to the courts of Heaven, He sent, as He had promised, the Spirit of truth, to guide into all truth. (John 14:16-17; 16:13). Thus what the "Spirit of Christ" preserved as the Old Testament, the Spirit of truth opened the minds of the writers of the New Testament to discern its true significance.

It was "the Lord" who called Abraham (Gen. 12:1). It was the "I AM" who appeared unto Moses and sent him to deliver the enslaved people of Israel (Ex. 3:14). It was that "Lord" who said unto Moses, I want to be "like unto thee" when I come into humanity (Deut. 18:18). It was "the Lord" who directed Moses to build a sanctuary according to a pattern He had designed (Ex. 25:8-9). It was the same Lord who outlined the ritual to be performed in that sanctuary (Lev. 1:1). It was the Holy Spirit of truth which speaks in the New Testament telling us what these things signify.

The typology found in the New Testament is both horizontal and vertical.<sup>2</sup> The types cited by Paul in I Corinthians represent the horizontal nature of typology, while many of the types used in the book of Hebrews illustrate the vertical nature of typology - the earthly figuratively revealing the heavenly.

Modern scholarship<sup>3</sup> usually disassociates itself strongly from the vertical form of typology. When the Millerite Movement was taken over by the "Seventh Month" advocates, a horizontal typology drawn from the Hebrew sanctuary services was implanted upon the time prophecy of Daniel 8:14 establishing the date of October 22, 1844. It was after the disappointment on that day, that a vertical typology, associating the earthly sanctuary services with the heavenly

ministry of Jesus Christ, became the basis for the sanctuary theology which is the heart of Seventh-day Adventism. Is there a Biblical justification for this vertical typological hermeneutic? Are there limitations?

After establishing the high priestly ministry of Jesus Christ as superior to the Aaronic, Paul declares "the sum" of the matter to be that He is set "on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens" as "a minister of holy things" (Gr.) in "the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched." (Heb. 8:1-2) How is this ministry in the heavenly tabernacle to be understood? The priests of the earthly "serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things."<sup>4</sup> (8:5) What reference is cited to confirm this typology? "Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle: for See, saith he, that thou make all things according to the pattern (tupos) shewed to thee in the mount." (ibid.)

It should be clearly kept in mind that it was the services performed in connection with the sanctuary which were the examples and shadow of heavenly things, not the tabernacle itself. Here is a Biblical basis for the typology which designates the priestly ministrations of the earthly sanctuary as illustrative of the heavenly, but with a limitation. The type was shown to Moses in the mount, but its typological significance was in the services performed in the priestly ministrations.

Failing to give heed to the limitation placed on the use of sanctuary detail leads to an allegorized typology. Seventh-day Adventist students of the sanctuary are not alone in this use of sanctuary detail. Others, Evangelical in their orientation, hold that those who study the intricate detail - the "precise measurements and construction of the tabernacle", with the offerings and feasts - prayerfully, will "find them full of the deepest teaching concerning Christ and spiritual things, and of the wisest counsels for the right ordering of our daily life." (Quoted by Arasola, op. cit., p. 166)

It is true that inasmuch as the way of God is revealed in the sanctuary, the way to holiness (Ps. 77:13), that we should be able to find revealed His purpose for the human soul.<sup>5</sup> But how much of that purpose is derived from elsegesis rather than exegesis? In Adventism it has been taught, and still is, that the court represents the Christian experience of justification. At this point, we find Biblical support. The sacrifices were offered in the

court. Paul writes that we are "now justified by [Christ's] blood." (Romans 5:9) Then we pass to the holy place which is interpreted as representing sanctification. But where is the plain, "Thus saith the Lord"? We reason our way to this deduction through the articles of furniture: the table of shewbread representing the Word of God (John 17:17), yet there is no Biblical text telling us there is a Table of Shewbread in the Heavenly Sanctuary; the candlesticks symbolizing the Holy Spirit (Revelation 4:5; Romans 15:16); and the Altar of Incense uplifting a life of prayer (Revelation 8:3). Then the last step is the most holy place representing perfection. Here we need much exegesis. The High Priest alone went into the Most Holy Place; He alone procured the at-onement. Failing to perceive this aspect of the sanctuary teaching, there is proclaimed a works motivated drive to reach perfection.

Not only are the services performed declared to be "the example and shadow" of the heavenly, but the specific services are stated - the daily and the yearly. After describing the "worldly" sanctuary, Paul writes:

"Now when these things were thus ordained, the priests went always [daily; Gr. -"at all times"] into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the service of God. But into the second went the high priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people." (Heb. 9:6-7)

These services were perceived as a "figure" (parable) for the time then present because in and of themselves they "could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience." (9:9) Thus in reality the only purpose they served was to typify for us heavenly things - that Christ through His ministry could obtain eternal redemption for us. (9:11-12)

To summarize: There is a plain Biblical basis to interpret the services of the earthly sanctuary as representing a vertical typology revealing the work and ministry of Jesus Christ as priest, and as High Priest forever after the Order of Melchizedec. This work is typified in the daily and yearly ministration of the Aaronic priesthood.

Footnotes:

<sup>1</sup>We will recognize Paul as the author of Hebrews in this study of Sanctuary Theology. "The earliest manuscript of the Pauline letters, p46, dating from about 200, includes it (the early Church assumed Hebrews to be Pauline),..." (Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, The Text of the New Testament, p. 49)

<sup>2</sup>Dr. Kai Arasola in his dissertation, The End of Historicism, devotes several pages to a background discussion of typology as it related to the Millerite and Advent Movements (pp. 161-168). Excerpts of his findings and evaluation should prove most enlightening to the reader:

"Typology has a background distinct from that of general historicism. The Christian church has from its beginning seen many Old Testament images and passages as types and prophecies of Jesus Christ. As one looks back further one finds a pattern in the writings of the Old Testament. The prophets were the first to use typology. As Israel was facing national disasters 'they looked for a new David, a new Exodus, a new covenant, a new City of God: the old became a type of the new and important as pointing forward to it.' This pattern was taken up by the NT writers who saw the Old Testament as a prefiguration of the Christ-event. The number of types found is vast...

"The typology of the NT is both horizontal, referring to historical fulfillments, and vertical, illustrating things considered as heavenly realities. ... 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 scholarship. ...

"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.' This view has in succeeding centuries been accepted as the traditional understanding of Biblical typology. It is still regarded as the true concept on the subject by many with a Biblicist view on the Scriptures.

"Within Protestant Biblicism there were two main lines of prophetic typology. On one extreme there was the so-called Cocceian school with an elaborate and imaginative exegesis 'impregnated with typology.' Sensus allegoricus was so important to the Cocceian interpretation of types that Harnack's term, 'Biblicalalchemy' [given for Origen's exegesis] suits perfectly some of these fanciful expositions. On the other extreme there was the Marshian typology representing a reaction from the prevalent undisciplined method. Marsh looked for Scriptural sanction for each type and gained fair scholarly but little popular support for his method. However Cocceian typology was prominent in Britain and North-America until mid-nineteenth century.

"Even though the scholarly nineteenth-century commentators promoted the sober Marshian typology, popular books and pamphlets applied typology to any number of aspects within the sphere of Christian life....

"Another feature of American typology is its interest in the termini technici of the sanctuary, the sacrifices and the feasts - types which became important for the Seventh-month movement and later for Adventism. Yet the literature available for this research has not provided any examples of Old Testament typology combined with prophetic exegesis that would parallel with Snow's typological ideas."

Comment: Herein is an aspect of the "uniqueness" of Adventism, and a question that must be addressed in any study of Sanctuary Theology. Is there a clear connection between Leviticus 16 and Daniel 7 and 8?

<sup>3</sup> A prime example of the position of modern scholarship in regard to the book of Hebrews is the dissertation by Wm. G. Johnsson for his doctoral degree in New Testament received at Vanderbilt University. The tragedy of this type of scholarship is the carryover of such teaching into the Church by the placement of those so imbued in positions of influence in the Church.

<sup>4</sup> The concept that the services ministered by the priest is the type of the heavenly reality rather than the structure itself is challenged by the way this text is translated in the NIV which is much in vogue in Adventism today. The NIV reads - "They serve at a sanctuary that is a copy and shadow of what is in heaven." In the Greek text, both the words, example (hupodeigmati) and shadow (skia) are in the dative. Literally translated this part of the verse would read - "who in example and in shadow serve of the heavenly." A. T. Robertson points out that the idea of the dative "is that of personal interest." Its primary use is of "a person, not a place" - an object such as the sanctuary itself. (A Grammar of the Greek New Testament, p. 536)

<sup>5</sup> "Through Christ was to be fulfilled the purposes of which the tabernacle was a symbol, - that glorious building, its walls of glistening gold reflecting in rainbow hues the curtains inwrought with cherubim, the fragrance of ever-burning incense pervading all, the priests robed in spotless white, and in the deep mystery of the inner place, above the mercy-seat, between the figures of the bowed, worshiping angels, the glory of the Holiest. In all, God desired His people to read His purpose for the human soul." (Education, p. 36) Too many in reading this perceive its meaning to be a detailed study of every feature and facet of the tabernacle to capture some typical meaning. A reading in context helps keep it all in perspective. In the preceding paragraph are found these sentences - "But this ideal they were, in themselves, powerless to attain. The revelation at Sinai could only impress them with their need and helplessness." The sanctuary was not to be perverted into a works-oriented theology, but rather a revelation of a gospel where one's trust and commitment is to his or her great High Priest who alone is able to save them to the uttermost. (Heb. 7:25; Acts 4:12)

## LET'S TALK IT OVER

With this issue of WWN, we begin, the Lord willing, an in-depth study of Sanctuary Theology which will continue through most of 1994. The need for such a comprehensive study was impressed upon my mind after reading the dissertation on The End of Historicism by Dr. Kai Arasola of Finland. It became evident that Seventh-day Adventists have never been given a complete picture of their "roots" in the Millerite Movement, nor a full revelation of all that William Miller taught at that time. For a number of years, I had access to Joseph Bates' article in the first issue of The Second Advent Review and Sabbath Herald. (See page 1) From this article, it was very evident that a decided break between the founders of Seventh-day Adventism and the leaders of the Millerite Movement had occurred. As one noted how little of the actual message given by Miller was retained by our spiritual forefathers, the reason demanded clarification. The carryover centered in the basics of the the prophecy of Daniel 8:14 as enlarged in the explanation given by Gabriel in Daniel 9.

Writing of the specific "Seventh-month Movement" which has been defined in our denominational history books as the Midnight Cry, Arasola summarized: {See F. D. Nichol, The Midnight Cry (1944)}

"The exegetical elements, apocalyptic prophecy from Daniel, sanctuary typology, a parable of Jesus, were all put together into a package which aroused unforeseen interest in prophetic interpretation." (p. 161)

This combination is attested to in a brief biographical sketch on Samuel S. Snow in the SDA Encyclopedia. Snow had received but slight acceptance of his relating the Day of Atonement typologically to the prophecy of Daniel 8:14. However, on July 21, 1844, he spoke in the large Boston Tabernacle on the text, "Behold the Bridegroom cometh [on the tenth day of the seventh month]; go ye out to meet Him." This introduced the parable of Jesus into the picture. At a campmeeting in Exeter, New Hampshire, three weeks later, the message was wholeheartedly accepted, and the 'seventh month' message spread with seemingly irresistible power." (p. 1357)

Inasmuch as Seventh-day Adventism is theologically involved in not only a prophetic

date based in Historicism, but also in a typological understanding of the sanctuary, in all honesty one must ask, is such, a Biblically sound position? We believe it is, and plan to set this Biblical basis forth in a series of studies in the upcoming issues of WWN. This issue discusses typology.

We are aware that such a study must include the premise that "we have many things to learn, and many, many to unlearn." (TM, p. 30) We further recognize that the truth committed to our trust "is an advancing truth, and we must walk in the increasing light." (R&H, March 25, 1890) It also must be kept in mind that "God will have a people upon the earth to maintain the Bible, and the Bible only, as the standard of all doctrines." (SP, IV, p. 413) To these guidelines and factors, we intend to rigidly adhere.

The combination of the understandings which formed the real "roots" of Seventh-day Adventism - Daniel 8:14 interpreted according to the historicist hermeneutic, the typological application of the sanctuary ritual, and the message of Jesus' parable in Matthew 25 - all must be candidly evaluated. This last element to be introduced into the Millerite Movement - the understanding of Matthew 25:1-13 - presents a "touchy" problem echoing into the present agitation stirring the Adventist Community today. This is the eschatological emphasis in Adventism reflected in The Great Controversy, and the vivid projection it is receiving today on billboards, in the press, as well as the reaction engendered in certain "independent" journals and in the Union papers of the Church itself.

Consider for a moment the facts which cannot be controverted:

1) The vision which forms the basis for The Great Controversy was given twice, in 1848 and 1858. During the second vision at Lovett's Grove, Ohio, Ellen G. White was instructed to write it out. This she did, and the book is known as Spiritual Gifts, Vol. I. The Great Controversy, as such, was first published in 1884 as the fourth volume of a set either called The Spirit of Prophecy, or The Great Controversy.

2) In 1888, The Great Controversy was revised. Questions have been raised over this publication in an unpublished manuscript - Ellen G. White and the Protestant Historians: The Evidence from an Unpublished Manuscript on John Huss. The manuscript by Dr. D. R. McAdams remains unpublished because the Ellen G. White Estate will not release certain documents upon which

this research is based, so I have been informed by reliable sources.

3) In 1911, a final cosmetic revision of The Great Controversy was published which is now a part of the Conflict of the Ages series.

4) All three editions of The Great Controversy teach that Matthew 25:1-13 was fulfilled in the Midnight Cry experience connected with the "Seventh-month Movement in 1844. (1884 edition - Chapter XVII; 1888 edition - Chapter XXII; 1911 edition - Chapter 22)

The problem to be faced is that between 1888 and 1911, Ellen White was given added light of eschatological significance which was not included in the 1911 revision, and which alters the picture as related to the other two.

In 1896, reporting the first campmeeting in Tasmania, at Hobart from November 28 to December 9, 1895, Ellen White interjected into her report, this comment - "My mind was carried into the future, when the signal will be given, 'Behold the Bridegroom cometh; go ye out to meet Him.'" (R&H, February 11, 1896)

In 1901, Ellen White wrote in a letter - "In the twenty-first chapter of Luke, Christ foretold what was to come upon Jerusalem, and with it He connected the scenes which were to take place in the history of this world just prior to the coming of the Son of man in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory." (Letter 10, 1901) By focusing on Luke 21, to the exclusion of Matthew 24 and Mark 13, the emphasis is on the specific reference in Luke 21 concerning Jerusalem which is not found in the other two synoptics. This brings Jerusalem into the eschatological picture.

These two factors are not included in the 1911 revision of The Great Controversy. No provision was made for this advanced understanding given to Ellen G. White. This additional revelation makes the 1884 and 1888 editions incomplete as a picture of the final events in human history. There may be still more light given besides these two cited above which has not been taken into account.

It is not difficult to square the advanced understanding of the Midnight Cry with Matthew 25, or to explain why it was so perceived in 1844. In Matthew 25, there are two "coming outs" noted. In the first, is the bringing together of the "Ten Virgins." These "went forth (exelthon) to meet the bridegroom." (25:1) In

the second going out, "at midnight, there was a cry made, Behold the bridegroom cometh, go ye out (exerchesthe) to meet him." (25:6) Both Greek verbs are from the same root word, one is past tense, the other, present tense. Both are describing the same type of experience, but at different times.

It is understandable that in 1844, when the Millerites believed the end would come in a matter of months, they could perceive of only one call to come out, and this they understood to be the second call at midnight. The significance of the textual evidence and the fact that "the Bridegroom" did not come in 1844 makes their exegesis of Matthew 25 untenable today. However, the implications of a corrected understanding are also unacceptable to many. In Manuscript Release #1216, Ellen White wrote:

"I was confirmed in all I had stated in Minneapolis, that a reformation must go through the churches. Reforms must be made, for spiritual weakness and blindness were upon the people who had been blessed with great light and precious opportunities and privileges. As reformers they had come out of the denominational churches, but they now act a part similar to that which the churches acted. We hoped that there would not be the necessity for another coming out." (1888 Materials, Vol. 1, pp. 356-357)

It should be obvious to any reader that here is a direct allusion to the parable of Matthew 25. If this parable is indeed prophetic in its application, there is to be a second calling out by "a voice at midnight."

We are now left with a second problem which must be considered. How do we account for this change in what we had perceived to be the events leading to the eschaton? A suggested answer is in typology, the same typology used by Paul in his letter to the Corinthian Church. He wrote that the events of the wilderness experience (and he limited the typology to that period) were written for our learning. (I Cor. 10:5-11) A parallel between the wilderness experience and the experience of the Adventist Church has been used by Adventist leaders. For example, there is the series of thirty-six sermons delivered during the Sabbath afternoon vesper services in the Battle Creek Tabernacle by Taylor G. Bunch. The syllabus of these studies is captioned - The Exodus and Advent Movement in Type and Antitype.

During the wilderness journey, when Israel stood

on the borders of the land of Canaan, the rebellion at Kadesh-barnea consigned them to continued wandering for forty more years. Concerning this edict on the part of God, the Scriptures read:

"After the number of the days in which ye searched the land, even forty days, each day for a year, shall ye bear your iniquities, even forty years, and ye shall know my breach of promise." (Numbers 14:34)

The margin reads - "Ye shall know the altering of my purpose." The question that must be answered is - Did the experience of 1888, 1901, and 1903 alter the schema of the eschatology which had been outlined in The Great Controversy editions of 1884 and 1888? Did not Ellen White write in 1901:

"We may have to remain here in this world because of insubordination many more years, as did the children of Israel, but for Christ's sake, His people should not add sin to sin by charging God with the consequences of their own wrong course of action." (Letter to P. T. Magan, dated December 7, 1901)

whg

Note: Between Christmas and the New Year, representatives from the Nora Springs, Iowa, Seventh-day Adventist Church and Back to God and the Bible Ministry met with us on campus to document from Scripture with explanatory notes the Statement of Beliefs previously formulated. This completed Statement is now available free upon request.

++++

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

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 paper may be reproduced without further permission by adding the credit line - "Reprinted from WVN, 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