

Andrews University

## Digital Commons @ Andrews University

---

Dissertations

Graduate Research

---

1980

### The Doctrine of the Sanctuary in the Seventh-day Adventist Church: Three Approaches

Roy Adams  
*Andrews University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/dissertations>



Part of the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Adams, Roy, "The Doctrine of the Sanctuary in the Seventh-day Adventist Church: Three Approaches" (1980). *Dissertations*. 4.

<https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/dissertations/4>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Research at Digital Commons @ Andrews University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Andrews University. For more information, please contact [repository@andrews.edu](mailto:repository@andrews.edu).



Seek Knowledge. Affirm Faith. Change the World.

Thank you for your interest in the

**Andrews University Digital Library  
of Dissertations and Theses.**

*Please honor the copyright of this document by  
not duplicating or distributing additional copies  
in any form without the author's express written  
permission. Thanks for your cooperation.*

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted you will find a target note listing the pages in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University  
Microfilms  
International

300 N. ZEEB RD. ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

8205565

ADAMS, ROY

THE DOCTRINE OF THE SANCTUARY IN THE SEVENTH-DAY  
ADVENTIST CHURCH: THREE APPROACHES

*Andrews University*

Th.D. 1981

University  
Microfilms  
International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Copyright 1980

by

Adams, Roy

All Rights Reserved

Andrews University  
Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary

THE DOCTRINE OF THE SANCTUARY IN THE SEVENTH-DAY  
ADVENTIST CHURCH: THREE APPROACHES

A Dissertation  
Presented in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Doctor of Theology

by  
Roy Adams  
August 1980

THE DOCTRINE OF THE SANCTUARY IN THE SEVENTH-DAY  
ADVENTIST CHURCH: THREE APPROACHES

A dissertation presented  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree  
Doctor of Theology

by  
Roy Adams

APPROVAL BY THE COMMITTEE

Raoul Uederen  
Raoul F. Uederen, Chairperson  
Professor of Historical  
Theology

Thomas H. Blincoe  
Thomas H. Blincoe, Dean  
SDA Theological Seminary

Fritz Guy  
Fritz Guy, Professor  
of Theology

William G. Johnsson  
William G. Johnsson, Professor  
of New Testament

C. Mervyn Maxwell  
C. Mervyn Maxwell, Professor  
of Church History

Edwin S. Gaustad  
Edwin S. Gaustad, Professor  
of History  
University of California,  
Riverside

October 26, 1980  
Date Approved

ABSTRACT

THE DOCTRINE OF THE SANCTUARY IN THE SEVENTH-DAY  
ADVENTIST CHURCH: THREE APPROACHES

by

Roy Adams

Chairman: Raoul Dederen

ABSTRACT OF GRADUATE STUDENT RESEARCH

Dissertation

Andrews University

Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary

Title: THE DOCTRINE OF THE SANCTUARY IN THE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST  
CHURCH: THREE APPROACHES

Name of researcher: Roy Adams

Name and degree of faculty adviser: Raoul Dederen, Ph.D.

Date completed: August 1980

This investigation studies the Adventist theology of the sanctuary as it found expression in the writings of Uriah Smith (1832-1903), Albion Fox Ballenger (1861-1921), and Milian Lauritz Andreasen (1876-1962).

Not only does the selection of these three figures make it possible to deal with the subject of the sanctuary, but it also provides a good opportunity to observe certain important developments in the understanding of the sanctuary doctrine within the Adventist church, because of the strategic place each figure occupied in Adventism, historically and theologically. The study attempts not only to describe the sanctuary theology of the three



figures, but also to provide interpretation and evaluation informed by the particular theological outlook of the respective figures.

Chapter I points out that Smith, though he appreciated the doctrine of the sanctuary for its own sake, nevertheless used it to support and defend what to him were even more fundamental theological concerns. Three such concerns are identified: (1) the salvation-historical significance of 1844, (2) the perpetuity of the decalogue and the Sabbath, and (3) the imminence of the parousia. The perception of such underlying concerns contributes to a better grasp of Smith's approach to the doctrine. It also aids in the identification of certain theological weaknesses.

Chapter II shows that what motivated Ballenger was a basic concern for righteousness by faith and Christian assurance, undergirded by a strong evangelistic orientation. It was this concern which led him to a radical revision of the historical Adventist understanding of the doctrine of the sanctuary. This reinterpretation provides positive insights into the doctrine, but also proves unsound in some of its basic assumptions and conclusions.

Chapter III makes clear that in those aspects of the doctrine which he emphasized, Andreasen, too, was motivated by an overriding theological concern--a concern for the sinless perfection of an eschatological Remnant. Emphasizing a three-phase process of atonement, he suggested that it was the third phase occurring in the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary which effected the perfecting of the saints.

Andreasen's position, though basically traditional, shows

several departures from Uriah Smith, mostly on non-major points. At the same time, Andreasen echoes Ballenger at many points. But while it would be possible to combine the views of Smith and Andreasen into a coherent Adventist theology of the sanctuary, the position of Ballenger represents too radical a departure to be included in such a merger.

The dissertation concludes that, bearing in mind the passage of time and a changed cultural setting, a contemporary Adventist approach to the doctrine of the sanctuary might benefit from some modifications in terms of method, language, and content. In addition, some of the major facets of the doctrine (for example the investigative judgment, the relationship of the cross to the antitypical day of atonement) may need to be expressed with greater theological precision. Moreover, Adventism may need to develop a greater degree of theological confidence in its approach to the subject so as to assure a climate conducive to new approaches, as well as a serious, critical appraisal of problems still outstanding.

For Celia...

and Dwayne and Kim

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS . . . . .	vii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . .	viii
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Early Definition of the Seventh-day Adventist Doctrine of the Sanctuary . . . . .	1
The Importance of the Doctrine for Seventh-day Adventists . . . . .	2
The Problem . . . . .	3
Methodology . . . . .	6
Biographical Résumé and Historical Standing . . . . .	9
Chapter	
I. THE DOCTRINE OF THE SANCTUARY IN THE WRITINGS OF URIAH SMITH . . . . .	15
Preliminary Considerations . . . . .	16
Smith's Place in Adventist History . . . . .	16
Smith's Sanctuary Corpus . . . . .	25
Smith's Perception of the Importance of the Sanctuary . . . . .	31
Smith's Theology of the Sanctuary . . . . .	35
A Concern to Defend the Salvation- Historical Significance of 1844 . . . . .	37
Affirmation of the Validity of the Basic Millerite Chronology of Dan 8 and 9 . . . . .	42
Identification of <u>qôdesh</u> in Dan 8:14 with the Heavenly Sanctuary . . . . .	46
Concept of a Two-Part Heavenly Ministry . . . . .	50
The Atonement . . . . .	58
Denial/Affirmation of a 'Shut-door' . . . . .	62
Conclusions . . . . .	67
Concern to Attest the Perpetuity of the Law and the Sabbath . . . . .	68
Concern to Preserve the Belief in an Imminent <u>Eschaton</u> . . . . .	77
The Cleansing of the Sanctuary and the Investigative Judgment . . . . .	79
An Imminent <u>Eschaton</u> . . . . .	84
Evaluation and Critique . . . . .	89

Chapter

II. BALLENGER'S THEOLOGY OF THE SANCTUARY . . . . .	95
Ballenger's Place in Adventist History . . . . .	95
Ballenger's Sanctuary Corpus . . . . .	99
Ballenger's Sanctuary Theology . . . . .	104
The Idea of a Heavenly Sanctuary	
Ministry before the Cross . . . . .	108
Objections to Traditional View	
of Heavenly Ministry . . . . .	108
Ballenger's New Interpretation . . . . .	112
Motive for Reinterpretation . . . . .	115
The Concept of Two Atonements . . . . .	118
The "Atonement" for Iniquity . . . . .	121
The Defilement and Cleansing of the	
Heavenly Sanctuary . . . . .	126
The Role of the Scapegoat ( <u>Azazel</u> ) . . . . .	131
The Investigative Judgment . . . . .	135
Analysis and Comment . . . . .	140
Retrospective Assessment . . . . .	140
Evaluation and Critique . . . . .	143
"Within the Veil" . . . . .	144
Relation of Blood to Defilement . . . . .	146
The Investigative Judgment . . . . .	149
The Atonement . . . . .	150
The Concept of a Heavenly Sanctuary	
Service before the Cross . . . . .	155
Scriptural Support . . . . .	155
Theological Premise . . . . .	159
Uniqueness of Christ . . . . .	160
Concluding Observations . . . . .	163
III. ANDREASEN'S THEOLOGY OF THE SANCTUARY . . . . .	165
Andreasen's Sanctuary Corpus . . . . .	167
Andreasen's Place in Adventist History . . . . .	170
Andreasen's Perception of the Importance	
of the Sanctuary . . . . .	177
Andreasen's Sanctuary Theology . . . . .	179
The Locus of Christ's Ministry	
upon His Ascension . . . . .	180
The Defilement and Cleansing	
of the Heavenly Sanctuary . . . . .	185
The Investigative Judgment . . . . .	191
Azazel . . . . .	197
The Atonement . . . . .	201
Andreasen's Understanding of	
the Atonement . . . . .	202
Conflict with Church Leaders . . . . .	207
"Novel" Position on the Nature of Christ . . . . .	208
"Novel" Positions on the Atonement . . . . .	212
Summary . . . . .	219

Chapter

III. (Continued)

Evaluation and Critique . . . . .	221
"Within the Veil" . . . . .	222
Defilement and Cleansing of the Sanctuary . . . . .	223
The Investigative Judgment . . . . .	224
The Scapegoat . . . . .	226
The Atonement . . . . .	227
The Concept of Sinless Perfection . . . . .	230
IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	236
Summary . . . . .	236
General Interpretive Assessment . . . . .	244
Question of Theological Gain . . . . .	244
The Locus of Christ's Ministry upon His Ascension . . . . .	245
The Literalness of the Heavenly Sanctuary and Ministry . . . . .	246
Defilement and Cleansing of the Heavenly Sanctuary . . . . .	248
The Investigative Judgment . . . . .	249
The Scapegoat . . . . .	251
The Atonement . . . . .	252
Question of Theological Synthesis . . . . .	253
Question of Basic Theological Motivation . . . . .	257
Suggestions for Possible Improvement and New Approaches . . . . .	258
Improvements . . . . .	248
Method . . . . .	259
Language . . . . .	260
Content . . . . .	264
Other Observations . . . . .	267
New Approaches . . . . .	271
A Phenomenological Approach . . . . .	272
A Psychotherapeutic Approach . . . . .	275
A Quasi-Typological Approach . . . . .	278
A Final Word . . . . .	282
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	284

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<u>AH</u>	<u>Advent Herald, and Signs of the Times Reporter</u>
E.G.W.	Ellen G. White
<u>GC</u>	<u>The Gathering Call</u>
G.C. Archives	Department of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, D.C.
<u>RH</u>	<u>Review and Herald</u> <sup>1</sup>
SDA	Seventh-day Adventist <sup>2</sup>
<u>SDA Ency.</u>	<u>Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia</u>
<u>ST</u>	<u>Signs of the Times</u>
<u>STM</u>	<u>Signs of the Times (Millerite)</u>

---

<sup>1</sup>This periodical went through several changes in nomenclature. At its inception in 1850 the name was Second Advent Review, and Sabbath Herald; in 1851 the name changed to The Advent Review, and Sabbath Herald; in 1861 to Review and Herald; in 1971 it went back to the old name Advent Review and Sabbath Herald; and finally in 1978 it assumed its current name, Adventist Review. Perhaps the name most widely used to identify the magazine in the United States is Review and Herald.

<sup>2</sup>Throughout the dissertation, the expressions "Seventh-day Adventist" and "Adventist" are used interchangeably, except as otherwise explained. This applies also to the abstract forms "Seventh-day Adventism" and "Adventism."

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

No one comes to the end of a doctoral dissertation without a keen awareness of his indebtedness to a large number of people. I wish first to express my gratitude to the members of my committee: Dr. Raoul Dederen (chairman), Dr. Fritz Guy, and Dr. William Johnson. Their genuine interest in the subject of my dissertation was a constant encouragement to me, and their helpful criticism has saved me from many pitfalls. My deepest gratitude goes to Dr. Dederen, in particular, who during the entire course of my doctoral studies has often gone beyond the call of duty in my behalf. Only he and I know the full extent of his good advice and tangible help.

Without the willing cooperation on the part of a superb library staff, my work would have been much more frustrating. In this connection, I especially wish to thank Mrs. Mary Jane Mitchell, Mrs. Frances Bartlett, Mrs. Rebecca Twomley, Mrs. Louise Dederen, and Mr. Marley Soper for their sympathetic understanding and courteous assistance.

I am also grateful to Miss Bonnie Beres who with much patience has typed and re-typed parts of this work, and to Mrs. Joyce Campbell who has brought it into proper form. The dissertation secretary, Mrs. Joyce Jones, has shown a high degree of competence in her suggestions regarding technical details and has thereby helped to make this work easier to read.



Finally, and most important, I am grateful for the support, encouragement, and patience of my wife, Celia, who, for endless frustrating months, has been both mother and father to our two lovely children, Dwayne and Kim. For all of this, and for other blessings too numerous to mention, I give thanks to God.

## INTRODUCTION

### Early Definition of the Seventh-day Adventist Doctrine of the Sanctuary

Following a visit to Low Hampton, New York, around 1853, Joseph Bates described the grave of William Miller:

The white marble monument erected over his head, shows the passing traveler, a book chisled out on the front of the marble slab, representing a Bible. On the first page, in large black letters, are the following appropriate words:

"And he said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred days, then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." Dan viii, 14.<sup>1</sup>

In this description, Bates put his finger on both the origin and 'soul' of Adventism. For it was in the Millerite Movement of the 1830s and 1840s that Seventh-day Adventism had its genesis; and Dan 8:14 was the scripture which above all else provided the raison d'être for its existence as a separate body. From that passage it drew its central doctrine of the sanctuary.

A definitive five-point statement of the historical Adventist understanding of the meaning of this doctrine appeared in an 1887 article by Uriah Smith, one of the Adventist pioneers:

1. That the sanctuary and priesthood of the Mosaic dispensation represented in shadow the sanctuary and priesthood of the present or Christian dispensation (Heb 8:5).

2. That this Sanctuary and priesthood are in heaven, resembling the former as nearly as heavenly things may resemble the earthly (Heb 9:23, 24).

---

<sup>1</sup> Joseph Bates, "Thoughts on the Past Work of William Miller and his Adherents, Respecting the True Starting Point of Dan viii, 14; ix, 24, 25," RH, 17 February 1853, p. 156.

3. That the ministry of Christ, our great high priest, in the heavenly Sanctuary is composed of two great divisions, as in the type; first, in the first apartment, or holy place, and, secondly, in the second apartment, or most holy place.

4. That the beginning of his ministry in the second apartment is marked by the great prophetic period of 2,300 days (Dan 8:14), and began when those days ended in 1844.

5. That the ministry he is now performing in the second apartment of the heavenly temple, is "the atonement" (Lev 16:17), the "cleansing of the Sanctuary" (Dan 8:14), the "investigative judgment" (Dan 7:10), the "finishing of the mystery of God" (Rev 10:7; 11:15, 19), which will complete Christ's work as priest, consummate the plan of salvation, terminate human probation, decide every case for eternity, and bring Christ to his throne of eternal domination.<sup>1</sup>

#### The Importance of the Doctrine for Seventh-day Adventists

Ellen G. White (1827-1915), who, with her husband James White, has been regarded as one of the founders of Adventism, is still, by way of her writing, the leading voice in the Adventist church. Commenting on the subject of the sanctuary in 1906, she declared that "the correct understanding of the ministration in the heavenly sanctuary is the foundation of our faith."<sup>2</sup> Nearly twenty years earlier, she had affirmed that "the intercession of Christ in man's behalf in the sanctuary above is as essential to the plan of salvation as was His death upon the cross."<sup>3</sup> And in 1971,

---

<sup>1</sup>Uriah Smith, "Questions on the Sanctuary," RH, 14 June 1887, pp. 376, 377.

<sup>2</sup>Ellen G. White, Letter 208, 1906. Quoted in Evangelism as Set Forth in the Writings of Ellen G. White (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1971), p. 221.

<sup>3</sup>Ellen G. White, The Great Controversy between Christ and Satan during the Christian Dispensation (Battle Creek: Review and Herald Publishing Co., 1888), p. 489. This work passed through several editions. All future references to it will be to the 1888 edition, except as otherwise indicated.

LeRoy E. Froom (1890-1974), a well-known Adventist historian, held that "the one distinctive, separative, structural truth--the sole doctrinal teaching that identifies and sets" the Adventist church "apart from all other Christian bodies past and present--is what we have always designated the 'Sanctuary truth.'"<sup>1</sup>

It is safe to say that if Adventists were questioned in regard to their most important doctrines, most of them would put the sanctuary, together with the Sabbath and the Second Advent, at the top of the list. The doctrine is usually cited as one of the "old landmarks" of Seventh-day Adventism.<sup>2</sup>

#### The Problem

In spite of the sanctuary's importance to Adventist theology and thinking, however, there exists within the Adventist church, as many of its adherents will readily admit, a certain degree of unease in regard to the theological integrity of the doctrine. In 1942, M. L. Andreasen, a teacher at the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary in Washington, D.C., in a report to leaders at his church's headquarters, stated that "a large number of our ministers have

---

<sup>1</sup>Movement of Destiny (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1971), p. 541. Froom goes on to say that whereas every other major doctrine of Seventh-day Adventists has been shared by other religious bodies in some form, at one time or another, the doctrine of the sanctuary has always been a distinctive Adventist emphasis, "the earliest post-Disappointment position to be discerned and taught." This "pivotal position" has been enjoyed by this doctrine throughout Seventh-day Adventist history. (Ibid.)

<sup>2</sup>See Ellen G. White, Counsels to Writers and Editors, compilation (Nashville, TN: Southern Publishing Assn., 1946), pp. 30-31. Also listed were the sabbath, and the non-immortality of the wicked. See also, ibid., pp. 53, 54; Selected Messages from the Writings of Ellen G. White, book 1 (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1958), pp. 207, 208.

serious doubt as to the correctness of the views we hold on certain phases of the sanctuary."<sup>1</sup> In the 1960s an ad hoc committee, officially known as the Daniel Committee, was formed by the president of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists to give study to the Adventist interpretation of the key text, Dan 8:14. As if to confirm Andreasen's observation, the committee, after meeting for four years (1962-1966), "adjourned without reaching any kind of consensus and without issuing a report."<sup>2</sup>

This state of uncertainty has persisted up to the present time. One gets the impression that many Adventists, at least in North America and particularly those in academic circles, have reservations regarding their church's interpretation of Dan 8:14, in the light of the grammatico-historical principles of exegesis widely accepted within Protestantism today.

Among other aspects of the doctrine which create problems for many Seventh-day Adventists may be listed the following: the theological significance of 1844; the validity of the year-day principle for the interpretation of the prophecies of Daniel, in particular; the scriptural integrity of the notion of an investigative judgment; the theological relationship of Dan 8:14 and

---

<sup>1</sup>M. L. Andreasen to J. L. McElhany and W. H. Branson, 25 December 1942, p. 5, E. G. W. Research Center, Andrews University.

<sup>2</sup>See Raymond F. Cottrell, "A Hermeneutic for Daniel 8:14," [1978?], p. 15, G. C. Archives. Also Desmond Ford and E. Syme, "Investigative Judgment Forum, October 27, 1979," transcript, E. G. W. Research Center, Andrews University; Ford, "Daniel 8:14, the Day of Atonement, and the Investigative Judgment," [1980], p. 34, G. C. Archives. For a survey of Adventist misgivings in regard to key aspects of the sanctuary doctrine, see *ibid.*, pp. 47-105.

Lev 16; the locus of Christ's ministry upon His ascension; the meaning of the Day-of-Atonement symbolisms in Heb 9, and its implications for the Adventist notion of an antitypical Day of Atonement commencing in 1844.

The present study does not attempt to solve these problems. Rather, it tries to take a critical look from within at the way in which the Adventist church has approached these and other problems. It is especially interested in the way the problems cited above, and others, have been addressed. This, it would seem, is a necessary first step toward a greater degree of theological precision in the elucidation of this doctrine. For theology, and in particular, dogmatic theology, does not advance intelligently, except by dynamic continuity with the past.

Very little work has been done in this area. No critical study has been made of the way the Adventist church has expressed itself on this central area of its theology. Robert Haddock's thesis on the history of the doctrine in the Adventist church from 1800 to the beginning of this century<sup>1</sup> is an important historical document, but it was not designed to evaluate the church's sanctuary theology, as such.

The present investigation attempts to make a contribution in this area.

---

<sup>1</sup> Robert Haddock, "A History of the Doctrine of the Sanctuary in the Advent Movement, 1800-1905," B.D. thesis, Andrews University, 1970. Hereafter designated History of Sanctuary. Descriptive references to the doctrine of the sanctuary and its development in Adventism are found in Froom, The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers: The Historical Development of Prophetic Interpretation, 4 vols (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1954), 4:877-905; Movement of Destiny, pp. 78-80, 541-50; P. Gerard Damsteegt,

### Methodology

The vast literature produced within the Adventist church over the years in the area of the sanctuary makes its encompassment impossible in a single study. Therefore, it was necessary to limit the present investigation. Three Adventist figures-- Uriah Smith, Albion F. Ballenger, and Milian L. Andreassen<sup>1</sup>-- each of whom has made a significant contribution to Adventist sanctuary theology, were selected to form the central focus of this study.

The original sources consulted include the published works of the three figures and all available unpublished documents (papers, transcripts of speeches, correspondence) in an attempt to reflect their theology as accurately as possible. Extraneous historical details, not germane to the purpose of this investigation, have been omitted; but since theology cannot be divorced from history, appropriate historical information has been included to provide perspective. Many of the historical data came by way of secondary sources, which, being largely non-interpretive, do not impede the attempt to allow the theology of the three figures to emerge with as little distortion as possible.

An attempt is thus made to understand the contribution of each figure within his own historical setting and from the perspective of his own fundamental theological concern(s). For it is

---

Foundations of the Seventh-day Adventist Message and Mission (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1977), pp. 165-177.

<sup>1</sup>The respective place and standing of each figure within Adventism is discussed below.

impossible to listen 'sympathetically' to a writer or theologian without an awareness of the historical circumstances which helped to shape his theological outlook. Thus, each of the three central chapters, Chapters I-III, includes a brief historical overview which serves to identify some of the influences which helped to shape a particular figure's understanding and elucidation of the doctrine.

Another element of these three central chapters is an attempt to understand the meaning of the doctrine in relation to a figure's underlying theological motivation(s). The identity of such basic motivations was determined inductively. That is to say, all the available works of each figure, published and unpublished, having a bearing on the subject of the sanctuary were carefully studied. In addition, extensive reading was done in other writings unrelated to the sanctuary theme. It was from this kind of immersion in the works of each particular figure that the fundamental theological concern(s) of each gradually became obvious.

With this background, the present study first lays out each figure's position on the sanctuary as accurately and as fully as possible, from a descriptive point of view, taking note of nuances, developments, modifications, and reformulations as they occur. To do this effectively, and to avoid any distraction from the main purpose of the study, it was necessary to concentrate primarily on the major categories of the sanctuary theme, rather than try to encompass the copious minutiae which generally embellish the doctrine in the writings of Adventist expositors.



This process of objective description is followed by and, in many cases, intermingled with interpretive insights into the particular development of the doctrine, in the light of the fundamental interest(s) of the figure concerned, and it is shown how this underlying theme has affected his entire sanctuary theology. This procedure not only leads to a "sympathetic" understanding of the sanctuary theology of each figure, but also to a better grasp of its distinctiveness.

Description and interpretation are followed by a process of evaluation. Here the strengths and weaknesses of a particular position are assessed. This is done on the basis of a variety of criteria, including general logic, consonance with the biblical data, theological cogency, and consistency with other elements of a figure's theology. The nature of the specific theme under consideration usually determines the particular criteria employed in evaluating it.

The methodological steps just described occur in each of the three chapters which form the main body of the present work. The final chapter considers the sanctuary theology of all three figures as a whole. Following a summary description of their three positions, it presents an interpretive-evaluative assessment of their contribution, focusing on the major aspects of the doctrine covered in the preceding chapters. Particularly, this assessment seeks to determine whether the elucidation of the subject in Ballenger and Andreasen represents significant gains over that of Uriah Smith, either from a theological or from a biblical point of view. And it raises the question as to whether there is

sufficient consonance and continuity in these three positions to make possible a synthesis of them into what may be called an 'Adventist theology of the sanctuary.'

Finally, based on the findings of this dissertation, the last chapter offers some suggestions for theological refinement in the Adventist understanding of the doctrine. It also gives suggestions for three new 'non-distinctive' approaches to the sanctuary theme. These suggestions for new approaches are supplied as pointers only and are not meant to serve as models of such approaches.

#### Biographical Résumé and Historical Standing

A brief biographical statement indicates the place of the three figures studied in this investigation in the history of Adventism.

Uriah Smith (1832-1903) was a prominent Adventist churchman, editor, and author for some fifty years. He was only twelve when his Millerite mother, Rebekah Smith, passed through the great disappointment of 1844,<sup>1</sup> an event which is seen to have had a profound influence upon his life. While serving as a public-school teacher in 1852, he attended Adventist meetings in Washington, New Hampshire. "It was there that he received his first deep convictions regarding the sabbath truth."<sup>2</sup>

Exhibiting a lifelong interest in apocalyptic prophecy and

---

<sup>1</sup>This episode is explained in chapter I.

<sup>2</sup>"In Memoriam," RH, 10 March 1903, p. 4.

eschatology, Smith produced his major work, Daniel and Revelation, in this area.<sup>1</sup> In 1855, when only twenty-three years of age, he became editor of the Review and Herald, the official paper of the Adventist church, a position which provided him with an avenue for influencing the thinking of Seventh-day Adventists for more than forty-five years.

An article devoted to his memory in the Review and Herald on the occasion of his death noted that "in the early days of the [Adventist] message," Smith joined with "James White, J. N. Andrews, and J. H. Waggoner in the diligent, thorough, critical study of Bible doctrines required to place this message fairly, intelligently, and convincingly before the world."<sup>2</sup> When the church's first educational institution, Battle Creek College, was established (1874), he was chosen as Bible instructor. He served for many years both as a member and as secretary of the Adventist General Conference Committee. He carried throughout his life a great burden to see the Adventist message proclaimed worldwide, and in what turned out to be his last appeal to a forthcoming General Conference session of his church, he wrote:

I am with you in the endeavor to send forth in this generation this gospel of the kingdom, for a witness to all nations. And when this is completed, it will be the signal for the coronation of our coming King. Dan 12:1.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>This work is described fully below.

<sup>2</sup>"In Memoriam: Uriah Smith," p. 4.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 5. Smith died before that General Conference session convened. For more on Uriah Smith, see SDA Ency., s.v. "Smith, Uriah"; Eugene Durand, "Yours in the Blessed Hope, Uriah Smith," Ph.D. dissertation, George Washington University, 1978; chapter I of this work.

Albion F. Ballenger (1861-1921), after teaching public school for a few years, was persuaded to enter the preaching ministry. As an Adventist minister, he served briefly in an editorial capacity, but made his major contribution in the area of evangelism.

In 1901 he was called to the British Isles where he served in various evangelistic and administrative capacities. It was while working in Europe that he came to entertain views on the sanctuary which ran counter to the traditional Adventist position. As a result of the ensuing conflicts, Ballenger was both relieved of his ministerial credentials and disfellowshipped from the Adventist church.<sup>1</sup> This development provoked a severe reaction on the part of Adventist congregations in Ireland and Wales, which by that time had come to appreciate his ministry.<sup>2</sup>

Notwithstanding his troubles with the church, and in spite of his unfrocking and excommunication, he continued for many years to regard himself as still a part of the Adventist people.<sup>3</sup> For a while, he kept a promise to Adventist leaders not to engage in public agitation of his "untraditional" sanctuary views. Eventually, however, he succumbed to the pleas of sympathizers to give a public

---

<sup>1</sup> See also "Early Life," Albion F. Ballenger obituary, GC, September-October, 1921, p. 2; SDA Ency., s.v. "Ballenger, Albion Fox."

<sup>2</sup> See Bert Haloviak, "Pioneers, Pantheists, and Progressives," June 1980, p. 30, G.C. Archives.

<sup>3</sup> See Ballenger, Cast Out for the Cross of Christ (Tropico, CA: by the author, [1911], pp. 33, 34, 77, 81. More information on the date and other circumstances of this book appears in chapter II.

explanation of his differences with the Adventist church.<sup>1</sup> This he did in the form of two books, discussed in chapter II, and through the pages of The Gathering Call, a small monthly magazine which he edited from 1914 until the time of his death in 1921.

Reports of a final reconciliation with the Adventist church were denied by his brother, E. S. Ballenger. According to him, Albion never recanted his independent views on the sanctuary.<sup>2</sup>

Milian L. Andreasen (1876-1962) came into the Adventist church as a teen-ager, not long after migrating to North America from his native Denmark. After working for a brief period as a school teacher, he entered the Adventist ministry and was ordained just after the turn of the century. Among his various church portfolios may be listed the following: president of Hutchinson Theological Seminary, a foreign language Adventist school in Minnesota, (1910-1918); president of Union College, Lincoln, Nebraska (1931-1938); teacher at the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Washington, D.C. (1938-1949); field secretary of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists (1941-1950).

Recognized within the church as a leading Bible scholar, Andreasen was requested on three separate occasions to prepare lessons for the church's world-wide daily Bible-study program.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Cast Out, pp. i, ii; An Examination of Forty Fatal Errors Regarding the Atonement: A Review of a Work Which "Fully Explains the Sanctuary Questions as Understood by the (Seventh-day Adventist) Denomination" (Riverside, CA: [1913]), Preface, p. III [sic]. More information on this work appears in chapter II.

<sup>2</sup> [E. S. Ballenger], "Did A. F. Ballenger Ever Recant?" GC, September-October 1937, p. 31. For more on Ballenger see SDA Ency., s.v. "Ballenger, Albion Fox"; chapter II of this work.

Early in his ministry, he developed an interest in the subject of the sanctuary and atonement, an interest which was sustained throughout his career, and expressed in various books and articles.

Toward the end of his life, from 1955 until his death in 1962, Andreasen became embroiled in a heated controversy with high Adventist leaders over the subject of the sanctuary and the atonement, a controversy eventually leading to the suspension of his ministerial credentials. Unlike Ballenger, Andreasen saw his role in the conflict as that of preserving the traditional Adventist positions on the sanctuary and atonement.<sup>1</sup>

The three figures, in terms of their sanctuary theology, are sufficiently alike so as to lend themselves to a comparative study. At the same time, they provide the variety, contrast, and historical distance necessary for the assessment with which this effort is concerned. Each of them occupies a strategic position in regard to the doctrine of the sanctuary in the Adventist church.

Uriah Smith represents the basic historical Adventist position, and his presentation of the subject was long regarded as normative. In the early period of Seventh-day Adventists, John N. Andrews did write as extensively as Smith on the sanctuary theme, but Smith pursued his interest in the doctrine fifteen years after Andrews had passed from the scene in 1883. Moreover, Smith was in a much better position, as editor of the church paper, to influence Adventist thinking in general.

---

<sup>1</sup> Andreasen's conflict with church leaders is explained more fully in chapter III. For more on Andreasen, see SDA Ency., s.v. "Andreasen, Milian Lauritz"; Virginia Steinweg, Without Fear or Favor: The Life of M. L. Andreasen (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1979); chapter III of this work.

Ballenger represents a break with the Adventist tradition, and his candid treatment of the subject, as he saw it, provides an interesting alternative development of the doctrine. His elucidation of the subject raises the intriguing question as to whether Adventist sanctuary theology would have been enriched had his positions been adopted officially by the church.

Andreasen came at a time when one would anticipate deeper reflection on the subject of the sanctuary, perhaps even a certain degree of modification or reassessment. For by the time he began his literary career (1924),<sup>1</sup> over three-quarters of a century of Adventist work on the sanctuary theme had elapsed. To an extent, we do find in him a certain degree of modification, but also a staunch adherence to traditional positions. So, while Smith's theology may properly be perceived as advocative, and Ballenger's as corrective, Andreasen's seems to be a combination of both, with a heavier emphasis on the advocative.

These three figures, therefore, provide a good opportunity to observe variety, modifications, revisions or reformulations in the treatment of this central doctrine of Adventism. Thus their contributions are used in this dissertation as paradigms through which to observe the expression of the doctrine in the Adventist church as a whole. Together, they provide a bird's-eye view of the Adventist teaching on the sanctuary.

This is the task which now lies before us.

---

<sup>1</sup>As shown in chapter III, this was the date of his first official writing for the Adventist church.

## CHAPTER I

### THE DOCTRINE OF THE SANCTUARY IN THE WRITINGS OF URIAH SMITH

During some fifty years as an editor and author in the Seventh-day Adventist church, Uriah Smith produced a large volume of material on the subject of the sanctuary. The present chapter seeks to understand the Adventist doctrine of the sanctuary as exhibited in those writings. However, rather than set forth the entire range of topics discussed by Smith during the course of nearly half a century, the intention is to identify basic emphases, thrusts, and concerns, and show how Smith's approach to the doctrine served the interest of these fundamental issues and concerns. An attempt is also made to uncover the underlying rationale for his approach to the sanctuary theme.

Thus, this chapter views Smith's sanctuary theology from the perspective of his own experience and from his own world-view which was not inconsonant with that of his Adventist contemporaries. It will endeavor to show how Smith's initial participation in the Millerite experience of 1844 and his subsequent formal affiliation with a post-Millerite minority group in the decade of confusion and disillusionment following that event was to influence his theology vis-à-vis the doctrine of the sanctuary.



### Preliminary Considerations

Before entering upon this task, however, some preliminary considerations are necessary in regard to (1) Smith's place in Adventist history, a factor which bears on his theological outlook; (2) his sanctuary corpus, as a means of indicating the scope of his contribution to Adventist sanctuary theology; and (3) his conception of the importance of the doctrine.

#### Smith's Place in Adventist History

Smith comes upon the Adventist theological scene in the decade following the "Great Disappointment" of 1844.<sup>1</sup> Although

---

<sup>1</sup>The "Great Disappointment" refers to the experience which came in October 1844 to the followers of William Miller, commonly known as the Millerites. Miller, a farmer living in Low Hampton, New York, had become convinced after a protracted period of independent Bible study that the second coming of Christ was imminent. His calculations, based on the prophecy of Dan 8:14, located the end of the world sometime in the Jewish year commencing in the spring of 1843 and terminating in the spring of 1844. Thus, according to this schema, Christ was due to return on or before March 21, 1844. Miller began to lecture publicly regarding these views about 1831--two years before his studies on the advent began to appear in the Vermont Telegraph, a Baptist paper. See [William Miller], William Miller's Apology and Defence (Boston: Joshua V. Himes, 1845), pp. 2-20; STM, 25 January 1843, p. 147; James White, Sketches of the Christian Life and Public Labors of William Miller, Gathered from His Memoir by the Late Sylvester Bliss and from other Sources (Battle Creek: Steam Press of the SDA Publishing Assn., 1875), pp. 47, 48; John N. Loughborough, The Great Second Advent Movement (Nashville, TN: Southern Publishing Assn., 1905), pp. 118-121; Francis D. Nichol, The Midnight Cry: A Defence of William Miller and the Millerites (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1944), pp. 28-40, 126; P. Gerard Damsteegt, Foundations of the Seventh-day Adventist Message and Mission (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1977), pp. 13-16.

As the time for which he predicted the Advent drew closer, some of his followers, using the Karaite Jewish method of computation, a method older than that employed by Miller, revised the date for the Advent to April 18, 1844. Of course, both dates passed without a realization of their hopes, a crisis that brought not only dismay, but also a reappraisal of their chronological position vis-à-vis the prophecy of Dan 8:14. This reappraisal led

them to make a connection between the cleansing of the sanctuary in Dan 8:14 and that referred to in Lev 16. They, accordingly, concluded that the end of the 2300 years (marking, in their view, the commencement of the cleansing of the sanctuary) had to occur, in accordance with the Levitical type, on the 10th day of the seventh Jewish month. On the basis of the Karaite calendation, they eventually settled upon October 22 as the equivalent, in 1844, of the 10th day of the seventh Jewish month, the Day of Atonement or cleansing of the sanctuary. See Letter from S. S. Snow, 16 February 1844 in The Midnight Cry, 22 February 1844, pp. 243, 244; Midnight Cry, 28 March 1844, p. 289; and 4 April 1844, p. 297; Isaac C. Wellcome, History of the Second Advent Message and Mission, Doctrine and People (Yarmouth, ME: by the Author, 1874), pp. 356-66; Nichol, Midnight Cry, pp. 163, 207, 208, 213-16; Loughborough, Second Advent Movement, pp. 160-66.

Naturally, there was great enthusiasm and excitement as the fateful day arrived. Some estimates place the figure of those awaiting the Advent at that time as high as 50,000, the greater bulk of these being in the New England States where Millerism had its genesis. See [Miller], Apology and Defence, p. 22; Josiah Litch, "The Rise and Progress of Adventism," Advent Shield and Review, May 1844, p. 90; Nichol, Midnight Cry, pp. 228-46.

When the time passed without the realization of their expectation, the Millerites experienced what has been referred to as the "Great Disappointment." This spectacular failure of their hopes had a disintegrating effect upon the movement. Some simply abandoned their faith in God and religion, some continued the process of date setting for a while--even as late as 1856; some became bitter opponents of their former faith. Those who retained faith in an imminent Second Advent adopted divergent emphases which eventually led them into at least five distinct and separate groups: Evangelical Adventists (stressing natural immortality and eternal future punishment), the Advent Christians (stressing the materiality of man and the final annihilation of the wicked), Seventh-day Adventists (with emphasis on the Sabbath or ten commandments and the second advent), Life and Advent Union (stressing a limited resurrection), and the Age-to-Come Adventists (believing in the eventual re-establishment of the Jews in Palestine). Uriah Smith belonged, of course, to the group which came to be known as Seventh-day Adventists. See [Miller], Apology and Defence, pp. 24-31; Sylvester Bliss, Memoirs of William Miller, Generally Known as a Lecturer on the Prophecies, and the Second Coming of Christ (Boston: Joshua V. Himes, 1853), pp. 293-98; Hiram Edson, manuscript, pp. 8a, 9, Heritage Room, James White Library, Andrews University; Wellcome, Second Advent Message, pp. 335-38; Nichol, Midnight Cry, pp. 247-60.

For more on William Miller and The Millerite Movement, see Bliss, "Rise and Progress of Adventism," pp. 46-93; Joseph Bates, Second Advent Waymarks and High Heaps; Or, a Connected View, of the Fulfillment of Prophecy by God's Peculiar People,

only about twelve years old when the Disappointment occurred, he evidently shared in the keen embarrassment which came upon the Millerite believers at that time.<sup>1</sup> This event played a major role in determining the future course of his life. He was later to speak as though he had been part and parcel of that 1844 movement: "In regard to the past, I would say, that though quite young, I was in the messages of 1843-44, and have ever believed that they meant something."<sup>2</sup>

---

from the Year 1840-1847 (New Bedford, [MS]: Press of Benjamin Lindsey, 1847), pp. 8-16; Nichol, Midnight Cry, pp. 41-287; SDA Ency., s.v. "Millerite Movement"; Jerome L. Clark, 1844: Religious Movements (Nashville, TN: Southern Publishing Assn., 1968), pp. 15-83; LeRoy E. Froom, The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers: The Historical Development of Prophetic Interpretation, 4 vols. (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1946-1954), 4:443-851; Mahlon E. Olsen, A History of the Origin and Progress of Seventh-day Adventists (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1925), pp. 121-66; David T. Arthur, "Millerism," in The Rise of Adventism: Religion and Society in Mid-Nineteenth-Century America, ed. Edwin S. Gaustad (New York, Evanston, San Francisco, and London: Harper and Row, 1974), pp. 154-72; Ingemar Lindén, The Last Trump: A Historico-genetical Study of Some Important Chapters in the Making and Development of the Seventh-day Adventist Church (Frankfurt am Main, Bern and Las Vegas: Peter Lang, 1978), pp. 17-65; Damsteegt, Foundations, pp. 16-100.

<sup>1</sup>Miller complained that "the amount of scoffing and mocking" which followed in the wake of the disappointment was "beyond any calculation." He said, "We can hardly pass a man, professor or non-professor, but what he scoffingly inquires, 'You have not gone up,' or 'God cannot burn the world'." Miller lamented that even the Bible itself was ridiculed, and the power of God subjected to blasphemy--and worse, all this was being done with the tacit approval of "[popular] ministers and moral editors." ("Letter from Bro. Miller," AH, 11 December 1844, p. 142.) On the Millerite embarrassment, see Loughborough, Second Advent Movement, pp. 181, 187, and Olsen, Origin and Progress, pp. 157-60. As the twelve-year-old son of a Millerite, Smith obviously shared in this distress.

<sup>2</sup>Smith, Letter, RH, 9 June 1853, p. 16.

This indicates that Smith was willing, even eager, to be associated with the earliest Millerite experience, notwithstanding the low esteem of that experience in the public mind. At the same time, it shows his perception of himself as one of the pioneers of the Adventist church.<sup>1</sup> Thus, with his roots in the pioneer period of Adventism, one can expect that the post-Disappointment Sitz im Leben would play an important role in determining the direction of his theological concerns.

The conditions prevailing among the Millerites following the 1844 episode were certainly not very enticing. It was a period of considerable confusion, perplexity, and disillusionment. The defection rate was high, and the credibility of the Millerite message was at a low ebb.<sup>2</sup> This climate gave rise to a good measure of reevaluation and reinterpretation of previously accepted positions, resulting in discord and disunity. In an effort to bring some order out of this confusion, unite the discordant voices, and rekindle a sense of purpose in an erstwhile confident movement, a conference of Millerites convened at Albany, New York, in April 1845.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>For a discussion of the place of Smith as one of the five most influential Adventist pioneers, see Eugene F. Durand, "Yours in the Blessed Hope, Uriah Smith" (Ph.D. dissertation, George Washington University, 1978), pp. 1-3.

<sup>2</sup>Miller himself felt constrained to use the expression "Babylon" to describe the state of affairs among his own followers in the wake of the Disappointment, and wondered whether they had not "sinned against the Holy Ghost." See "The Albany Conference," AH, 4 June 1845, p. 129. Letter, Miller to I. E. Jones, AH, 25 December 1844, p. 154. For more on the prevailing atmosphere among Miller's followers at this time, see Oisen, Origin and Progress, pp. 160, 161, 164; Damsteegt, Foundations, pp. 114, 115; Haddock, History of Sanctuary, pp. 106-08.

<sup>3</sup>The Albany Conference was the event which brought to a head a growing crisis of confidence on the part of many Millerites

The conference, however, failed to produce unity, and a few months later, as described by one Millerite editor, at least four groups of Adventists could be distinguished. One group rejected the validity of their past experience, believing it was all a mistake. A second group saw the 1844 failure as evidence that the 2300 days had not yet ended, a conclusion which led to further time setting. Yet another group, not rejecting their former experience outright, nevertheless became afflicted with doubt. A fourth group expressed confidence in the integrity of the Millerite calculations and believed that the prophecy in Dan 8:14 had been fulfilled.<sup>1</sup>

To that last group Smith became affiliated seven and a half years later (December 1852) at the age of twenty. But his opinion of them as

. . . 'a faithful few' . . .  
Whom Treason cannot move, nor Unbelief,  
Nor Doubt corrupt. . . .<sup>2</sup>

was not shared by the larger body of Millerites. In 1850 James White observed that those Millerites who continued to espouse 1844 as the terminus of the 2300 days "were held up, by many Advent

---

in the prophetic calculations of the past two years. Prominent leaders like Miller, Joshua V. Himes and Josiah Litch retreated from their former positions and admitted to being in error regarding the 1844 expectation. For more on the Albany Conference, see Froom, Prophetic Faith, 4:827-36; Wellcome, Second Advent Message, pp. 415-28; Damsteegt, Foundations, pp. 113-15.

<sup>1</sup>Hale, "Editorial Correspondence," AH, 10 September 1845, p. 40.

<sup>2</sup>Smith, "The Warning Voice of Time and Prophecy," RH 12 May 1853, p. 202. This work is described below.

preachers and papers, to public notice, as fanatics, and they were classed with Mormons, Shakers, &c., &c."<sup>1</sup>

It is in this setting that Smith must be understood. While it is possible to detect in his earlier writings an awareness of the existence of a larger Protestant establishment by and large unrelated to the Millerite concerns, his sanctuary apologetic was directed primarily toward the other three groups of post-1844 Millerites just described. His approach to the doctrine, the areas to which he gave the greatest emphasis, and even the forms of expression he employed, were all calculated to make the greatest impact upon that particular audience.<sup>2</sup>

In regard to his impact upon Adventist history, youth was in his favor. Like other early Adventist pioneers such as James White, Ellen G. White, J. N. Andrews, and Joseph Bates,<sup>3</sup> he was able to influence the direction of the emerging Adventist church. But because he outlived these early shapers of Adventism by many

---

<sup>1</sup>White, "Our Present Position," RH, No. 2, December 1850, p. 14.

<sup>2</sup>It must be noted, however, that by Smith's time the situation had grown considerably more complex and confused. Said an editorial in the Advent Herald, "Are there not 'Albany Conference' Adventists, 'Hartford Convention' Adventists, and Anti-conference Adventists? Seventh day, first day, and every day Adventists? Workers and no workers? Shut door, open door, feetwashers? 'Whole truth,' and 'apostate' Adventists? Baptist, Methodist, Calvinist, Episcopal, Congregational and Presbyterian Adventists?" (Editorial, "The Advent Question," AH, 27 November 1847, p. 133). This helps to explain the variant strains and emphases in Smith, some of which might strike the modern reader as farfetched. Damsteegt has shown that on the major issues of the day (the shut door, the ministry of Christ, the sealing), there was wide divergence of opinion. (See Foundations, pp. 116, 117.)

<sup>3</sup>See above p. 19, n. 1.

years (except for Ellen White, who died in 1915), he was able to influence trends within the church in the decades following their deaths, and, in fact, even for several decades following his own death at the age of 71 in 1903.<sup>1</sup> Among the most important avenues of his influence are his Review and Herald editorials, of which there were some 4,000,<sup>2</sup> and his book Daniel and Revelation,<sup>3</sup> which for many years was the magnum opus on eschatological prophecy in the Adventist church.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Bates died in 1872 at 80, James White in 1881 at 60, and Andrews in 1883 at 64.

<sup>2</sup> See Durand, "Uriah Smith," p. 5. Smith was editor of the Review and Herald for about 41 years, not 50 years as Durand implies (*ibid.*, p. 2). A careful assessment of the facts reveals the following picture. Smith became editor in 1855 with the establishment of the Review and Herald office at Battle Creek. In 1869, he took a one-year leave of absence from the editorship on account of overwork. In 1870 when he would normally have resumed the editorship, James White was instead elected editor for one year, with Smith serving as his associate. He was again absent from his post (which he had resumed in 1871) for about six months in 1873. This arose out of administrative differences with James White--Smith was actually dismissed from the Review. In 1897, A. T. Jones became editor, serving in this capacity for about four years, while Smith visited extensively in Europe. Smith resumed the position in 1901, holding it until his death in 1903. See SDA Ency., s.v. "Smith, Uriah."

This would give a period of some 41 years during which he was editor, still a considerable time at the helm of the denomination's most authoritative weekly (or, for the early period, fortnightly) voice, and at a time when the position adopted by the editor of a paper carried considerably more weight than it does today. It is interesting to note that Smith's total severance from the Review and Herald since first becoming associated with it was just one and a half years, which means that he was with the paper in some capacity for some 46 years.

<sup>3</sup> The complete title of the book was Thoughts, Critical and Practical on the Books of Daniel and the Revelation: Being an Exposition, Text by Text, of Those Important Portions of the Holy Scriptures (Battle Creek: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1881 and 1882. Hereinafter cited as Daniel and Revelation).

<sup>4</sup> No other book by Adventists on apocalyptic prophecy has

The fact that Smith's life-work came to an end in the twentieth century is apt to cause us to forget how far back into Adventism his roots go. With a service record covering considerably more

---

managed to outshine Daniel and Revelation in terms of comprehensiveness and popular appeal. It received the hearty endorsement of Ellen G. White. See Manuscript 174, 1899; Letter 229, 1903, E. G. W. Research Center, Andrews University; "A Call for Active Work," RH, 16 February 1905, p. 12.

The book is really a combination of what were, originally, two books: Thoughts, Critical and Practical, on the Book of Revelation (Battle Creek: Steam Press of the SDA Publishing Assn., 1865) and Thoughts, Critical and Practical, on the Book of Daniel (Battle Creek: Steam Press of the SDA Publishing Assn., 1873). These will hereafter be designated Thoughts on Revelation and Thoughts on Daniel. The changes through which these books passed as separate entities, as well as those which occurred in their combined form, may be briefly outlined as follows:

1. Thoughts on Revelation
  - 1865 - 1st publication
  - 1875 - 2nd edition revised
  - 1885 - 3rd edition, revised and enlarged
  - 1896, 1904?, 1912 - published separately as part II of Daniel and Revelation.
2. Thoughts on Daniel
  - 1873 - 1st publication
  - 1873 - condensed edition
  - 1885 - 2nd edition, revised and enlarged.
  - 1897, 1911?, 1912 etc. - published separately as part I of Daniel and Revelation.
3. Daniel and Revelation
  - 1881 - 1st publication
  - 1888 - (by this date it had gone through six editions, but with no revisions).
  - 1941 - new edition, revised and annotated
  - 1944 - last revised edition.

"Material relating to the 1944 revision," located in the Heritage Room, James White Library, Andrews University, shows how the Adventist church faced up to the sensitive question of inaccuracies, both historical and theological, in one of its most influential publications. It shows the changes that were made in response to charges of plagiarism; and gives the rationale for the revisions implemented. For a discussion of the alleged inspiration of Daniel and Revelation, see A. L. White, "Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation," Ministry, January 1945, pp. 11-13, 46. The book, except in scholarly Adventist circles, is still widely used within the church.



than one third of all Adventist history,<sup>1</sup> he must be seen essentially as a product of the Millerite movement. His apparent closeness to us, resulting in part from the periodic updating of his very popular Daniel and Revelation, must not cause us to forget that his theological concerns had their genesis in the Millerite experience of which he was a first-hand observer. It was this climate of confusion, disillusionment, and internecine conflict which, to a considerable extent, shaped him, and his works provide us with his response to the contemporary theological issues with which he was confronted.

---

<sup>1</sup>Regarding themselves as the true successors of the original, pre-Disappointment Millerites, SDAs have traditionally traced their history from the year 1844. That was the date which, in their reckoning, marked the end of the 2300 prophetic days of Dan 8:14, a position from which, as a group, they never departed. Instead they invested the date with new importance, seeing in it the commencement of the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary. See Jonathan M. Butler, "Adventism and the American Experience" in The Rise of Adventism, p. 178; Ahlstrom, A Religious History of the American People (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1972), p. 480; Froom, Movement of Destiny, p. 17; SDA Ency., s.v., "Prophetic Interpretation, Development of" (especially p. 1157); ibid., s.v. "Millerite Movement" (especially sec. IV: "Relation of SDA's to Millerism"; ibid., s.v. "SDA Church"; White, Great Controversy, pp. 453, 454, passim. Uriah Smith's presentation of the sanctuary, discussed in this chapter, further substantiates these points.

However, it should be pointed out that SDAs did not actually constitute a distinct group as such in 1844. Jonathan Butler notes that to the early observer they would have appeared as "a fissiparous offshoot of the Adventist conference at Albany in 1845" (Rise of Adventism, p. 178.) To this Spalding agrees: At the time of the conference in question, "There was no body known as Seventh-day Adventists." See Footprints of the Pioneers (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1947), p. 25. However, since the most prominent distinctive features of Seventh-day Adventism (namely, the sabbath, the sanctuary and the gift of prophecy) were already being advocated by some as early as 1844, it may be argued that the church essentially had its genesis in that year. (See Ahlstrom, Religious History, pp. 480, 481.)

A brief survey of his sanctuary corpus gives us some perspective in our attempt to understand his approach to the subject.

### Smith's Sanctuary Corpus

During a period of forty-three years, beginning in 1854, Smith produced four works dealing directly with the subject of the sanctuary.<sup>1</sup> The 2300 Days and The Sanctuary appeared first, in 1854. In this thirty-two-page pamphlet, he does the spade-work on the doctrine--that is, so far as his own presentation is concerned. He attempts to establish (1) a continuity between Dan 8 and 9, (2) the validity of the year-day principle and its application to the prophetic chronology of Daniel, (3) the year 457 B.C. as the commencement of the 2300 prophetic days of Dan 8:14, and (4) the meaning and significance of qôdesh (sanctuary) in that text.

Each succeeding work of Smith's on the sanctuary represents, basically, an elaboration of the one preceding it. Thus, for example, The Sanctuary and the Twenty-Three Hundred Days of Daniel VIII. 14 (1863) is essentially an expansion and elaboration

---

<sup>1</sup>(1) The 2300 Days and the Sanctuary (Rochester, NY: [Review and Herald Publishing Co.], 1854); (2) The Sanctuary and the Twenty-Three Hundred Days of Daniel VIII, 14 (Battle Creek: Steam Press of the SDA Publishing Assn., 1863); (3) The Sanctuary and the Twenty-Three Hundred Days of Daniel VIII, 14 (Battle Creek: Steam Press of the SDA Publishing Assn., 1877); and (4) Looking unto Jesus; or, Christ in Type and Antitype (Battle Creek: Review and Herald Publishing Co., 1897, 1898).

Smith, a prolific writer, authored many other works on a variety of subjects. In addition to more than a dozen other books (apart from those just listed) and several pamphlets, thousands of editorials and articles poured from his pen into the pages of the Review and Herald. Other articles appeared in Signs of the Times and Youth's Instructor. See, Durand, "Uriah Smith," p. 5.

of The 2300 Days of 1854. Likewise, his 1877 book builds upon its 1863 counterpart, as evidenced even by their identical titles.<sup>1</sup> Perhaps the most interesting example of this phenomenon of expansion and elaboration may be seen in the way certain doctrines, elementally featured in his earliest work, "The Warning Voice,"<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Moreover, their title, "The Sanctuary and Twenty-three Hundred Days of Daniel VIII, 14" is a mere transposition of that of 1854, "The 2300 Days and the Sanctuary," except for the addition of the words "of Daniel VIII, 14."

This does not mean, of course, that there were no new aspects of the sanctuary discussed. The 1877 book, for example, included chapters on "the atonement," "the close of probation," "the seven last plagues," etc., none of which received any significant treatment in his earlier works.

Yet it is quite obvious that, essentially, Smith builds upon the foundation of his own earlier treatments. In addition, there are also many instances in which he is obviously utilizing wholesale the ideas of others before him. For example, the title of his 1863 and 1877 books is identical, except for the words "of Daniel VIII, 14," to that of Andrews' book, The Sanctuary and the Twenty-Three Hundred Days (Rochester, NY: Published by James White, 1853). There is, moreover, a remarkable phraseological similarity in the prefaces of Smith's 1877 work and that of Andrews'. Andrews began by saying that "no apology can be needed for the presentation of this subject [of the sanctuary];" and Smith, for his part, started off: "In introducing to the reader a work on the subject of the sanctuary, we have no occasion to make any apology. . . ." The fact that Smith, in the same preface refers to Andrews' book as one of only two that had preceded his on the subject, strongly hints at the source of his phraseology. More significant cases of apparent borrowing are cited as the chapter proceeds.

<sup>2</sup>This 35,000 word poem (see "In Memoriam: Uriah Smith," p. 4; SDA Ency., s.v. "Smith, Uriah") evaluated by a recent writer as a "small epic" (John O. Waller, "Uriah Smith's Small Epic: The Warning Voice of Time and Prophecy," Adventist Heritage 5 [Summer 1978]:53-61), was serialized in the Review and Herald from March 17 to August 11, 1853, occupying a total of nine issues. Later that year, it was published in book form under the same title--The Warning Voice . . . (Rochester, NY: James White, 1853). All references and citations in the present study are taken from the Review and Herald serialization, unless otherwise indicated.

Smith was only 21 years old and a new convert of less than one year when he submitted the poem to the Review and Herald. Yet it gave evidence of considerable internalization of the Adventist message.

The poem sought to do at least four things: (1) to anchor

are later given extensive separate treatment in later books and editorials.<sup>1</sup>

---

the faith of the readers in Scripture; (2) to reaffirm the comprehensibility and reliability of biblical prophecy; (3) to reestablish the authenticity of the Millerite Movement and the integrity of 1844 as the terminus of the 2300-year prophecy of Dan 8:14; and (4) to warn of impending judgment, and call people back to acceptance and observance of the ten commandments as the standard of that judgment. See RH, 17 March 1853, p. 169; 14 April, p. 186; 28 April, p. 192; 21 July, p. 34. In this way, the poem revealed Smith's theological direction and concerns, providing the raison d' être for his life and ministry.

<sup>1</sup>For instance, as we have already seen, the poem at the very outset postulates that biblical prophecy was both comprehensible and reliable. This proposition was later to find practical demonstration and elaboration in the book Daniel and Revelation. Again, the poem briefly mentioned the prophecy of Rev 13, identifying the two-horned beast as the United States (see 14 April 1853, p. 185; 23 June, pp. 18, 19). That theme was later to find full expression in The United States in the Light of Prophecy; or, An Exposition of Rev XIII, 11-17 (Battle Creek: Steam Press of the SDA Publishing Assn., 1872) and in The Marvel of Nations, Our Country: Its Past, Present and Future, and What the Scriptures Say of It (Battle Creek: Review and Herald and Oakland, CA: Pacific Press, 1887).

Other themes, seminally present in the poem and later developed by Smith, include: (1) The destiny of the wicked (11 August 1853, p. 49) which finds full expression in his book under the title, Which? Mortal, or Immortal? or, An Inquiry into the Present Constitution and Future Condition of Man (Battle Creek: Steam Press of the Review and Herald Office, 1860). The basic material of this book ran through several editions and changes in nomenclature. The final edition appeared in 1897 under the title Here and Hereafter or Man in Life and Death: The Reward of the Righteous and the Destiny of the Wicked (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn.). (2) Spiritualism (4 August 1853, p. 41), which finds its development in Modern Spiritualism: A Subject of Prophecy and a Sign of the Times (Battle Creek: Review and Herald Publishing Co., 1896 and 1897). Other items touched on in the poem and later discussed by Smith in various editorials and articles include the sabbath (23 June 1853, p. 18), the second advent (11 August 1853, p. 49), slavery (23 June 1853, p. 18), the resurrection (11 August 1853, p. 49), the fall (11 August 1853, p. 49), and the restoration (11 August 1853, pp. 49, 50).

Every major work produced by Smith is seminally present in the poem.

Smith clearly indicates that he was satisfied with the basic presentation of the doctrine of the sanctuary on the part of earlier Adventist writers. So thoroughly did they explicate the subject that they "left no essential feature to be discovered by additional light." The reason for his own efforts (speaking with particular reference to his 1877 book) was simply to provide "a more extended examination" of the significance of the doctrine, and to set forth "more fully the reasons upon which it rests."<sup>1</sup> His perceived audience extended beyond the limits of his own church.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>The Sanctuary (1877), p. 5. Smith alluded to two Adventist works on the sanctuary prior to 1877, but mentioned, specifically, only one--The Sanctuary by Andrews (1853). I suggest that the unnamed work was his own (1863) The Sanctuary. No other work of comparable size and scope existed in Adventism prior to 1877. This may explain, at least partially, his satisfaction with past Adventist expositions of the doctrine; and, if I am correct, it is also indicative of Smith's own conception of his role in the development of Adventist sanctuary theology.

There were, of course, quite a few (minor) studies on the sanctuary preceding that of Andrews and Smith: Owen R. L. Crosier, "The Sanctuary," The Day-Star, Extra, 7 February 1846; Joseph Bates, An Explanation of the Typical and Anti-Typical Sanctuary, by the Scriptures. With a Chart (New Bedford: Benjamin Lindsey, 1850); and James White, The Sanctuary, the 2300 Days, and the Shut Door (Oswego, NY: n.p., 1850).

The studies by Bates and White were brief 16-page tracts, probably meant for mass distribution. Their brevity notwithstanding, they provided the basic outline that Smith would later follow. White's, for instance, moved from a definition of the "sanctuary" in Scripture to a discussion of the typical nature of the earthly sanctuary. Next came an interpretation of the cleansing of the sanctuary, followed by a discussion of the 2300 prophetic days of Dan 8:14 in terms of its nature, commencement, and termination. This later becomes Smith's basic approach.

Over and over again I have been impressed by the sameness of all these early presentations, later writers seeming to borrow extensively from the earlier ones.

<sup>2</sup>The Sanctuary (1877), pp. 5, 6.

In addition to the foregoing major works, Smith took up the theme of the sanctuary in many of his other books and writings.<sup>1</sup> A large number of Review and Herald articles and editorials (as well as articles in Signs of the Times and the Youth's Instructor) referred to the doctrine. In his Review and Herald editorials, Smith often responded to questions and issues raised by his readership--some significant, others, apparently, quite picayune.<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, through all these avenues and through the variety of circumstances they represent, we receive a more complete picture of his theology of the sanctuary.

Looking Unto Jesus; Or, Christ in Type and Antitype<sup>3</sup> (1897) constitutes Smith's final major treatment of the sanctuary theme. The work is fundamentally the same as The Sanctuary of 1877, the basic elements of the doctrine being preserved. In most cases the very order of the material has been retained, except for minor changes.

---

<sup>1</sup>For example, Thoughts on Revelation (1865), pp. 54-89, 140-200, 232; The Visions of Mrs. E. G. White, a Manifestation of Spiritual Gifts According to the Scriptures (Battle Creek: Steam Press of the SDA Publishing Assn., 1868); The Biblical Institute: A Synopsis of Lectures on the Principal Doctrines of Seventh-day Adventists (Oakland, CA: Pacific SDA Publishing Assn., 1877), pp. 58-97; Synopsis of the Present Truth: A Brief Exposition of the Views of S.D. Adventists (Battle Creek: SDA Publishing Assn., Oakland, CA: Pacific Press, 1884; Thoughts on Daniel, pp. 137-39, 141-42, 190-266; Daniel and Revelation, pp. 121-23, 124-25, 158-217.

<sup>2</sup>Thus, his discourse on the location of God's throne and his postulation of its mobility. See Smith, "Questions on the Sanctuary," RH, 14 June 1887, pp. 376, 377; also "Between the Cherubim," RH, 6 March 1888, p. 152. Here Smith replies to a correspondent who wanted to know whether "the mercy seat and cherubim [were] ever in the outer apartment of the earthly sanctuary."

<sup>3</sup>The title of this work indicates a greater christological awareness on Smith's part than we have previously seen in him.

Still, there is one feature of this last work on the sanctuary that should not be overlooked, namely, an obvious process of contraction.<sup>1</sup> This exercise was probably for the purpose of making room for the inclusion of seven new chapters (II-VIII), representing about fifty pages of christological material not present in the 1877 book.<sup>2</sup> Coming, as it does, after the historic debate on righteousness by faith at the 1888 Adventist General Conference in Minneapolis,<sup>3</sup> this new section probably reflects, to some extent, Smith's response to that debate.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>The most notable example of contraction is that in which six chapters of the 1877 work (chaps. 11-16) are reduced to a single chapter (chap. 10) in Looking Unto Jesus. This represents a reduction, in terms of pages, from 66 to 29, and, although the pages in the later work are larger, it is still a sizeable reduction. While this in itself may not be taken to represent an important shift in emphasis, it seems to indicate that Smith clearly perceived some aspects of his discussion of the sanctuary to be peripheral and, to a degree at least, expendable.

<sup>2</sup>The chapters in question bear the following titles:

- I. Introduction (dealing heavily with the theme of the cross)
- II. Christ as Creator
- III. Christ as Redeemer
- IV. The Incarnation
- V. Principles of Controversy between Sin and Righteousness
- VI. The Lesson of the Cross
- VII. Christ the Theme of the Bible
- VIII. The Everlasting Covenant

<sup>3</sup>On one side of this debate were those Adventists (chiefly E. J. Waggoner, A. T. Jones, and Ellen G. White) who saw the need for a strong emphasis on righteousness by faith in Christ, apart from the deeds of the law. On the other were those who feared that such emphasis would compromise the importance of obedience to the law. The issue was sharply drawn. See Olsen, Origin and Progress, pp. 625-27; Spalding, Origin and History, pp. 281-303; SDA Ency., s.v. "Righteousness by Faith"; Froom, Movement of Destiny, pp. 188-299.

Although there is evidence (as seen below) that Smith was in opposition to this new emphasis, he may have gradually conceded just enough to allow him to take a more Christ-centered approach in the opening section of his 1897 book.

<sup>4</sup>There is occasion later in this chapter to discuss in greater detail Smith's reaction to the 1888 episode.

The general thrust of this final work demonstrates the fact, however, that the passage of the years did not dull Smith's sense of urgency, to which, as he believed, the doctrine bore testimony, nor did it alter his conviction of the importance of the sanctuary.

We look now at the way he expressed this importance.

#### Smith's Perception of the Importance of the Sanctuary

As the hub around which the whole system of biblical truths centers, the sanctuary doctrine provides "the key to the interpretation of some of the most important prophecies pertaining to the present time." It is "the grand and radiant nucleus around which cluster the glorious constellations of present truth!"<sup>1</sup> Thus Smith extolled the importance of the sanctuary.

---

<sup>1</sup> Looking Unto Jesus, pp. 56-58; cf. The Sanctuary (1877), pp. 10-15; The Sanctuary (1863), p. 71. These references spell out Smith's high regard for the doctrine. For him it is "the great central object in the plan of salvation through Jesus Christ." In it, as in no other theme, "we see the different subjects of revelation blended together in . . . a harmonious whole." "The great truths of revelation find their focal point" in it, for it "unites the two great dispensations, the Mosaic and the Christian," showing how they relate to each other. It lights up the whole Mosaic economy, filling its multitudinous rites and ceremonies with meaning. (Looking Unto Jesus, pp. 56-57.)

In two Review and Herald editorials, Smith elaborated on the centrality of the subject of the sanctuary. In the first editorial, he listed ten areas in which the sanctuary helped to supply the correct position. Among these, (1) the concept of a pre-Advent judgment; (2) the error of continual time setting; (3) the distinction between the sacrifice of Christ and the atonement; (4) the immutability of the law and the perpetuity of the sabbath; (5) an imminent Second Advent; (6) the unconscious state of the dead. See "The Great Central Subject," RH, 22 November 1881, p. 328. In the second editorial, he gave thirteen areas, among which were three not included in the first editorial. These three were as follows: (1) The sanctuary doctrine helped to explain the parable of Matt 22:1-14; (2) it helped to bring out the meaning of Matt 25:1-13--the parable of the ten virgins; and (3) it provided the basis for the third angel's message of Rev 14. (See "The



He emphasized the relationship of the sanctuary to "the present time" and to "present truth," an emphasis which grew out of a fierce apologetic against opponents of Seventh-day Adventists in the period following the 1844 episode. Therefore, Adventists came to look upon the doctrine of the sanctuary as the solution to the perplexity which came upon the Millerites in 1844. For them, the sanctuary doctrine was a magnifying glass through which one was enabled to see more clearly "the glorious constellations of present truth."<sup>1</sup>

In addition to being the core around which other truths cluster, and a magnifier of "present truth," the sanctuary was also

---

Sanctuary," RH, 27 September 1887, p. 616.)

Smith's position here sounds very much like that expressed by J. N. Andrews in "The Sanctuary," RH, 18 June 1867, p. 12. Andrews there referred to the sanctuary as "The great central doctrine of . . . [the Adventist] system," inseparably connecting all aspects of their faith, presenting the subject "as one grand whole." Cf. James White, "Our Present Position, Or, the Waiting, Watching Time," ST, 3 December 1874, p. 73. He referred to the sanctuary as the vital connection between the past and the present, the justification of "the great advent movement," and a light upon its future.

<sup>1</sup>The Sanctuary (1863), p. 71. Smith spoke also for his fellow sabbatarian Adventists in the period following 1844 when he wrote: "How it [the sanctuary doctrine] opens to our understanding the plan of salvation! How it lifts the veil from the position of our Lord in heaven! . . . What a flood of light it pours upon past fulfillment of prophecy! . . . It is as though a new apartment of the heavenly temple were suddenly opened before us, filled with all the divine splendor, the majesty and the beauty of eternal truth." Ibid.

It is, indeed, remarkable that the early Adventists thus came at one point to see the doctrine of the sanctuary not as something to be defended but as a bulwark of defence for the other doctrines they held. Also, as Smith said, they regarded it as "the great safeguard against all those bewildering errors" which brought about the disintegration of the "once harmonious body of Adventist believers" (ibid.; cf. Smith, "Origin and History of the Third Angel's Message," RH, 13 January 1891, p. 68 where he speaks of the sanctuary as "the great key" to the Disappointment).

associated in Smith's mind with the very center of human redemption. As he saw it, the fact that the earthly tabernacle stood for the visible manifestation of God in ancient Israel ought to have the most far reaching implications for us in the Christian age. For it indicates that, "next to Christ," the sanctuary should claim the attention of man "as the place where the mysterious process of the world's redemption is carried forward."<sup>1</sup> Experientially, this means that if anyone is to manifest consistent faith in Christ today, he must become acquainted with His present position and work in the heavenly sanctuary.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Looking Unto Jesus, pp. 56-57, 60; The Sanctuary (1877), pp. 10, 11.

<sup>2</sup>Smith, "The Cleansing of the Sanctuary," RH, 2 October 1855, p. 54. A subsequent statement by J. N. Andrews sounds much less dogmatic: "We do not say others who do not understand the subject cannot receive God's blessing, but we do say that those who are workers with Christ need to understand the sanctuary of the Bible." ("The Sanctuary of the Bible," RH, 30 December 1873, p. 21.)

Did Andrews' concession signal a weakening in the erstwhile dogmatic stand by Adventists vis-à-vis the importance of the sanctuary doctrine? It is difficult to tell. What we do know is that there was an apparent waning of interest in the doctrine in the 1870s. See Haddock, History of Sanctuary, pp. 224, 225. Haddock suggests that this may have resulted from the thorough investigation and systematization of the doctrine which took place in the preceding decades, leaving little room for fresh approaches (ibid.). Another possible reason was perhaps a general malaise resulting from what was largely perceived as a failure of Adventist sanctuary apologetics to make the intended impact upon its primary audience. Andrews, for example, complained about this failure in the (1873) article in question ("The Sanctuary and the Bible," p. 20). And as late as 1881, Smith lamented the attitude of "indifference" on the part of non-SDAs toward the doctrine. See Smith, "The Great Central Subject," p. 328.

When this malaise began to dissipate in the late 1880s, it gave way to a change of emphasis from the more traditional aspects of the doctrine to its experiential implications. That is, stress was placed on the sanctuary as church and people. Its cleansing pointed to the need for the cleansing of a polluted church and people. See Haddock, History of Sanctuary, pp. 240-70, 276-96, 297, 304-15.

Accordingly, Smith compared the Adventist proclamation of the doctrine to the message of Noah to the antediluvians, of Lot to Sodom, and of Jesus to His contemporaries.<sup>1</sup> The command (in Rev 11:1, 2) to rise and measure the temple of God is "a prophetic command to the church to give the subject of the temple or sanctuary a special examination" at this time.<sup>2</sup>

This is probably the reason that Smith, over the years, devoted so much space to the subject, regretting that only "one people" had caught its significance.<sup>3</sup> As far as he was concerned, its "importance" could "neither be overdrawn nor overestimated."<sup>4</sup> The following affirmation fairly summarizes his conception of the momentous significance of the doctrine for the present generation:

As a light on theoretical subjects and an incentive to the highest practical godliness it ranks with the choicest of all Bible themes. Especially is it the great citadel of truth for the last days. Every believer should be as familiar with it as with his mother tongue. Every time we need the Saviour we go to the Sanctuary; and there our eternal interests center.<sup>5</sup>

Apart from the theological importance of the sanctuary in and of itself, Smith also appreciated the doctrine for its apologetic value. Here was a 'weapon' which in one fell swoop could destroy

---

<sup>1</sup>Looking Unto Jesus, p. 148; cf. The Sanctuary (1877), p. 261. Note the sense of urgency implicit in these comparisons. In each case with which the sanctuary preaching was compared, catastrophic judgment was imminent. (In the case of the contemporaries of Jesus, Smith is obviously thinking of the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70.) It is pointed out below that the notion of urgency was an important one for Smith.

<sup>2</sup>Thoughts on Revelation, p. 188.

<sup>3</sup>Looking Unto Jesus, p. 58.

<sup>4</sup>The Sanctuary (1863), p. 71.

<sup>5</sup>Smith, "The Sanctuary" (1887), p. 616.

the foundation of all opposition. It is, therefore, important to see in Smith a "hidden" agenda, in which the sanctuary becomes an apologetic for the entire doctrinal system of Seventh-day Adventists.<sup>1</sup>

The following sections demonstrate how Smith's theology of the sanctuary served the purpose of three apologetic concerns which were of fundamental importance to Seventh-day Adventists. It can be seen that these three concerns comprise the dominant motifs of his theology of the sanctuary.

### Smith's Theology of the Sanctuary

Often an author is actuated by certain underlying concerns which play a decisive role in his theological emphases. The awareness of such motivations can provide deeper insight into his theological outlook. A careful study of Smith leads to the conclusion that his theology of the sanctuary was governed by three fundamental concerns: (1) to extol the salvation-historical significance of 1844; (2) to attest the perpetuity of the decalogue in general, and the sabbath in particular; (3) to preserve the belief in an imminent eschaton.<sup>2</sup> It was not surprising to find

---

<sup>1</sup>Although Smith's theology, to a large extent, revolves around the doctrine of the sanctuary, his bedrock concern was not the sanctuary per se. Rather, he used the doctrine to corroborate what were, for him, yet more fundamental articles of faith.

<sup>2</sup>These three concerns stand out boldly in an 1881 editorial by Smith ("The Great Central Subject," RH, 22 November 1881, p. 328). Here he expressly referred to the doctrine of the sanctuary as one which not only served to solve certain theological difficulties but also to establish other doctrines. He listed ten areas thus served by the sanctuary: (1) The notion of a preliminary judgment; (2) The idea of Christ's confession of his saints before the Father; (3) The idea of the blotting out of sin; (4) The error

these concerns illustrated in the changing design of the masthead of the Review and Herald,<sup>1</sup> of which he was editor for many years.

of 'time setting'; (5) The atonement; (6) The law and the sabbath; (7) The second advent; (8) The state of the dead; (9) Christ's position and work; (10) The message and mission of God's Remnant. (Cf. Smith, "The Sanctuary," RH, 27 September 1887, p. 616 where he listed 13 points.)

If we eliminate points 1, 2, 3, 5, and 9, since these are already, essentially, a part of the sanctuary doctrine as Smith explained it, and also point 8, since Smith did not use the doctrine to prove this point to any appreciable degree, we are left with numbers 4, 6, 7, and 10. Points 4 and 10 go together, Smith endeavoring to show through them that the sanctuary doctrine "sets the seal of divine truth, and of divine providence, to the message now going forth." The 2300 days did end in 1844, and "the error of continually setting times for the Lord to come" should cease. In point 6, Smith is explicit: The sanctuary "establishes the doctrine of the immutability of the law and the perpetuity of the sabbath. . . ." In point 7, he asserted that the sanctuary "establishes the doctrine of the soon coming of Christ. . . ." (Ibid.)

Thus, in this important piece, Smith has himself isolated for us the three fundamental concerns which provided much of the impetus for his emphasis on the sanctuary.

<sup>1</sup> Certain changes in the Review and Herald masthead after the first thirteen years of Adventism, illustrate the developing conception of the sanctuary in Adventist theology.

On May 29, 1860, five years after Smith became editor, there appeared for the first time on the masthead the emblem of the mercy seat with the words, "and there was seen in His Temple the Ark of His testament," a reflection of the increasing role of the sanctuary in the Adventist apologetic for the law and the sabbath. It was also an indirect reference to their new emphasis on an "open door," as is seen below.

This design remained basically unchanged until December 13, 1870, when it appeared for the last time. It is difficult to say whether this discontinuance had anything to do with an apparent decline in interest in the subject of the sanctuary in the 1870s (see Haddock, History of Sanctuary, pp. 224, 225). The emblem which succeeded was that of an open Bible. Ten years later the Bible was moved to one side, balanced on the other by a dove, central place being given to a globe of the world, with the caption: "The field is the world."

Beginning April 16, 1889 there was another change. This time, the name of the paper ("Advent Review and Sabbath Herald") was typographically represented in such a way as to give equal prominence to the Sabbath as to the Advent. The motto ("The field is the world") remained, as did also the Bible, the dove, and the words of Rev 14:12 as underscript.

The rest of the chapter develops largely around these three fundamental concerns.

A Concern to Defend the Salvation-  
Historical Significance of 1844

It [the sanctuary] is the only question which explains the great Advent Movement of the past, as viewed with reference to the disappointment of 1844, and binds the past and present movement together as one consistent whole.<sup>1</sup>

Smith's concern to safeguard the integrity of the 1844 Millerite experience, apart from his perception of its biblical authenticity, stems from two related factors: (1) his actual relationship to the 1844 episode, and (2) his perceived relationship to that event.<sup>2</sup> The two are intertwined, of course, but listing them separately underscores an important point.

So far as his actual relationship to that event is concerned, he was only a minor at the time of its occurrence, as we have already noted. Therefore, strictly speaking, he was not an active participant in the Millerite expectation, as such. However, Smith himself did not so perceive his relationship to that event. His own testimony was clear: "In regard to the past, I would say, that though quite young, I was in the messages of 1843-44, and have ever

---

It is not accidental that in this latest revised masthead during Smith's term as Review and Herald editor, there appeared the three central theological concerns of his life--the (urgent) parousia, the perpetuity of the law and the sabbath, and the salvation-historical integrity of 1844, the last concern symbolized in the motto: "The Field is the World." This motto was an echo of the angel's commission in Rev 10:11 to "prophecy again . . ." and constituted both a testimony to an 'open door' and an apologetic for the identification of Adventists with the true remnant thus commissioned. These points are developed more fully below.

<sup>1</sup>Smith, "The Sanctuary" (1887), p. 616.

<sup>2</sup>See above, pp. 16, 18, 19.

believed that they meant something."<sup>1</sup> So far as he was concerned, he had experienced the emotional trauma through which the Millerites passed and had suffered keenly the widespread contumely heaped upon them, having been linked with them through his mother. Thus, based on his own testimony, it is possible to regard his silent teen years as a period of reflection and evaluation.<sup>2</sup>

This period of reflection and evaluation came to a head during and following that, for him, eventful New Hampshire conference in the fall of 1852. It is significant that a chief emphasis at that conference was James and Ellen White's explanation of the reasons for the 1844 Disappointment.<sup>3</sup> Under the influence of the conference, Smith was encouraged to conduct an intense "examination of the arguments" for the Adventist position. It was this examination which, as he later testified, "fully decided me to go with the remnant, who keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus."<sup>4</sup>

So then, Smith's relationship to the 1843-44 Millerite experience, as he himself perceived it, was one of complete

---

<sup>1</sup>Letter, RH, 9 June 1853, p. 16. Emphasis supplied.

<sup>2</sup>Not, as Durand would have it, a period of spiritual indifference ("Uriah Smith," p. 14). Smith's statement to the effect that following the Disappointment he gave "little attention to the subject" is not inimical to my conclusion. "Little attention" is to be understood in the context of Smith's renewed intense interest in the 1844 Millerite experience during the fall of 1853. My argument for a period of reflection and evaluation is supported by Smith's own earlier statement in the same article that he was involved in the 1844 messages, and had "ever believed that they meant something." (RH, 9 June 1853, p. 16.) It was as a result of his strong determination in the fall of 1852 to come to grips with the possible implications of that 1844 episode that he eventually came to affiliate himself with the sabbatarian Adventists.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

identification: he was in it. Thus when he took up the cudgels following his conversion to sabbatarian Adventism, it was with the conviction and enthusiasm of a Saul of Tarsus, defending the faith which once caused him such keen anguish and distress, a faith with which he had now become completely identified.<sup>1</sup>

It is against this background that we are to understand his concern for the salvation-historical validity of 1844. For him, "the scattering and dividing which followed the passing of the time"<sup>2</sup> could only be checked by an uncompromising advocacy of the integrity of the 1844 experience. If the validity of that event could be compromised, then the whole structure of Seventh-day Adventism, as he perceived it, would collapse.<sup>3</sup> He did not have

---

<sup>1</sup>It is as though he had a passion to make up for those teen years spent in relative inactivity, so far as the Adventist message was concerned. His poem, "The Warning Voice" gives the portrait of an enthusiastic convert, determined to change his world.

<sup>2</sup>The expression "the passing of the time" (used here by Smith in *RH*, 9 June 1853, p. 16) was employed by post-1844 Millerites with the date of October 22, 1844, as the point of reference. "The passing of the time" meant the passing of the above date. For examples of the use of the expression, see Bates, "Thoughts on the Past Work of William Miller and His Adherents, Respecting the True Starting Point of Dan VIII, 14; IX, 24, 25," *RH*, 17 February 1853, pp. 156, 157; White, "Our Present Position," *ST*, 3 December 1874, p. 73.

<sup>3</sup>It has already been suggested that of all the groups to emerge from the break-up of the Millerite movement, sabbatarian Adventists had the greatest stake in preserving the integrity of 1844. The day following the Disappointment, one of their number, Hiram Edson of Port Gibson, New York, came under strong conviction in regard to the significance of the termination of the 2300 days of Dan 8:14. Edson was impressed that "instead of our High Priest coming out of the Most Holy Place of the heavenly sanctuary to come to this earth" at the end of the 2300 days, that he then, "for the first time," entered "the second apartment" of the heavenly sanctuary. Further, that before Jesus could return to the earth, He must perform a special work in the second compartment of the heavenly sanctuary. (Hiram Edson, manuscript fragment, n.d., n.p.,



p. [9a], Heritage Room, James White Library, Andrews University.)

A period of intense study ensued, Edson being joined by two associates, Owen R. L. Crosier and Dr. Franklin B. Hahn. Their conclusions, written up by Crosier and published in the Day Dawn (March or April 1845, for which, see Spalding, Footprints, pp. 79-82) and later as an "Extra" of the Day-Star, 7 February 1846, were adopted by James White and Joseph Bates. Crosier's article quickly became one of the most influential documents (if not the most influential) on the sanctuary in early Adventism, and Ellen G. White, feeling "fully authorized by the Lord," recommended it "to every saint." (Letter, E. G. White to Eli Curtis, A Word to the "Little Flock," p. 12.)

It was thus that 1844, in the very wake of the Disappointment, came to be invested with new meaning by sabbatarian Adventists, and any attempt to impugn the significance of their past experience was regarded as treason. They considered their "advent experience" as "the richest and brightest" of their lives. (See Edson, ms., p. [9]). In this series of rhetorical questions, Edson reveals the high stake of the sabbatarian Adventists in the integrity of 1844. He asked, poignantly: "If this had proved a failure, what was the rest of my christian experience worth? Has the bible proved a failure? Is there no God--no heaven--no golden home city--no paradise? Is all this but a cunningly devised fable? Is there no reality to our fondest hopes and expectation of these things?" (Ibid.)

In the confusion following the break-up of the Millerite movement, many erstwhile Millerites, not to mention those who formed part of the larger religious and secular community, were all too ready to answer each of Edson's questions in the affirmative. It was this prevailing mood which gave drive to Smith's effort to defend the integrity of 1844. See "The Warning Voice," 12 May 1853, p. 202; 23 June, p. 17; The 2300 Days, pp. 29-31; The Sanctuary (1863), pp. 12-15; The Sanctuary (1877), pp. 102-10; Daniel and Revelation (1881), pp. 255-82; Smith, "Questions on the Sanctuary," ST, 12 August 1875, p. 316; Smith, "Origin and History of the Third Angel's Message. No. 2," RH, 9 December 1890, p. 760; Smith, "Are the Dates Correct?" RH, 26 January 1897, pp. 56, 57; Smith, "A Notable Anniversary," RH, 29 October 1901, p. 704; Smith, "The Sanctuary" (1887), p. 616.

Smith's confidence in the integrity of 1844 was profound. "God had led in the work. His Spirit had enlightened. . . . Their principles of interpretation were sound; their reckoning and interpretation of the prophetic periods, incontrovertible. . . ." Only in their understanding of the sanctuary of Dan 8:14 were the Millerites at fault. ("Origin and History of the Third Angel's Message, No. 5," RH, 6 January 1891, p. 8.)

His concern, of course, was shared by other Adventist writers of the period. See, for instance, Bates, "Midnight Cry in the Past," RH, December 1850, pp. 21-24; Andrews, "Position of the Advent Herald Party on the Sanctuary Question," RH, 12 May 1853,

to look very far to find those who seemed intent on bringing about this eventuality. The "Advent Herald Party" was only too willing to oblige.<sup>1</sup>

Faced with this situation, Smith saw in the doctrine of the sanctuary the best hope of establishing the validity of the 1844 Millerite experience. I have isolated five areas in his sanctuary theology which seem calculated to serve that purpose. They are as follows:

---

p. 204; Andrews, The Sanctuary, pp. 10-27; James White, "Our Present Position," RH, no. 2, December 1850, pp. 13, 14 (cf. J. White, "Our Present Position," pp. 73, 74); "The 2300 Days," RH, 6 December 1853, p. 72. See also Damsteegt, Foundations, pp. 104-106, where he discusses early attempts to vindicate the integrity of the October 1844 terminus of the 2300 days.

<sup>1</sup>Through their chief organ, The Advent Herald, this group of post-1844 Millerites represented a serious threat to belief in the integrity of 1844. Miller himself, in less than a year, had completely abandoned his position: "To contend that we were not mistaken" he declared, "is dishonest. We should never be ashamed to confess all our errors." What he meant was clear: We dare not teach that in 1844 Christ came "as the Bridegroom, that the door of mercy was closed . . . that the seventh trumpet then sounded, or that it was the fulfillment of prophecy in any sense." ("Mr. Miller's Apology and Defence," AH, 13 August 1845, p. 5); cf. Miller, Apology, p. 28. Miller's changed attitude reflected the disillusion of Joshua V. Himes and other leaders of the "Advent Herald Party" with the 1844 terminus of the 2300 days. Bates observed that it was following the Albany conference that the Advent Herald began toying with new commencement dates for the 2300 days. See Bates, "Thoughts on the Past Work of William Miller," pp. 156, 7.

In an effort to counteract the influence of the Advent Herald in this area, the Review and Herald profusively cited earlier issues of that paper in defense of the integrity of the 1844 terminus of the 2300 days. See, for example, "The Seventh Month," RH, 16 September 1851, p. 3, reprint from AH, 8 January 1845; James White, "Our Present Position," pp. 13, 14; Editorial, RH, March 1851, pp. 52-53. Cf. Andrews, The Sanctuary, pp. 13-14 where he refers to the Advent Herald's early presentation of the chronology of Dan 8 and 9 as "a calm, dispassionate vindication of the original dates. . . ."

1. His emphasis on the validity of the basic Millerite chronology of Dan 8 and 9
  2. His identification of qôdesh in Dan 8:14 with the heavenly sanctuary
  3. His concept of a two-part heavenly ministry
  4. His concept of the atonement
  5. His denial/affirmation of the idea of a shut-door.
- Each of these areas is now examined in turn.<sup>1</sup>

Affirmation of the validity of the basic Millerite chronology of Dan 8 and 9

The question of the chronology of Dan 8 and 9 was a vital one for Smith, as it was for the Millerites.<sup>2</sup> In his treatment of

---

<sup>1</sup>These five emphases, incidentally, are subsumed under the three basic notions found in Dan 8:14, namely that of time, place, and event. The first emphasis falls under the rubric of time, the second under that of place, and numbers 3-5 come under that of event. Smith's treatment of the sanctuary theme may thus be seen as a comprehensive interpretation of this cardinal text of Seventh-day Adventism.

In neither of the other two major figures treated in this research (Ballenger and Andreasen) will one find such a sustained and comprehensive treatment of all aspects of the sanctuary doctrine. The reason for this is not, necessarily, that they were less interested in all areas of the sanctuary. Evidently both men felt that sufficient had already been said by earlier Adventist writers on certain aspects of the doctrine.

<sup>2</sup>The Millerite interest in biblical/prophetic chronology may be seen in the number of works produced on the subject by Miller and his followers. As samples, we may note the following: (1) By William Miller: William Miller's Apology and Defence, pp. 9-12; The Bible Students Manual of Chronology and Prophecy (Boston: Joshua V. Himes, 1841); A Dissertation on Prophetic Chronology, Second Advent Tracts, No. 5 [Boston, Joshua V. Himes, 1841]; Evidences from Scripture and History of the Second Coming of Christ about the Year A.D. 1844, and of His Personal Reign of 1,000 Years (Brandon, VT: Vermont Telegraph, 1833); Views of the Prophecies and Prophetic Chronology, Selected from Manuscripts of William Miller; with a Memoir of His Life, ed. Joshua V. Himes (Boston: Dow, 1841). (2) By Josiah Litch: A Dissertation on the

this aspect of the subject he essentially sought to affirm and defend three basic points:

1. That the 457 B.C. commencement of the 2300 prophetic days had been attested beyond reasonable dispute.<sup>1</sup>

---

Chronology of Prophecy, Second Advent Tracts, No. 3 [Boston: Joshua V. Himes, 1841]; Dissertation on the Fall of the Ottoman Empire, the 11th of August 1840, Second Advent Tracts, No. 11 ([Boston: Joshua V. Himes], n.d.); The Probability of the Second Coming of Christ about A.D. 1843 Shown by a Comparison of Prophecy with History, up to the Present Time, and an Explanation of Those Prophecies Which Are Yet to Be Fulfilled (Boston: David H. Ela, 1838). (3) By Sylvester Bliss, The Chronology of the Bible, Showing from the Scriptures and Undisputed Authorities that We Are Now Near the End of Six Thousand Years from Creation, Second Advent Library, No. 38 (Boston: Published by Joshua V. Himes, 1843).

All of the foregoing include a discussion of the chronology of the prophecies of Daniel, involving Dan 8:14. In fact, one may even say that the undergirding reason for this whole emphasis on prophetic chronology was the explication of the cryptic statement of Dan 8:14. That statement, in large measure, permeated the entire chronological discussion.

<sup>1</sup>In order to arrive at this conclusion, however, it was necessary for Smith, and his predecessors, to establish a connection between Dan 8 and 9. To do this, Smith reasoned as follows: (1) The angelic messenger was the same in both visions; (2) he appeared in the second vision to elucidate the aspect of time (he refers here to 9:24), precisely that which was left hanging in the vision of chapter 8; (3) the 70 weeks of 9:24 were spoken of as having been determined (chathak), a word which according to biblical authorities meant "cut off," suggesting that the 70 weeks indeed formed part of a larger whole. This larger whole could only refer to the 2300 prophetic days of Dan 8:14; there being nothing else from which they could have been cut off. See The 2300 Days, pp. 3-5; The Sanctuary (1863), pp. 12, 13, 16; The Sanctuary (1877), pp. 56-81; Looking Unto Jesus, pp. 170-76.

These factors indicated, for him, that, logically and thematically, Dan 8:14 and 9:25-27 are continuous, and that the time periods in both should begin together. The clue for that common starting point was 9:25 "from the going forth of the command to restore and build Jerusalem." Since, however, there were more than one Persian decree affecting the resettlement of the sixth century Jewish exiles, there yet remained the need to select the correct one. The argumentation he employed in the process substantiated for him both a 457 B.C. starting point and a year-day prophetic principle (one prophetic day equalling one literal year) applicable to the two prophecies in question. He proceeded as follows:

Inasmuch as there was a decree in 457 B.C. enjoining the

restoration and rebuilding of Jerusalem, he assumed that that decree was the one referred to in the prophecy. He assumed, further, that the 69 weeks (which were to reach to the Messiah, see Dan 9:25) were symbolic, that is 483 literal years. He then tested the validity of these two assumptions by matching the events transpiring at the end of that period with the requirements and stipulations of the prophecy in Dan 9:24-27. See The 2300 Days, pp. 4, 5; The Sanctuary (1877), pp. 65-81, especially, p. 67; Looking Unto Jesus, pp. 178-89.

So far as Smith was concerned, it all harmonized perfectly. For having identified "Messiah the Prince" with Jesus Christ, he found that the period reached to 27 A.D., "where according to [chronologist] Ussher, Christ was baptized." The 2300 Days, pp. 5, 6; cf. The Sanctuary (1863), pp. 22, 23; The Sanctuary (1877), pp. 84-85; Looking Unto Jesus, pp. 189, 190. (In the last two works, Smith did not overtly rely on Ussher's chronology in determining the date for Christ's baptism.)

Thus, when Christ, immediately following His baptism and temptation preached in Galilee "the time is fulfilled" (Mark 1:14, 15), He could only be referring to "the 69 weeks which were then fulfilled." (See the foregoing references.)

It may be observed that Smith's appreciation of the significance of this Markan passage was not original with him or with Adventists. Some of the commentaries of the day tended in the same direction. See, for example, Richard Watson, An Exposition of the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark, and of Some Other Detached Parts of Holy Scripture, 7th ed. (New York: Carlton and Porter, [1833]), p. 324; Albert Barnes, Notes, Explanatory and Practical, on the Gospels: Designed for Sunday School Teachers and Bible Classes, 2 vols, 17th ed. rev. and cor. (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1841), p. 350; John J. Owen, A Commentary, Critical, Expository, and Practical, on the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, for the Use of Ministers, Theological Students, Private Christians, Bible Classes, and Sabbath Schools (New York: Leavitt and Allen, 1857), p. 418. Each of these commentaries saw a connection between Mark 1:14, 15 and Dan 9:24-27.

Smith was satisfied that the apparent fulfillment of the stipulations of the prophecy in the ministry and death of Christ proved two things: (1) that the time periods mentioned in the two Danielic passages are prophetic, one "day" being equivalent to one literal year; and (2) that 457 B.C. was indeed the correct starting point.

In The Sanctuary (1877), pp. 67, 68 (cf. Looking Unto Jesus, pp. 179-87), he examined four separate events which, at one time or another, had been accepted as marking the commencement of the 70 weeks of Dan 9:24: (1) Cyrus' decree for the rebuilding of the temple, 536 B.C.--Ezra 1:1-4; (2) Darius' decree in 519 B.C. encouraging the completion of that work after being hindered by hostile forces (Ezra 6:6-12); (3) the decree by Artaxerxes Longimanus in 457 B.C. (Ezra 7); and (4) a decree by the same king in 444 B.C. commissioning Nehemiah to complete the work in Jerusalem (Neh 2). Selecting the third option, he exhibited an array of impressive, scholarly evidence in its favor.

2. That the connection between Dan 8 and 9 was logical and valid.<sup>1</sup>

3. That that connection at once suggested that the year-day principle must apply to both prophecies, and that both must commence together.<sup>2</sup>

To accept these three propositions was to believe that 1844 was indeed the terminus of the 2300 prophetic days.

In the wake of the challenge posed by the "Advent Herald Party," Smith and his contemporaries guarded this point with ceaseless vigilance. And if no one else did, they themselves came to manifest the most profound confidence in the validity of the basic Millerite chronology. James White, for example, affirmed in 1850 that "this prophetic period has been, and still is, the main pillar of the Advent faith."<sup>3</sup> Joseph Bates, in the same year, declared the invincibility of the date 457 B.C. against the "most weighty objections" raised by "learned

---

<sup>1</sup>See immediately preceding note. Smith regarded the prophecy of Dan 9 as valuable for his argument in that it provided a gauge of the validity of the chronology of the more extensive prophecy of Dan 8:14. It provided, in other words, a midpoint test of the accuracy of the total prophecy contained in those two chapters of Daniel.

<sup>2</sup>See above, p. 43, n. 1. The year-day principle is based on Num 14:34 and Ezek 4:6. The principle has been employed by some biblical scholars for centuries. See Froom, Prophetic Faith, 1:176, 431, 449, 450, 471, 774, 889, etc. Froom has shown that whereas early Christian expositors like Ireneaus (c. 130-c. 200) and Tertullian (c. 160-c. 240) did already espouse the year-day principle, it was not until the 12th century that this principle began to be applied to the longer time prophecies of Daniel and Revelation. Prior to this the principle was primarily applied to the seventy weeks of Dan 9 which was believed to be in the past (ibid., pp. 241-42).

<sup>3</sup>James White, "Our Present Position," p. 13.

men" all across the land.<sup>1</sup> J. N. Andrews confidently affirmed that ". . . the man does not live who can overthrow the chronological argument, which terminates the 2300 days" in 1844, nor could anyone "meet the mighty array of evidence by which it is fortified and sustained. . . ."<sup>2</sup>

Smith joined his colleagues in the view that this important plank in the Adventist system of doctrines had been well laid. This was of immense importance to him in his attempt to defend the salvation-historical significance of 1844.

Identification of qôdesh in Dan 8:14  
with the heavenly sanctuary

Following O. R. L. Crosier, James White, J. N. Andrews, and others before him, Smith gave much attention to the identification of qôdesh (sanctuary) in Dan 8:14. Like them, he took the position that the Great Disappointment was directly attributable to the failure on the part of the Millerites to correctly identify qôdesh in the passage in question.<sup>3</sup>

Contrary to the Millerites, who had identified qôdesh with

---

<sup>1</sup>Bates, "Midnight Cry in the Past," p. 21. Here Bates recalled that 457 B.C. was "the starting point to settle the whole argument of the advent doctrine. . . ."

<sup>2</sup>Andrews, The Sanctuary, p. 16.

<sup>3</sup>See Crosier, "The Sanctuary," Day Star Extra, 7 February 1846, pp. 38, 39; Crosier, ["The Sanctuary"], RH, 5 May 1851, pp. 78-80 (reprint from the Day Dawn, no date indicated); James White, The Sanctuary, pp. 1-8; Andrews, The Sanctuary, pp. 26-55. The importance attached to this aspect of the subject may be determined by the space given to it. The reference in James White, cited above, represents more than 50 percent of his article, while that in Andrews represents more than 25 percent of his 72-page book.

the church or the earth,<sup>1</sup> Smith contended that the term in Dan 8:14 referred to the heavenly sanctuary.<sup>2</sup> Therefore, the text did not

---

<sup>1</sup> See Miller, Evidences, pp. 15, 38; Miller, STM, 15 May 1841, p. 25; Miller, "Cleansing of the Sanctuary," STM, 6 April 1842, p. 1; J. White, Labors of William Miller, p. 7; Andrews, "The Sanctuary," ST, 22 October 1874, p. 57. For a good summary of the development of Miller's belief on this question, see Damsteegt, Foundations, pp. 31-35.

<sup>2</sup> He employed two basic arguments here--a logical argument and a scriptural. His logical approach depended for its cogency on some basic presuppositions which he shared with his audience, composed chiefly of post-Disappointment Millerites and fellow Adventists. Although many had begun to deny it (see Smith, The 2300 Days, pp. 30, 31; The Sanctuary, 1877, pp. 21-24), the conviction was still fairly widespread that Dan 8 and 9 belonged together, that the time prophecies in Dan 8:14 and 9:24-27 commenced simultaneously--in 457 B.C., and that the 2300 prophetic days terminated in 1843/1844. Therefore, the fact that the earth and the church were still in an unpurified state was logical proof that they could not be regarded as the sanctuary referred to in Dan 8:14. Ibid., The 2300 Days, pp. 30, 31.

Scripturally, Smith first argued that inasmuch as the Old Testament sanctuary connoted "something to be built" physically (Ex 25:8), it could not, therefore, signify either the church (as people of God) nor the earth (see The 2300 Days, p. 9). He pointed out, secondly, that Dan 8:14 required the cleansing of a sanctuary at the end of 2300 prophetic days (literal years), a period ending in 1844, seventeen centuries after the disappearance of Herod's temple, the last manifestation of the Jewish sanctuary. From this it was clear that Dan 8:14 envisioned some other sanctuary than the Jewish.

Going back to the Old Testament, Smith noted that Moses had been ordered to make the sanctuary according to the pattern shown him in the mount (Ex 25:9, 40; 26:30), a factor which suggested "a great original from which they [the sanctuary and its furniture] were made" (ibid.). To identify that "great original" Smith referred to three principal texts: Rev 4, Rev 8:3, and Rev 11:15, 19. These passages describe certain celestial activities, places, and objects seen by John in vision. For example, he saw "seven lamps of fire" before the throne, "a golden censer and incense" in the hand of an angel, and "the ark of his testament." (Ibid., pp. 12-14.)

Since these were items of furniture found in the earthly sanctuary, Smith concluded that John was actually "looking into the temple in heaven," and that "the patterns of the earthly things, the tabernacle and its appendages," were therefore to be found there. He saw convincing corroboration of these conclusions in the book of Hebrews (chapter 9:24) which clearly spoke of a heavenly temple (ibid., p. 14).

Accordingly, he was convinced that he had "found the



forecast the cleansing, or destruction, of the earth by fire. Rather, it predicted a divine activity to commence in heaven at the end of the 2300 days. At that time Jesus would move from the holy to the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary. In the former He had been ministering since the cross. In the latter He was to perform His closing redemptive work, the cleansing of the sanctuary, and the atonement.<sup>1</sup>

An understanding of this point, Smith contended, would have changed the entire focus of the Millerite expectation. For then the prophecy would have been perceived as directing attention to the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary rather than to the destruction of the earth. Even in the post-1844 era, such an understanding could serve as a corrective to error: (1) it would squelch further attempts at new time setting,<sup>2</sup> an activity which

---

pattern" for which he was looking, "the great original of the earthly sanctuary." "We have found," he said "that it is in heaven . . . and contains two holy places" in accord with the typical sanctuary. It is to this heavenly sanctuary, then, that Dan 8:14 refers. The 2300 Days, pp. 7-14, 21, 25-29; The Sanctuary (1963), pp. 38-51; The Sanctuary (1877), pp. 112-28; Looking Unto Jesus, pp. 203-13; Smith, "The Sanctuary: A Novel Argument," RH, 9 January 1844, pp. 156, 157; Daniel and Revelation (1881), pp. 221-26.

As to the time when the earthly sanctuary gave way to the heavenly, Smith had no doubt. It was during the scenes of the crucifixion. The torn veil (Matt 27:51; Mark 15:38; Luke 23:45) signified that the service of the earthly temple "were forever finished." Henceforth, "the world was to look for salvation and pardon" in the heavenly sanctuary. (The 2300 Days, pp. 19, 20; cf. The Sanctuary (1877), pp. 172-77.)

<sup>1</sup> These concepts are discussed below.

<sup>2</sup> Perhaps it was natural for the Millerites, in the wake of the Disappointment, to advance the terminal date of the 2300 'days'. Although Miller, as early as December 1844, warned against the practice of new time setting (see "Letter from Bro. Miller," AH, 18 December 1844, p. 147), he himself could hardly keep from advancing the time beyond October 22, 1844. "I think I may safely

constituted, at least, a tacit repudiation of the 1844 terminus of the 2300 days and the Millerite experience which accompanied it;

---

say," he volunteered in a letter to Joshua V. Himes and Sylvester Bliss, "that the Lord will make his appearance yet, before the Jewish year shall terminate" (ibid.). Evidently, he did have some following on this point, for five months later we find Apollos Hale arguing in the same paper against those who (like Miller) had reset the time of the Advent for the spring of 1845--which would be about the time that the Jewish year 1844, according to some reckoning, would terminate. (See Hale, "The Last Experiment on Definite Time," AH, 7 May 1845, p. 100.) However, far from criticizing the practice of time setting, per se, Hale proceeded to set his own: "There is certainly greater reason to look for the Lord, before the closing of the coming year [1846], than there has been to look to any point in the past" (ibid.).

An 1845 editorial in the Advent Herald (19 February 1845, p. 12) expressed some distress over the view of some "that the prophetic periods are run out, and that we are past their fulfillment." The writer took the position that the Millerites were indeed mistaken in the "computation of time." Then he added this remark which, if anything, was an open invitation for new date setting: "There is a disputed circle, reaching from [18]43 to [18]47, somewhere within which, according to all chronologers, these periods must be fulfilled . . ." (ibid.).

In 1850, Bates complained that since 1844, cardinal dates in the 2300-day prophecy had been "moved from year to year" by those whom he called "the greater portion of Adventists" (see "Midnight Cry in the Past," p. 22). This, of course, was an indirect indication of new time setting. In 1851, Edson argued against those who had pushed back the terminus of the 2300 'days' to 1849 or 1850. An editorial note in RH, 5 May 1851, p. 78, spoke of "those who have advocated the end of the [2300] days this spring, and have again been disappointed . . ." (emphasis supplied). The statement warned against setting "a new date" for the expiration of the prophetic period.

All this points to the fact that the practice of 'time setting' continued to be in vogue for many years after the Disappointment. There is evidence that small pockets of believers espoused dates for the advent as late as 1854 and 1856 (see "Reply to 'Remarks on the 2300 Years'," RH, 6 December 1853, p. 172. This article was apparently a reprint from the Advent Herald for apologetic purposes). Even Bates and J. White set new dates for the Advent following the Disappointment (see Haddock, Doctrine of the Sanctuary, pp. 158, 163-65, 172). The new time setting of these two sabbatarian Adventists did not, however, imply any abandonment of the integrity of 1844.

and (2) it would leave intact the basic Millerite chronology of Dan 8 and 9,<sup>1</sup> for then it would be clearly evident that the Millerite error was not in regard to time, but rather in respect to place and event.<sup>2</sup>

Thus Smith's emphasis on the identification of the sanctuary of Dan 8:14 was an attempt to substantiate the validity of 1844.

Concept of a two-part  
heavenly ministry

However important Smith regarded the chronological demonstration of the factuality of the 1844 terminus, and however certain he was of the identification of qôdesh in Dan 8:14, the integrity of the whole Millerite experience seemed to need something more to commend it. It must be shown that some event of extraordinary importance did occur at the termination of the period in question.

Smith's emphasis on the concept of a two-part heavenly ministry was one step in his attempt to complete this validation process. He took the notion from the Old Testament, more particularly, the book of Leviticus. Here he observed that the services were divided into a daily ministrations in the holy place and a yearly in the most holy place. Through the continual daily ministrations, as Smith interpreted it, the sins of the penitent Israelite were transferred to the sanctuary, via the blood of the sacrifice.

---

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 16, n. 1.

<sup>2</sup> See Looking Unto Jesus, p. 216.

Then by means of the yearly service, those same sins were removed from the sanctuary through the blood of the Lord's goat, thus cleansing the sanctuary.<sup>1</sup>

This led Smith to conclude that inasmuch as the earthly sanctuary and its ministrations were a mere reflection of the heavenly, then there must also be a corresponding two-part heavenly ministry. So when Christ ascended He began what was really the first part of a divided ministry--in the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary.<sup>2</sup> This first apartment mediation, typified by

---

<sup>1</sup>Smith, The 2300 Days, pp. 15-17. The Sanctuary (1877), pp. 202-13; Looking Unto Jesus, pp. 88-98; Smith, "The Sanctuary. A Novel Argument," p. 157. "Synopsis of the Present Truth," ST, 17 June 1880, p. 271; 24 June, p. 282, 283; 1 July, pp. 295, 296; 8 July, pp. 307, 308; 15 July, pp. 319, 320; "The Chronological Position of the Atonement," RH, 8 May 1888, p. 296; "Questions on the Sanctuary," RH, 14 June 1887, p. 376.

<sup>2</sup>The 2300 Days, pp. 17, 18 (here Smith leaned heavily on the book of Hebrews, particularly 8:2, 3; 9:11, 12; 8:5); "Bible Reading on the Sanctuary: What the Sanctuary Is," RH, 23 July 1889, p. 472; "Bible Readings on the Sanctuary, No. 2: Its Furniture and Uses," RH, 30 July 1889, pp. 488, 489; Smith, "Queries on the Sanctuary," RH, 21 January 1890, p. 40; "Within the Veil," RH, 4 March 1890, p. 136; Smith, "The Veil of Hebrews 6," RH, 14 January 1890, pp. 24, 25.

In "Queries on the Sanctuary," p. 40, Smith addressed himself to the question of the eternal mediatorship of Christ. He made the following points: (1) We must distinguish between "the mediatorship of Christ as a whole, and the specific part of it which consists of his work as priest in the sanctuary on high." Christ has been man's mediator in a general sense since the adoption of the plan of salvation, but a priest only after the cross. (2) People in the former dispensation obtained forgiveness just as we do today. Their faith, demonstrated in the animal sacrifices, connected them to Christ "through whom alone all actual forgiveness of sin, from first to last, is secured."

Smith, therefore, concluded that although (according to Ps 11:4 and Jer 17:12) there was a sanctuary in existence in the Old Testament period, there was no priestly ministry there till after the cross. In the period before the cross, the heavenly sanctuary served as "the temple and palace of Jehovah." When a priestly ministry became necessary, the temple and throne of God were deemed its most natural locus (ibid.).

the daily services in the earthly sanctuary, fills the gap between calvary and 1844, at which time our great High Priest entered upon the second and last phase of His priestly ministry for us, the cleansing of the sanctuary.<sup>1</sup>

This typological approach enabled Smith to explain the role of the heavenly sanctuary in salvation history from the cross onwards. It allowed him to affirm the validity of expecting a change in the nature of Christ's ministry at some point following the cross, a change which he believed to have been predicted and pinpointed in Dan 8:14. In short the approach was important for establishing the salvation-historical integrity of 1844.

This is why he bristled at any suggestions which tended to play down the compartmentalization of the heavenly sanctuary.<sup>2</sup> Such

---

In formulating his position on a two-apartment heavenly ministry, Smith seemed to rely heavily on Andrews, who was certainly among the most prolific writers on the subject of the sanctuary in early Adventism. Smith's arguments for two separate apartment ministries appear to be a reproduction of Andrews'. (See The Sanctuary, pp. 52-54; cf. Andrews, The Sanctuary, pp. 10, 11; Andrews, "The Sanctuary Question," RH, 7 July 1853, pp. 25-28.) Andrews did concede, however, that at His ascension Christ went into the most holy place for a brief period to anoint it (alluding to Dan 9:24), a concession not found in Smith (see Andrews, The Sanctuary, pp. 51, 60). J. N. Loughborough, a prominent Adventist writer and a contemporary of Smith and Andrews, interpreted Dan 9:24 as the anointing of Christ at his baptism, not of the most holy place in heaven (see Great Advent Movement, p. 62).

<sup>1</sup>The 2300 Days, pp. 20, 31; The Sanctuary (1863), pp. 55, 64, 65; The Sanctuary (1877), pp. 245-55; Looking Unto Jesus, 143-48; "The Sanctuary. A Novel Argument," pp. 156, 157; "Synopsis of the Present Truth," ST, 17 June 1880, p. 271; 24 June, pp. 282, 283; 1 July, pp. 295-96; 8 July, pp. 307, 308; 15 July, pp. 319, 320; "The Chronological Position of the Atonement," p. 296; "Questions on the Sanctuary," p. 376.

<sup>2</sup>See Thoughts on Revelation, pp. 73, 74, 77. Cf. The Sanctuary (1877), pp. 193, 194; Looking Unto Jesus, pp. 118, 119. Smith also faced two other questions in regard to a two-

part heavenly ministry. One concerned the expression "within the veil" (Heb 6:19, 20), the other the location of God's throne.

The text in Heb 6:19, 20 says: "Which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that within the veil; whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus, made an high priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec" (KJV). Some contended that the veil in this passage referred to that which divided the holy place from the most holy. Thus, Christ, upon His ascension, passed immediately into the most holy place. (See The Sanctuary (1877), p. 221; Looking Unto Jesus, p. 126.)

Smith, in response, noted that the admission that there was a veil in the heavenly temple was already a tacit acceptance of a physical division in that sanctuary--else, why a veil at all? (The Sanctuary, pp. 221, 222; Looking Unto Jesus, pp. 126, 127.) From a linguistic-contextual standpoint, he argued that katapetasma (veil), though employed by the evangelists (Matt 27:51; Mark 15:38; Luke 23:45) to denote the second veil of the temple--that which ripped in two at the death of Christ--was, nevertheless, given a different meaning when used in Heb 6:19, 9:3, and 10:20. The evangelists were, naturally, thinking of the temple of their day. There "the opening to the holy place was composed of huge folding doors," the only veil being "that which hung between the holy and most holy place." By contrast, the author of Hebrews "goes back invariably to the tabernacle as erected by Moses." Looking Unto Jesus, p. 131. (This argument, incidentally, did not appear in The Sanctuary of 1877, the precursor of Looking Unto Jesus.)

The "peculiar" use of the word in Hebrews ("peculiar" so far as New Testament usage is concerned) is suggested by the apostle's employment of the adjective "second" in Heb 9:3, to qualify the word 'veil'--"and after the second veil, the tabernacle which is called the holiest of all." This qualifier suggests that katapetasma does not, invariably, refer to the second veil, that the author of Hebrews understood that the hanging at the entrance of the ancient tabernacle "was just as much a veil as that which divided between the holy and the most holy" (The Sanctuary (1877), p. 225, 226; Looking Unto Jesus, p. 128, 129). In support of this view, Smith cited Edward Robinson, A Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament (New York: Harper, 1850), s.v. "καταπέτασμα"; and John M<sup>c</sup>Clintock and James Strong, Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature, 12 vols. (New York: Harper and Bros., 1867-1887), IV, s.v., "Hanging."

Thus, inasmuch as the author of Hebrews does make a distinction between the two veils by specifying a "second" veil (chapter 9:3), "we must understand him as referring to the first veil when not thus specified." Heb 6:19, 20, therefore, speaks of Christ's entry into the holy place of the heavenly sanctuary (see the Sanctuary, 1877, pp. 224, 227, 228; Looking Unto Jesus, pp. 129, 130).

The second objection--regarding the location of God's

a suggestion would reduce the idea of the cleansing of the sanctuary to an "absurdity."<sup>1</sup> It would destroy the correspondence between the earthly economy and the heavenly, making the heavenly cast a misleading shadow. For if all heaven constitutes the sanctuary (or the most holy place) then the ancient daily services which occupied the entire year, less one day, would become meaningless.<sup>2</sup> Thus, he

---

throne--appeared particularly unsettling to Smith, for it argued the case from the standpoint of his own presuppositions. This view contended that the only object in the ancient sanctuary which logically corresponds to the throne of God was the mercy seat in the most holy place beneath and between the cherubim. Therefore when Scripture says that Christ upon His ascension "sat down on the right hand of God," (Heb 10:12) or that Christ, having overcome, "sat down" with His father "on his throne" (Rev 3:21), it means that he did go into the Most Holy Place immediately upon his ascension.

Against this view, Smith argued that the 'right hand of God' does not necessarily have reference to location as such, but rather to status, to a position of honor. It "simply denotes the position Christ holds in relation to God, as the second in exaltation, power, and glory." See Smith, "Questions on the Sanctuary," p. 377; Looking Unto Jesus, pp. 121, 122; "Between the Cherubim," RH, 6 March 1888, p. 152.

Smith argued, moreover, for the mobility of God's throne--it is "not always and immovably in the most holy place." Neither can the location of the shekinah in the earthly sanctuary be taken as indicative of the location of God's throne in heaven. Employing texts like Ex 33:9; Num 12:5; Deut 31:15, Smith tried to show that God met and communicated with Moses elsewhere than from between the cherubim. Daniel's vision of a heavenly assize also indicates that God's throne is movable ("Questions on The Sanctuary," p. 377). "The law," Smith reasoned, "had a shadow, but not the very image of the things" (ibid.).

It is somewhat surprising to find Smith questioning the correspondence between the type and the antitype when so much of his argumentation on other points rested precisely on this relationship. Nor does he provide any criteria by which he selects what elements of correspondence may be emphasized and what may be ignored.

<sup>1</sup>Thoughts on Revelation, p. 120. He argued that if Christ went to the most holy place upon his ascension, this then means that the cleansing of the sanctuary has been in process ever since, this being the only activity connected with the most holy place. To regard the cleansing of the sanctuary as being in process ever since the ascension was, to Smith's mind, absurd.

<sup>2</sup>Thoughts on Revelation, pp. 120, 121. Smith's point was

contended, the sanctuary is not "all heaven." There are indeed "two apartments," and, therefore, at some point within the Christian dispensation, Christ must move from one to the other, as did the ancient priests once each year on the day of atonement. For him, 1844 was that time. Affirming the prophetic calculations of Josiah Litch<sup>1</sup> and alluding to Rev 11:19,<sup>2</sup> he spelled out his position vis-à-vis 1844 with confidence:

---

that the ministry of the ancient priests was as much a shadow of heavenly things as the house in which they ministered. Therefore, since by far the greater part of that ministry occurred in the holy place, it makes nonsense of the type to denigrate or negate the antitypical importance of the first apartment services of the earthly sanctuary.

<sup>1</sup>Josiah Litch was a Millerite preacher who, using the historicist prophetic hermeneutic of William Miller, predicted the fall of the Ottoman empire for August 11, 1840, a prediction based on Rev 9:15 and believed by the Millerites to have met an exact fulfillment. See Josiah Litch, The Second Coming of Christ about 1843, pp. 152-58, especially p. 157; The Fall of the Ottoman Empire. Cf. Thoughts on Revelation, pp. 139-76, especially pp. 169, 173, 176; Ellen G. White, Great Controversy, pp. 334, 335. The Millerites received from this prediction-fulfillment (as they saw it) an extraordinary boost of spirits. It strengthened their own belief in other yet unfulfilled time prophecies interpreted on the same year-day principle. It also brought conviction to some skeptics (see Loughborough, Advent Movement, pp. 129-133). According to Loughborough, Litch testified that "within a few months after August 11, 1840, he had received letters from more than one thousand prominent infidels . . . in which they stated that they had given up the battle against the Bible" and conceded the divine origin of the Scriptures (ibid., p. 132). See also Olsen, Origin and Progress, pp. 115, 116; Smith, "Origin and History of the Third Angel's Message. No. 3," RH, 16 December 1890, p. 776, where he speaks of the "mighty impetus" given the Millerite movement by the "unquestionable and striking fulfillment" of Rev 9:15; Francis D. Nichol, ed., Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary, 9 vols. (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1957), 7:794-96. The last reference provides a brief history of the interpretation of Rev 9:15 and calls attention to some problems in the interpretation of the fifth and sixth trumpets of Rev 9.

<sup>2</sup>Here John 'sees' the temple of God in heaven opened.



The Temple is opened; the second apartment of the sanctuary is entered. We know it is the holy of holies that is here opened; for the ark is seen, and in that apartment alone the ark was deposited. This took place at the end of the 2300 days, when the sanctuary was to be cleansed, the time when the prophetic period expired, and the seventh angel commenced to sound. Since then the people of God have seen by faith the open door in Heaven, and the ark of God's testament there.<sup>1</sup>

So, for Smith, the idea of a two-phase heavenly ministry gave credence to the Millerite expectation of an extraordinary event to occur at the end of the prophetic days. And though the actual event they expected was to be discredited, not so the expectation itself. The bi-partite ancient service removed from the realm of the bizarre the belief that a change in Christ's ministry occurred at some specific point during the Christian dispensation, even after that once-for-all event of the cross. And to teach that Christ immediately entered the most holy place at his ascension was to disarrange "that great central pillar of the prophecies," the 2300 days, throw "the whole system of prophetic interpretation into inextricable confusion," and even destroy "the Messiahship of Christ."<sup>2</sup>

That last statement indicates that Smith's concern for a two-compartment heavenly ministry was not for its own sake. It indicates that he considered such a ministry as validating certain basic elements of biblical revelation. However, it is necessary to probe more deeply to uncover that which constituted his real fears.

---

<sup>1</sup>Thoughts on Revelation, pp. 196, 200. It is pointed out below that Smith saw an important connection between the disclosure of the ark, referred to in Rev 11:19, and the renewed emphasis (by Adventists) on the binding claims of the Ten Commandments.

<sup>2</sup>The Sanctuary, p. 223. I have not been able to locate similar sentiments in Looking Unto Jesus. It is not immediately clear why Smith might have omitted such emphatic declarations in his later work.

I rather doubt that Smith was overly concerned that "the Messiahship of Christ" would somehow be destroyed. After all, Christians of every shade had as much stake in that as he did. Nor was he primarily concerned about "the whole system of prophetic interpretation" being thrown into "inextricable confusion." It would seem that what primarily concerned him was the implication for the integrity of 1844 of any denial of a two-compartment heavenly ministry.<sup>1</sup>

Such a denial would call into question the Adventist contention that Christ was doing a special work in the present, a work typified by the second division of a two-part ancient service. This would be tantamount to believing that "the past Advent movement . . . [was] all a mistake." Such a conclusion would begin the deterioration of the very foundation of Adventism; for "if there . . . [was] nothing to the past movement, there is certainly nothing to the present."<sup>2</sup> This was clearly Smith's real concern.

But the very fact of the once-for-allness of Christ's work on the cross called into question the need for some new salvation activity in 1844. The doctrine of the atonement, as Smith conceived it, addressed itself to this problem.

---

<sup>1</sup>Smith, in fact, indicates this directly. "We have already seen," he said, "how the idea that Christ entered directly into the most holy place at his ascension . . . disarranges the period of 2300 days, that great central pillar of the prophecies" (The Sanctuary--1877, p. 223). This was his primary concern.

<sup>2</sup>The Sanctuary (1877), p. 224. The condemnation of Ballenger in 1905 for teaching, among other things, that Christ went immediately into the most holy place at his ascension (discussed in chapter II) indicates the importance Adventists attached to this aspect of their teachings.

### The Atonement

In terms of their role in establishing for Smith the salvation-historical integrity of the 1844 Millerite experience, the aspects of (1) a two-part heavenly ministry and (2) the atonement<sup>1</sup> are complementary. The first validates the expectation of a change in Christ's ministry within the Christian dispensation, the second identifies the nature of that change.

Smith's understanding of the Christ-event rested, to a large extent, on his interpretation of the sacrificial system of the Old Testament. Such an approach led him to the conclusion that, far from having been made at the cross, the atonement did not even commence there.

His first protracted statement on the subject came in his 1877 book, The Sanctuary. Here he confidently affirmed that in order to understand the relationship of Christ's death on the cross to the atonement, we have to go back to the Old Testament types, since the doctrine of the atonement has its roots in the typical system. According to this system, the atonement was, necessarily, preceded by three important steps: (1) The confession of sin on

---

<sup>1</sup>Although Smith did equate the atonement with the cleansing of the sanctuary (see Thoughts on Revelation, p. 55; Looking Unto Jesus, p. 236) I am dealing with it separately here precisely because he himself tended to treat the two concepts quite distinctly. His treatment of the atonement, in my view, showed a deeper sensitivity to the aspect of time of occurrence. Although the cleansing of the sanctuary in Smith's theology cannot be divorced from the idea of time, yet the emphasis there, as is shown in the discussion of that aspect of his theology, was more on chronometry than on chronology.

(Smith equated the atonement not only with the cleansing of the sanctuary but also with the "investigative judgment of the saints," "the blotting out, or remission of sins" and the "finishing of the mystery of God." See Looking Unto Jesus, p. 241.)

the part of the penitent over the head of the victim, (2) the shedding of the blood of the offering, and (3) the presentation of the blood by the priest at the altar, or within the sanctuary. These three steps were taken repeatedly every day of the year. But on one particular day, they were followed by a service of atonement, "the last ceremony of the year" which "completed the round of sanctuary service."<sup>1</sup>

Thus "the offering and service of the priest preceded the atonement" and did not constitute it. Atonement was made only when the priest ministered in the most holy place at the end of the year.<sup>2</sup>

Drawing the parallel between the earthly and heavenly sanctuaries, Smith concluded that "the anti-typical atonement . . . was not made when the offering for this dispensation was provided,

---

<sup>1</sup>The Sanctuary, pp. 277; Looking Unto Jesus, pp. 237, 238. Discussing this same idea elsewhere, Smith suggested that such evidence (found in the typical system) demonstrated that "Christ must have a long general work to perform," followed by "a comparatively short and specific ministry . . . called, The Making of the Atonement." ("The Chronological Position of the Atonement," p. 296.)

<sup>2</sup>The Sanctuary, p. 277, emphasis supplied; Looking Unto Jesus, p. 238; "The Chronological Position of the Atonement," p. 296. Here Smith argued that the daily work of the Old Testament priests had nothing to do with atonement, per se. Smith, evidently, did not attach much importance to the fact that the transaction in the daily service was repeatedly referred to as "atonement" (kaphar). See Lev 1:4; 4:20, 30, 31; 5:6; 10, 13, 16, 18, etc. Cf. Lev 16:6, 10, 11, etc. Crosier had distinguished between a "daily atonement" for the "forgiveness of sins" and a "yearly atonement" for the "blotting" out of sins. The first was an "individual" atonement, the other a "national atonement." ([Crosier], "The Priesthood of Christ," RH, 16 September 1852, p. 77; cf. Bates, "Midnight Cry in the Past," p. 21.) Smith, evidently, did not relish the concept of a "daily atonement." Nor should Crosier's position here be taken to suggest any appreciation of the concept of atonement at the cross. Not only did he not draw this conclusion, he was actively hostile to it. (See "The Priesthood of Christ," p. 76).

nor by the service of the priest in the first apartment of the [heavenly] sanctuary." Rather, it "is accomplished only by the service of the priest in the most holy place." This, according to the prophetic chronology of Dan 8:14, did not commence until 1844.<sup>1</sup>

Viewed in this way then, the cross becomes a "preparatory" act which merely opens the way (by providing the blood) for "the priestly work he [Christ] was to perform" in the heavenly sanctuary. And to regard the offering on the cross as the atonement is to

---

<sup>1</sup> The Sanctuary, pp. 277, 278; "The Atonement Not Made on the Cross--In Process Now," RH, 30 January 1894, p. 70; [Smith], The Biblical Institute, pp. 79, 81. In taking this view Smith was reflecting the commonly held view in contemporary Adventism. See, for example, Crosier, "The Law of Moses," The Day Star Extra, 7 February 1846, pp. 40, 41; [Crosier], "The Sanctuary," p. 85; Loughborough, Letter, RH, 19 August 1852, p. 62. (Loughborough's position is very vague here, but he is surely arguing against atonement at the cross); J. H. W[aggoner], "The Atonement, Part II," RH, 24 November 1863, p. 206; R. F. Cottrell, "Should S. D. Adventists Exist?", No. 2, ST, 30 March 1876, p. 133; Waggoner, "Barnes on the Atonement," RH, 10 September 1861, p. 116. Waggoner, "The Atonement," No. 14, ST, 31 August 1876, p. 290; No. 15, 7 September 1876, p. 299; No. 16, 14 September 1876, p. 307; Waggoner, The Atonement; An Examination of a Remedial System in the Light of Nature and Revelation, In Two Parts (Battle Creek, MI: Steam Press of the SDA Publishing Assn., 1868), pp. 103, 104 (cf. 1872 edition, pp. 109, 110 and 1884 edition, 180-184); "Fundamental Principles of Seventh-day Adventists," ST, 4 June 1874, p. 3; (cf. "Fundamental Principles of Seventh-day Adventists," ST, 28 January 1875, pp. 108, 109). Adventists had probably inherited their position on the atonement from William Miller who, against the widespread Protestant view, had contended that atonement was not made at the cross (Miller, Letter, Western Midnight Cry, 21 December 1844, cited in SDA Ency., s.v. "Atonement").

There appears to have been at least one dissenting voice. J. M. Stephenson, a contemporary of Smith, seemed to be suggesting an atonement at the cross in the first of a series of articles on the subject (see Stephenson, "The Atonement," RH, 22 August 1854, p. 9). Stephenson was none too clear, however. But the fact that Waggoner seems to take issue with him on the question of the time and place of the atonement (see references to Waggoner just cited) suggests he was, in fact, in conflict with the generally held contemporary Adventist view on the time of the atonement.

"confound together events that are more than eighteen hundred years apart."<sup>1</sup> The atonement "comes at the end not at the beginning" of Christ's ministry and "to locate it in any other place is to utterly ignore this beautiful structure of the type, and do violence to many scriptures."<sup>2</sup>

So what emerges from Smith's study of the type is his repudiation of the accepted Protestant position that the death of Christ on the cross constituted the atonement. "The death of Christ and the atonement are not the same thing."<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>The Sanctuary, p. 278; Looking Unto Jesus, pp. 238-240.

<sup>2</sup>"The Chronological Position of the Atonement," p. 296.

<sup>3</sup>The Sanctuary (1877), p. 276; Looking Unto Jesus, p. 237. This position, which Smith urged should be fixed "forever in the mind," was not seen by him as a denial of the atonement, of course. It merely gave to it its "proper place," thereby preventing conflict with "other great truths of the Bible" (ibid.). At least one of those "great truths" was of primary concern to Smith--the significance of the 1844 terminus of the 2300 days.

In Smith's view, the idea of an atonement at the cross leads to certain theological inconsistencies. For example, it has Christ making the atonement before He became priest (ibid.; "S. D. Adventists and the Atonement," RH, 14 July 1891, p. 438; "The Atonement," RH, 30 January 1894, p. 70). In Looking Unto Jesus, p. 239, in a section which evidently did not appear in The Sanctuary (of 1877), Smith says, emphatically, that ". . . on the cross . . . bearing the sin of the world, and pouring out his blood for sinful men, he [Christ] was not acting as priest. His priesthood had not then begun; and besides it was no part of the priest's work to present the offering; the sinner did that."

One important reason for Smith's objection to atonement at the cross was that it could lead, as he reasoned, to universalism on the one hand, or to predestination on the other. See "The Atonement" (1894), p. 70; "A Difficulty Explained," RH, 15 April 1890, p. 232; The Sanctuary (1877), pp. 275, 276; "The Chronological Position of the Atonement," p. 296; "S. D. Adventists and the Atonement," p. 438; Looking Unto Jesus, pp. 236, 237.

Smith's attention had been called to several biblical statements which seemed to contradict his position on the atonement; for example, Acts 2:38. This text seemed to suggest that the remission of sins immediately followed repentance and baptism. If so,

This radical departure from the commonly held Protestant view was regarded by Smith and his Adventist colleagues as an emphasis whose time had come. It enabled them to call attention with confidence to 1844 as a significant milestone in salvation-history. Something new transpired at the conclusion of the prophetic period that was of vast importance to human salvation--the atonement.

#### Denial/affirmation of a "shut-door"

Any study of the original documents of the Millerites

why then a future atonement for this very purpose?

Smith suggested that what the text meant was that baptism was performed "for, on 'in order to', remission"--which meant, simply, that "baptism . . . looks forward to a future time, when all the requirements of God having been complied with in faith, sins will be blotted out by the blood of Christ." This is the time when, according to Acts 3:19, "times of refreshment" will come "from the presence of the Lord." See The Sanctuary (1877), p. 279; Looking Unto Jesus, p. 240. (It is questionable whether Smith's interpretation of Acts 2:38 is compatible with sober exegesis.)

Another text which seemed to militate against his concept of an atonement commencing in the middle of the 19th century was Rom 5:11. This text seemed to affirm that in the first century, Christians had already "received the atonement." In response, Smith argued that katalage (the word rendered "atonement" in the KJV) might be rendered, more accurately, "reconciliation." This is an experience between the individual and God on the basis of personal confession and Christ's intercession--a transaction far different from the atonement or blotting out of sin (*ibid.*, pp. 240, 241; Biblical Institute, p. 81). For his treatment of Heb 1:3, another passage in the same vein, see "The Chronological Position of the Atonement," pp. 296, 297; "A Difficulty Explained," p. 232.

In arguing against the blotting out of sin when one repents, Smith cited three principal texts (apart from Acts 3:19): Eze 18:26; Eze 33:13; and Matt 18:21-35. All three passages seem to speak of confessed sins being thrown back upon the individual, which Smith takes as an indication that they were still in existence and not blotted out.

How fair was Smith's treatment of these atonement passages? Was there a tendency to bend them to conform to his own presuppositions? At the very least, his appraisal of them raises several theological and religious questions, ultimately leading to the fundamental issue of Christian assurance.

confirms the fact that some did espouse the concept of a "shut door."<sup>1</sup> Indeed, given their pre-suppositions, it was logical for them to arrive at that conclusion.<sup>2</sup>

However, this view soon lost its respectability with the majority of post-1844 Millerites, to the extent that Miller, surprisingly, denied that he had ever espoused it.<sup>3</sup> Case after case

---

<sup>1</sup>Even before the Disappointment, the close of human probation was expected to coincide with, or just precede, the end of the 2300 days. (See Miller, Evidence, p. 97.) However, the idea received a high degree of attention and became an issue following the experience of October 1844 (see "Letter from Bro. Miller," AH, 11 December 1844, p. 142; Hale, "Has the Bridegroom Come? Is the Door Shut? Both Sides of the Question," AH, 5 March 1845, pp. 26, 28; Hale, "Duties and Trials of Our Position," RH, 25 November 1851, p. 50).

Early Adventist pioneers generally believed in a "shut door." See James White, "Our Present Position," p. 14; Bates, "The Midnight Cry in the Past," pp. 22, 23; Bates, Explanation of the Sanctuary, pp. 10-12; and F. G. Brown, Letter, AH, 11 November 1844 (cited in Olsen, Origin and Progress, p. 161); Letter, RH, February 1851, p. 46. For a recent study on the "shut door," see Rolf J. Poehler, "'... And the Door Was Shut': Seventh-day Adventists and the Shut-Door Doctrine in the Decade after the Great Disappointment," term paper, E. G. W. Research Center, Andrews University, 1978; see also Damsteegt, Foundations, pp. 106-15, 149-63.

<sup>2</sup>See Smith, "The Cleansing of the Sanctuary" (1855), p. 54.

<sup>3</sup>See "Letter from Bro. Miller," AH, 26 March 1845, p. 49; "Letter from Bro. Miller--The 'Shut-Door' Doctrine Repudiated," AH, 13 November 1847, p. 119.

Evidently, a decision against the "shut door" idea was taken at the Albany Conference of post-1844 Millerites in April 1845, a meeting which Miller attended. There is a reference in RH, February 1851, p. 47 to the effect that the Laodicean church (a pejorative term used by Adventists at that time) had its inception at that conference. One reason for this hostile Adventist view was that the conference leaders "succeeded in convincing their brethren that the door was open, and [that] they must now 'double their diligence' to convert the world."

Josiah Litch, a prominent Millerite, also repudiated the shut door. See "Letter from Br. J. Litch," AH, 27 November 1844, pp. 122, 123; "The Ten Virgins," AH, 21 May 1845, p. 120.



of new conversions from the world at large were presented in the Advent Herald as a means of discrediting the idea of a "shut-door."<sup>1</sup>

This development presented Adventists with a dilemma. To deny the concept of a "shut-door" seemed to them a back-handed way of repudiating the integrity of 1844.<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, affirming it became increasingly more untenable with the passage of time, especially in view of undeniable empirical evidence in terms of new conversions.

Smith came upon the stage in the wake of a painful, and perhaps reluctant, retreat by Adventists from their former position on this question and quickly perceived the bearing of that debate on the integrity of the 1844 prophetic terminus. He apparently saw that if the idea of a "shut-door," as commonly understood, continued to be affirmed by Adventists, then every new case of conversion would tend to bring discredit on their belief in the significance of 1844. On the other hand, he saw, with Adventists in general, that an unqualified denial of the idea of a "shut-door" could subtly compromise

---

<sup>1</sup> See Himes, "Meetings in New London, Ct.," AH, 5 February 1845, p. 205; "Editorial Correspondence," AH 5 February 1845, p. 205; cf. Himes, "Low Hampton Conference," AH, 15 January 1845, p. 182. (Here he urged a new offensive in gospel witnessing to sinners.)

In response, Adventist spokesmen attempted to discredit these reports of alleged conversions. See Bates, Second Advent Waymarks and High Heaps, or a Connected View of the Fulfillment of Prophecy by God's Peculiar People, from the Year 1840 to 1847 (New Bedford: Press of Benjamin Linsey, 1847), p. 46; "Midnight Cry in the Past," pp. 22-24; "The Laodicean Church," RH, November 1850, pp. 7, 8; "Our Labor in the Philadelphia and Laodicean Churches," RH, 19 August 1851, p. 13; James White, "Our Present Position," p. 15.

<sup>2</sup> One senses this concern in James White's article (*ibid.*, p. 14).

the salvation-historical integrity of 1844 in another direction, as noted above.

Accordingly, Smith approached the issue in three steps:

(1) he repudiated the idea of a "shut-door," as commonly understood; (2) he affirmed it, in the sense of a change of locus in Christ's heavenly ministry; and (3) he postulated the idea of a new open door since 1844.<sup>1</sup> The strategy was apparently a skillful one. The second step counterbalanced the first, while the third launched a new offensive.

---

<sup>1</sup>See The Visions, pp. 21-27; Thoughts on Revelation, pp. 55, 56, 73-74; "The Warning Voice," RH, 17 March 1853, p. 63, and 4 August, p. 42; "Origin and History of the Third Angel's Message. No. 2," RH, 9 December 1890, p. 760; "The Sanctuary," RH, 4 April 1854, p. 84. In that last reference Smith assures that "to this open door all may come for pardon . . . for whom mercy yet lingers." (Cf. 2300 Days, p. 23.) The idea of an "open door" was based, in part, on Rev 4:1, 5. Smith saw the concept of a "shut-door" as having a potentially negative effect on the integrity of 1844.

However, though he categorically rejected the "shut door" idea as espoused by the Millerites, he was able to explain their stand with a great deal of sympathy (see "Origin and History of the Third Angel's Message--No. 5," RH, 6 January 1891, p. 8); cf. Loughborough, Advent Movement, pp. 155-56, 200, 221; Damsteegt, Foundations, pp. 43, 44, 106-10.

By 1851, Adventists had begun a retreat, however surreptitiously, from their hard line on the "shut-door." Notice how this was manifested in James White. That year, in reprinting an article by Apollos Hale (ardent "shut-door" advocate among the 'Advent Herald Party'), White felt it necessary to make some editorial disclaimers. "In the main," he said, "we believe . . . Hale's position in the article to be correct. But the idea of the 'door of mercy' being shut is unscriptural and untrue. The Bible mentions no such door." See "Call to Remembrance the Former Days," RH, 16 September 1851, p. 25. I interpret this semantic quibble as a weak attempt to put some distance between Adventists and the more radical advocates of a "shut-door." This is further demonstrated by the fact that five months later, White was led to admit that the "shut-door" of the Matt 25 parable barred from God's mercy none of the honest children of God, neither those who "had not wickedly rejected the light of truth, and the influence of the Holy Spirit" ("Call at the Harbinger Office," RH, 17 February 1852, p. 94).

The door had opened wider by March 1853, when White admitted that although "the great work of saving men" had closed since

By means of this new offensive (the idea of an "open door"), Smith attempted to recapture the significance of the 1844 prophetic terminus. Yes, there was a closed door in 1844--the door to the holy place of the heavenly sanctuary. It was closed because Christ no longer ministered there. But with its closure, a new door opened--that leading into the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary. The "shut-door" did not, therefore, signify a close of human probation, but rather a cessation of ministry in the first apartment and a commencement of a new ministry in the second.<sup>1</sup>

This heavenly change of locus was far from theological hair splitting for Smith. Ignoring it, "thousands upon thousands"

---

1844, "a few are now coming to Christ" and are finding salvation. ("The Sanctuary," RH, 17 March 1853, p. 176.) In an article the following month, White "rejoiced to publish to those that have an ear to hear, that there is an OPEN DOOR." He expressed his yearning that "precious souls would come to this open door and share the Saviour's pardoning love." ("The Shut Door," editorial, RH, 14 April 1853, p. 189.) One month later, White flatly declared that the shut door of Luke 13:23-25 was "in the future," a radical departure from the past. (See White, "Remarks on Luke XIII, 23-25," RH, 26 May 1853, p. 4.)

It should be observed, however, that there was always a deep resistance to opening the door to those who were regarded as having rejected their 1844 experience. I have not been able to find any clear evidence that they were eligible to enter through the new open door. For example, Smith, in giving an invitation to "all" to come to the open door appears to attach a significant qualifier; "all . . . for whom mercy yet lingers." ("The Sanctuary," RH, 4 April 1854, p. 84; 2300 Days, p. 23.)

<sup>1</sup>The Visions, p. 23; Thoughts on Revelation, pp. 55-56. This new ministry partook of elements of the old, and so did not constitute the close of probation. Christ still "pleads his blood in the second" apartment of the heavenly sanctuary, He is "advocate in the most holy, as well as in the holy place" (The Visions, p. 28; Biblical Institute, pp. 77, 79). For this view, Smith relied on J. N. Andrews, "The Sanctuary and Its Cleansing," RH, 30 October 1855, pp. 68-69. See also Smith, "Bible Reading on the Sanctuary, No. 4," RH, 27 August 1889, p. 536.

had made shipwreck of their faith. For it is no more possible, he contended, to approach God by way of the holy place after 1844 than it was to approach Him through animal sacrifices after the cross. In both cases there was a "shut-door," and in both it was a crucial factor to be aware of Christ's "present position."<sup>1</sup> One could reach him after 1844 only by giving due heed to His "present position" in the most holy place in the heavenly sanctuary.

In this way, Smith sought to turn the tables, to transform the idea of a "shut-door" from an element of derision for the Adventist position to one of respect. To reject the theological significance of 1844 could lead to dire consequences, Smith alleged. For only those could find salvation after 1844 "who go to the Saviour where he is, and view him by faith in the most holy place." "This," he warned, was "the only door now open for salvation." Those who had made a "deliberate and final rejection" of this truth had "shut up their only way to everlasting life."<sup>2</sup>

### Conclusions

Smith's efforts to affirm the basic Millerite chronology of Dan 8 and 9, his tireless attempts to identify the qôdesh of Dan 8:14, and his vigorous polemic for a two-part heavenly ministry in conformity to the Old Testament cultus, were essentially for the sake of preserving the salvation-historical significance of 1844. Likewise, the position he set forth on the atonement, as well as his approach to the question of a "shut door," had as its chief goal the strengthening of the theological significance of 1844.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Visions, p. 24.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 24, 26, 27.

The need to safeguard the integrity of 1844 was thus a major concern for him. As he saw it, the stability and credibility of the Adventist church was bound up with it.

Concern to Attest the Perpetuity of  
the Law and the Sabbath

No person can receive the true light on the sanctuary,  
and the present position and work of our great Mediator,  
without having his attention specially directed to the ten  
commandments.<sup>1</sup>

One of the subjects discussed by Adventist leaders at that 1852 New Hampshire conference (a conference which Smith attended, and which was a turning point in his life) was the question of the law and, in connection with it, the sabbath.<sup>2</sup> Before their expulsion, the Millerites, by and large, had been members of Sunday-observing Protestant churches. The question of the decalogue and the sabbath was not a particular issue for them at the time.<sup>3</sup>

However, in the midst of the post-1844 ferment that small group of Millerites just then beginning to espouse the doctrine of the sanctuary was confronted, almost simultaneously, with the claims of the fourth commandment of the decalogue. It was brought to their attention through a member of the Seventh-day Baptist church, that Saturday was, in fact, the correct seventh day, and thus the only biblically valid day of rest.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Smith, "The Cleansing of the Sanctuary" (1855), p. 54.

<sup>2</sup>See above, p. 38.

<sup>3</sup>Millerite leaders were made aware of the sabbath through the Seventh-day Baptists, but were unimpressed with its relevance. (See Damsteegt, Foundations, p. 136.)

<sup>4</sup>For accounts of the origin and development of the sabbath

As a result, this group came to adopt the seventh day of the week as the sabbath, a move which only added to the tension and resentment between them and the larger body from which they sprang. When the editor of The Harbinger described Adventists as "these Shut-Door sabbatarians"<sup>1</sup> he was only expressing the general contempt in which they were held by Millerites of that period.

Like their detractors, Adventists quickly perceived that the integrity of a seventh-day sabbath stood or fell with the intactness of the ten commandments. Therefore, just as the whole debate against the law was, in effect, aimed at the sabbath, so also the whole Adventist defence of the law was primarily to attest the perpetuity of the sabbath. The apathy among the larger body of post-1844 Millerites for the decalogue was matched by a growing Adventist appreciation of its inviolability.<sup>2</sup> And though they

---

in the Adventist church, see Loughborough, Advent Movement, pp. 115-30; Olsen, Origin and Progress, pp. 181-87; Spalding, Origin and History, I, pp. 115-30; Spalding, Footprints, pp. 30-39; Froom, Prophetic Faith, IV: 941-961; SDA Ency., s.v. "The Sabbath," section v: "The Sabbath among Adventists;" Damsteegt, Foundations, pp. 136-43.

<sup>1</sup>Editorial, Advent Harbinger, 31 January 1852. Cited in White, "Call at the Harbinger Office," p. 94.

<sup>2</sup>The first issues of the Review and Herald were filled with articles arguing the binding claims of the law and the sabbath. Every single issue between November 1850 and June 1851, for example, devoted large sections to the elucidation of that question. (There was also heavy concentration on the sanctuary after the first few issues.) No one leafing through the pages of the Review and Herald for the first fifty years of its existence will have any trouble finding several articles on the law and/or the sabbath in almost every issue. The Signs of the Times (which at its inception in 1874 and many years following was virtually another Review and Herald, for the West Coast) showed the same trend.

The sabbath was seen as the visible sign of God's remnant people, and as a reason for their separate existence. See [James White], "The Position of the Remnant. Their Duties and Trials Considered," RH, 12 September 1854, pp. 36, 37; R. F. Cottrell, "Should

adduced every possible argument in its defense, they eventually came to regard the doctrine of the sanctuary, itself a disputed point, to constitute their best means of demonstrating the unassailability of the law.<sup>1</sup>

As Smith took up the argument on this point, it was to the literalness of the sanctuary that he appealed. In his first extensive statement on the sanctuary (1854) he indicated that the heavenly sanctuary, being "the great original" after which the earthly was patterned, likewise "contains two holy places."<sup>2</sup> He took the position that Rev 5:8 described the work of actual redeemed members of the Christian church "offering incense" in the heavenly sanctuary in behalf of praying saints on earth. The heavenly sanctuary, he argued, was as literal as are God and Christ. Just as Christ "ascended with a literal, tangible body," which He still retains, so also must He have "a literal place in which to

---

Seventh-day Adventists Exist?," p. 149. Smith noted that the great burden of the Advent Movement, according to Rev 14:9-12, was that of "warning against the last work of anti-Christian powers, and its great reform of the commandments of God"--the sabbath being uppermost in his mind. The only people doing this, he observed, were the Seventh-day Adventists in America and Europe. ("The Present Burden of the Advent Movement," ST, June 1877, p. 204; cf. Smith, "The Warning Voice," RH, 17 March 1853, p. 169.

<sup>1</sup>See [James White], "The Ark and the Mercy Seat," RH, 27 May 1852, p. 13 (reprinted in ST, 22 October 1874, p. 60); Smith, "Bible Reading on the Sanctuary. No. 4: The Cleansing of the Sanctuary," RH, 27 August 1889, pp. 536, 537; Looking Unto Jesus, pp. 226-30. See also above, p. 32, n. 1; R. F. Cottrell, "Light from the Sanctuary," RH, 17 November 1874, p. 164; Smith, "The Cleansing of the Sanctuary" (1855), p. 54; "Origin and History of the Third Angel's Message, No. 6," RH, 13 January 1891, p. 68; "The Seventh-day Adventists," RH, 3 November 1874, pp. 148, 149.

<sup>2</sup>2300 Days, p. 14.

minister." That literal place, like its earthly counterpart, was equipped "with its corresponding vessels of service. . . ."<sup>1</sup>

This last statement seems to provide the clue to Smith's reason for emphasizing so strongly the literalness of the heavenly sanctuary. It is doubtful that he was merely interested in the literal existence of boards and nails, incense and candlesticks in

---

<sup>1</sup> Thoughts on Revelation, pp. 86, 87, 140. In Looking Unto Jesus, pp. 115, 118, Smith asserted that the Old Testament tabernacle was "simply copied from the sanctuary of this dispensation." He based this conclusion principally on Old Testament passages like Ex 25:8, 9; Ex 26:30; Ex 27:8, etc. These he compared with New Testament references like Acts 7:44 and numerous texts in Heb 8 and 9.

On the basis of the above texts, he held a very literal conception of the heavenly sanctuary. "The candelstick," he suggested in one article, actually "glows before the throne of God in heaven, symbol of the seven spirits of God. . . ." ("Final Fate of the Candlesticks," RH, 31 December 1901, p. 850.) In another place he seems to concede that there could be an "actual [physical] presentation" of Christ's blood in heaven (Looking Unto Jesus, p. 140). (Smith's own view, however, was that Christ pleads the merits of his blood--see Thoughts on Revelation, p. 89, but his concession in the preceding reference is instructive.)

Smith's literalism did not prevent him from emphasizing the surpassing vastness and magnificence of the heavenly sanctuary, a structure fully equipped to handle "over two hundred millions of angelic assistants" (a figure based on Dan 7:10) in its most holy place alone. (See Thoughts on Revelation, pp. 88, 89; "A Notable Anniversary," RH, 29 October 1901, p. 704.) Nor did it prevent him from warning against what he saw as over-literalism. See, for instance, "The Cleansing of the Sanctuary" (1855), pp. 52, 53; Looking Unto Jesus, pp. 99-107.

Was this caution altruistic, or was it self-serving? On the basis of what criteria did Smith attempt to place restrictions on others while utilizing some of these "details" himself? For example, as we have already seen, Smith made use of his knowledge of the location of sanctuary furniture in the earthly sanctuary to identify scenes in the heavenly sanctuary, scenes which he invested with deep theological importance (see above, pp. 55, 56). Yet when his opponents used the same hermeneutical principle to argue for the immediate entrance of Christ into the most holy place upon his ascension, he vigorously objected (see Smith, "Questions on the Sanctuary," p. 377; "Between the Cherubim," p. 152).



heaven. Granted, he may very well have had an interest in these details, but they were certainly not his primary interest. His fundamental concern was to attest the perpetuity of the law and the sabbath. And if the heavenly sanctuary can be shown to contain the "corresponding vessels of service," then the ark must also be regarded as being present there--and with it the tables of the covenant (the Ten Commandments) which, in the ancient tabernacle, were ensconced within it. This was his primary interest.

Accordingly, he attributed great significance to Rev 11:19, a passage which describes the disclosure of the ark of the covenant in connection with the opening of the heavenly temple. That text, he affirmed, calls our attention "to the close of the ministration of Christ, the last scene in the work of mercy for a guilty world."<sup>1</sup> The following statement, already cited above, shows how his concern for the integrity of the 1844 terminus of the 2300 days converged with his desire to attest the validity of the law, and how both have been sandwiched between the notion of an open door into the most holy place.

The Temple is opened; the second apartment of the sanctuary is entered. We know it is the holy of holies that is here opened; for the ark is seen, and in that apartment alone the ark was deposited. This took place at the end of the 2300 days, when the sanctuary was to be cleansed, the time when the prophetic period expired, and the seventh angel commenced to sound. Since then the people of God have seen by faith the open door in Heaven, and the ark of God's testament there.<sup>2</sup>

Smith saw an important connection between this disclosure

---

<sup>1</sup>Thoughts on Revelation, p. 200; 2300 Days, p. 23.

<sup>2</sup>Thoughts on Revelation, p. 200.

of the ark in heaven and the growing emphasis by Adventists on the binding claims of the Ten Commandments. For it was in the ark, that "central" piece of sanctuary furniture, that the decalogue was stored. Thus the revelation of the ark in the heavenly temple was evidence not only that the holy place had been entered, but also that the time had arrived for a new emphasis on the decalogue.<sup>1</sup> Thus the vision of Rev 11:19 placed any idea of a change in the law "beyond the range of possibilities." It suggested that the fourth commandment was equally binding on "the second house of Israel" as on "the first," requiring the observance of the seventh day as a memorial of creation.<sup>2</sup>

Smith thus regarded the young sabbatarian Adventist movement to which he belonged as the true continuation of "the second house of Israel," the Remnant, called of God in accordance with prophecy, to proclaim the hour of judgment come, a judgment having as its norm the Ten Commandments. The "burden" of the Remnant was, therefore, "to warn against the worship of the beast, and urge, in contrast, obedience to God."<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. See also Smith, "The Seventh-day Adventists," pp. 148, 149.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. Haddock observed that "Bates was the first to connect Rev 11:19 with the Sabbath, thus giving the Sabbath a prophetic import" (*History of Sanctuary*, p. 182). See also Smith, "Origin and History of the Third Angel's Message, No. 5," *RH*, 13 January 1891, p. 68.

<sup>3</sup> Smith, "The Biblical Institute," p. 90; "The Message from the Sanctuary," *ST*, 25 November 1880, pp. 522, 523; "The Mark of the Beast," *ST*, 2 December 1880, p. 536 and 9 December 1880, pp. 550, 551. Smith associated the sabbath with the seal of God (see "The Warning Voice," 23 June 1853, p. 18; cf. "The Warning Voice," 21 July, p. 34). In one place he admonished, "Keep God's commandments, and the faith of Jesus; so shall you escape the bitter vials

of the final plagues. . . ." ("The Warning Voice," 21 July, p. 34.)

Smith's linkage of the Adventist emphasis on law with the requirements of prophecy is of extreme importance in any effort to understand his theology. His relationship to the 1888 righteousness by faith debate, for example, can only be fully understood in the light of this theological outlook. The debate over righteousness by faith was, in part, an effort to move the Adventist church away from an over-emphasis on those aspects of their faith considered to be unique or peculiar (like the sabbath, the law, conditional immortality, etc.) to the central doctrine of the Christian faith, the righteousness of God in Christ. It was felt that many Adventists had a tendency to take this doctrine for granted, if not ignore it altogether.

Not only was Smith the editor of the church paper, he also served as secretary of that 1888 General Conference session, grappling with the question of righteousness by faith. Yet the crucial debates were virtually ignored in the pages of the Review. More significant even was his editorial attitude following 1888. In a final editorial for the year 1888, he served notice that, so far as the contents of the paper were concerned, there would be no change, "pointed doctrinal articles," would continue to dominate ("The 'Review' for 1889," RH, 18 December 1888, p. 792).

That he did keep his promise may be seen in the following articles, appearing in the period immediately following 1888: (1) By Smith: "How They Work It," 8 January 1889, p. 24; "Second Corinthians 3," 8 January 1889, p. 24, 15 January 1889, p. 40, 22 January 1889, p. 56, 29 January 1889, p. 72 (four editorials on the law); "The Sabbath Between," 5 February 1889, p. 89; "Antiquity of God's Law," 19 February 1889, p. 120; "Another Attack--Seventh-day Adventism 'Exposed' Again," 5 March 1889, p. 152 (stress on the ten commandments and the faith of Jesus as constituting the Adventist "creed"); "A Disappointing Text," 7 May 1889, p. 296 (against Sunday advocates); "An Explanation Wanted," 21 May 1889, (on the sabbath), p. 328; "Thoughts on the Law," (ibid.); and many more examples may be added to this list. (2) By others: John H. Waggoner, "Making an Image," 1 January 1889, p. 10; Stephen N. Haskell, "Who Has Changed--Papists or Protestants?" 1 January 1889, p. 10; M. B. Duffie, "Badges," 8 January 1889, p. 19 (on the Mark of the Beast); John O. Corliss, "A Call to Arms, in Behalf of a National Sunday Law," 8 January 1889, p. 26; etc. Add to all this D. T. Bourdeau's lengthy series on "Principles by Which to Interpret Prophecy," Nos. 1-35, 27 November 1888--24 September 1889.

It is not that the Review contained nothing on righteousness by faith during this time, for there appeared, religiously, a series of articles on the subject by Ellen G. White. See, for example, the 1889 Review for 26 March, 2 April, 16 April, 28 May, 4 June, 11 June, etc. Even Smith attempted a few of his own--"Our Righteousness," 11 June 1889, p. 376 and "Our Righteousness Again," 2 July 1889, p. 424. (Unfortunately, these revealed a deep inability either to understand or fully accept the doctrine of righteousness by faith alone.)

It is clear that Smith had no uncertainty regarding the divine mandate for the Adventist church. The proclamation of the third angel's message of Rev 14:9-11 was its primary task, a task predicted in prophecy and made necessary by history.

Here he pointed to the apostasy which occurred in the Christian church, beginning in the first century "with a defection in reference to the law of God," followed by others like the immortality of the soul, the veneration of Mary, and the exaltation of the papacy. The midnight of this original apostasy came with the supplanting of the doctrine of righteousness by faith with legalism by the "man of sin," the papacy. Thus the Reformation of the sixteenth century began with "the foundation principle" of justification by faith. But that reformation could only be "complete" when the church retraced itself "back to apostolic ground," discarding the apostate "badge of authority--its attempted change of the law."<sup>1</sup>

---

His life-long tenacity for the law and the sabbath was deeply embedded in the prophetic significance of the sanctuary. The ark in that open temple of Rev 11:19 ever stood clear in his consciousness. The time for the proclamation of the law had arrived in accordance with prophecy and there was to be no let up. That dogged purpose shows in this 1877 statement: "Cease to agitate? Never. Cease to urge the claims of God's holy law? Not while men disobey it. Let this great reform stop or go backwards? We have not so learned duty. . . . Let the agitation die away? We shall increase it. A truth of unparalleled clearness is given to us. God has a controversy with the nations. . . . He has set his hand to vindicate the claims of his law, against the corruption and presumption of the man of sin. A counterfeit sabbath soon to be made a civil test . . . the people must be enlightened on the subject." ("Let Us Alone," ST, 26 July 1877, p. 228.)

<sup>1</sup>Smith, "Origin and History of the Third Angel's Message, No. 1," p. 744.

Accordingly, Smith argued that inasmuch as the original apostasy occurred over the question of the law, "a return to the keeping of the commandments of God, as he gave them, must be the last step in the work of reform." Hence the "necessity" of the third angel's message.<sup>1</sup>

In this context, the doctrine of the sanctuary was thus perceived to be vital to an effective completion of the mission of the church. For, once established, that doctrine becomes "absolutely decisive" in regard to "all questions of duty touching our obligation to the law of God."<sup>2</sup> In the following statement Smith expressed this same thought, trying to show the relationship of the sanctuary to the sabbath:

While the sabbath can be shown to be binding by independent lines of arguments from the scriptures, the Sanctuary argument is absolutely and forever decisive on this question. Any person who is established on the subject of the Sanctuary, can never have the first shadow of doubt or misgiving on the subjects of the law and the sabbath.<sup>3</sup>

In support of this point, Smith called attention to two early Adventists, J. B. Cook and T. M. Prebble, who, after embracing the sabbath for a brief period, abandoned it. This, according to him,

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. With this concept of the church's message and mission, Smith was not willing to expend energy on what he perceived to be less urgent issues. I suggest below that it was his conception of doctrinal priority, arising from his theology of the sanctuary, which prevented him from appreciating the importance of the issue of righteousness by faith which surfaced in 1888. Durand has shown that Smith's sense of urgency also affected his response to the debate over abolition in the 1850s and on (see "Uriah Smith," pp. 86-98, especially pp. 92, 97, and 98).

<sup>2</sup> Smith, "Questions on the Sanctuary," p. 376.

<sup>3</sup> "The Sanctuary" (1887), p. 616; cf. "The Seventh-day Adventists," pp. 148, 149.

was because they failed to make the vital connection between the sabbath and the sanctuary, viewed in the light of prophecy.<sup>1</sup>

Smith's emphasis on the sanctuary, therefore, particularly the literalness of its heavenly manifestation, had as its goal the more basic purpose of attesting the perpetuity of the law and the sabbath. The stress on these two doctrines was to become more prominent in view of the judgment and the approaching parousia. This element of intensification and urgency was another goal, if also a result, of Smith's sanctuary theology, and to this we now turn our attention.

#### Concern to Preserve the Belief in an Imminent Eschaton

While it can be proved that the coming of Christ is at the door by scriptures not directly connected with this subject [the sanctuary], yet the sanctuary subject is a demonstration on that question. For if Christ is now closing up his work as priest, which is very soon to finish, it is absolutely certain that the second coming, also, is very soon to occur; inasmuch as, his priesthood being finished . . . his next move is to come for his people.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Smith, "Origin and History of the Third Angel's Message, No. 6," p. 68. As Smith perceived it, it was the subject of the sanctuary that "clinched the sabbath" with the early pioneers, and "forever linked that truth to . . . [the Advent] movement." He affirmed that no one who adopted the doctrine of the sanctuary "as brought out in connection with the third angel's message," could ever "waver on the sabbath question" (ibid.) The doctrine of the sanctuary, especially as understood against the background of Rev 11:19, indicates that the Advent movement had taken the stage "in the right time and manner to fulfill the prophecy. . . ." It gave a feeling of absolute assurance to him: "The temple is opened, and no man can shut it. The ark is seen, and no man can obscure it. The corresponding movement on earth is in progress, and no man can stop it." The Sanctuary (1877), p. 268, (cf. Looking Unto Jesus, p. 231).

This all fits in with Damsteegt's observation that the sabbath was integrated into the experience of early Adventism "through three closely related themes: (1) the restoration of all biblical principles before the Second Coming; (2) the sanctuary theology; (3) the third angel's message." Foundations, p. 138.

<sup>2</sup>Smith, "The Sanctuary," (1887), p. 616.

What has been said about the Millerites thus far confirms the view that the factor which more than any other welded them together was their belief in an imminent eschaton. The sabbatarian Adventists, who represented an off-shoot from the larger body of post-1844 Millerites, took this conviction with them. And when Smith formally became a part of their communion, he immediately saw the importance of maintaining a sense of urgency in respect to the parousia. In what follows an attempt is made to show how the ideas of a cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary and an investigative judgment are featured in his attempt to preserve that belief in an imminent eschaton.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>The use of the Old Testament sanctuary ritual for the purpose of demonstrating an imminent parousia was not an inheritance from Millerism. The Millerite understanding of the sanctuary, as we have seen, was vastly different from that held by sabbatarian Adventists. The typical Millerite expectation of an imminent eschaton, though in part related to the subject of the sanctuary, had, in fact, a radically different orientation. It was based on the understanding of the sanctuary as the church or the earth, with the latter meaning predominant. Therefore, for them, the cleansing of the sanctuary in Dan 8:14 presaged the cataclysmic end of the world at the terminus of 2300 prophetic days, which they calculated to be 1843/1844. In their case, it was the identity of the sanctuary per se, and not the nature of the ritual of the ancient tabernacle, which evoked a sense of urgency.

Like the Millerites before them, Smith together with Adventists as a whole did make use of general prophecy to support a belief in an imminent parousia (see Smith, "The New Volume," RH, 6 January 1891, p. 8; "This Generation," RH, 17 November 1891, p. 712; "Origin and History of the Third Angel's Message, No. 2," p. 760; Thoughts on Revelation, pp. 56, 183, 185, 198, 199; Daniel and Revelation, p. 474; cf. Andrews, "Thoughts on Revelation XIII and XIV," RH, 19 May 1851, pp. 81-86; James White, "This Generation," ST, 4 June 1874, p. 6).

On the basis of these and other prophetic outlines in Scripture, Smith was strengthened in his conclusion that time could not continue much longer. Only a few more details yet remained to round out the "prophetic outline" and complete the picture. The end could come, he wrote in 1897, before the close of the century ("How Long?" RH, 23 February 1897, pp. 120, 121; "Watchman, What of the Night?" RH, 31 August 1897, p. 550. [Smith's feathers were

The cleansing of the sanctuary and  
the investigative judgment

Smith based his theology of the cleansing of the sanctuary on Lev 16 which gives a description of the day of atonement ritual in Israel.<sup>1</sup> The cleansing of the earthly sanctuary became necessary, he noted, on account of the sins of Israel transferred to it in the process of the daily service ritual.<sup>2</sup> This symbolic transfer of sin to the earthly sanctuary pointed to a real transmission of the

---

ruffled when a certain Rev. M. Baxter, using what Smith regarded as invalid premises, stole his thunder. Baxter predicted that the world would end April 30, 1901. Although he ridiculed Baxter's prediction by pointing to his dismal track record, there was yet something about this latest prediction which was particularly "mischievous," in Smith's view. It came "unquestionably right on the eve of the closing time of trouble and the end of all things." In fact, as Smith saw it, "it would be nothing strange if all should be consummated long before the date" set by Baxter. But it would be unfortunate and misleading, Smith felt, if people should confuse the obviously approaching end with Baxter's "groundless theories."]

See also The Warning Voice of Time and Prophecy; The United States in the Light of Prophecy; The Marvel of Nations; Modern Spiritualism: A Subject of Prophecy and a Sign of the Times (Battle Creek and Atlanta: Review and Herald Publishing Co., 1896 & 1897); "Is the Silence in Heaven During the Cleansing of the Sanctuary?" RH, 18 December 1856, p. 52; "The Warning Voice," 17 March 1853, pp. 169, 170 (here he discussed the prophecies of Dan 2, Joel 2, Matt 24, etc.); "Signs of the Times," ST, 3 August 1876, pp. 260, 261; 10 August 1876, p. 268; 17 August 1876, p. 276; 24 August 1876, p. 284, "Signs of the Times," ST, 17 October 1878, p. 308; "The Second Coming of Christ: Is It Near? The Prophetic Periods," ST, 20 May 1875, p. 220.

Aware that a strong sense of urgency could lead to isolationism, Smith advocated basic normalcy in lifestyle while awaiting the Advent (see "Watchman, What of the Night?" RH, 28 September 1897, p. 614). However, as noted earlier, this expectation of an imminent parousia did influence his response to some important issues of the day, in particular the abolition movement of the 1850s and 1860s (see above, p. 76, n. 1).

<sup>1</sup> With Lev 16 he coupled Heb 8-10. See The 2300 Days, pp. 16-23; The Sanctuary (1877), pp. 205-13, 214-20, 245-55; Looking Unto Jesus, pp. 91-98, 118-25, 143-48; "Then Shall the Sanctuary be Cleansed," (1888), p. 168; "The Cleansing of the Sanctuary," (1855), p. 52.

<sup>2</sup> The concept of the transference of sin was important for



sins of the penitent to the heavenly sanctuary. Hence the need for its cleansing.<sup>1</sup> The agent for this cleansing is the blood of Christ.<sup>2</sup>

---

Smith. He described how the penitent sinner in the Old Testament confessed his sins with hands laid on the head of the sacrificial victim. By this act, Smith asserted, sins were symbolically "transferred first to the victim, and then through his blood to the sanctuary itself." (2300 Days, p. 16; The Sanctuary (1877), p. 204; Looking Unto Jesus, pp. 88-90; etc.) Citing scholarly corroboration for his position, Smith boldly asserted that the ceremony of hand-laying would be completely meaningless apart from the idea of the transference of sin: ". . . if nothing of this kind was intended, the whole ministration was a farce" (Looking Unto Jesus, pp. 88-90. In The Sanctuary of 1877, he cited no scholarly authorities.)

Thus, confessed sins were transmitted to the sanctuary via the sprinkled blood of the animal victim. (Note that Smith's perception of sin as an entity--see Looking Unto Jesus, p. 97--made it easy for him to conceptualize its transfer from the victim to the sanctuary.)

<sup>1</sup>The Sanctuary (1877), pp. 246, 247; The 2300 Days, pp. 21, 22. Because the defilement of the sanctuary was brought about by sin, and not by some physical agent, Smith found the prevailing notion of a physical cleansing misleading. Even in the case of the earthly sanctuary the extreme limitation of access ensured that there was no physical need for a yearly cleansing. The cleansing then was "simply a ceremony by which imputed sins were removed and borne away forever." (The 2300 Days, p. 21; The Sanctuary (1877), pp. 247, 248; Looking Unto Jesus, p. 144.)

Smith was not always comfortable with the rendition of tsâdaq in Dan 8:14 as "cleansed." To him, this tended to confuse the issue by engendering in the mind ideas of physical cleansing. This, in turn, led to quibbling "over the idea that there is anything physically impure in heaven." In fact, Smith argued, neither tsâdaq, nor katharizo (the Septuagint equivalent of tsâdaq, and the word used in Heb 9:23) convey the concept of "cleansing from physical uncleanness." Instead they signify a cleansing "from the defilement of sin," a process which can be affected only by "the blood of an offering." ("Then shall the sanctuary be cleansed," RH, 13 March 1888, p. 168).

Perhaps this is why Smith was not overly troubled when he found that of the forty-one occurrences of tsâdaq and its derivatives in the Old Testament, only once (in Dan 8:14) was it translated 'cleansed'. The prevailing renditions were 'righteous'--eleven times, 'justice' and 'justify'--twenty-eight. (See "The Sanctuary--an Objection Considered," RH, 1 November 1864, p. 180.) Smith argued that while the word 'justify' is a more accurate rendering of the Hebrew, yet "the 'justification' involved in the term must be secured by removing or cleansing from something which, so long as it remains, prevents such justification." ("Then Shall

The time of the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary was of extreme importance for him, as we saw in his strong attempts to safeguard the integrity of 1844. This date, he believed, marked the termination of the 2300 prophetic days of Dan 8:14 and the commencement of that cleansing.<sup>1</sup> While this did not signal the close of human probation,<sup>2</sup> it marked the inception of the second and final phase of Christ's priestly ministry for mankind, the investigative judgment.<sup>3</sup>

---

the Sanctuary Be Cleansed," p. 168.) In this respect, Smith saw a significant connection between tsâdaq of Dan 8:14 and katharizo of Heb 9:23, in which the author speaks of the purifying of the heavenly things by the blood of Christ. He noted that katharizo is the very word used by the septuagint to translate tsâdaq in Dan 8:14 (ibid.).

<sup>2</sup>The 2300 Days, pp. 16, 17, 22; The Sanctuary (1877), p. 249.

<sup>1</sup>See above, pp. 14, 15.

<sup>2</sup>See above, pp. 24, 25; "The Cleansing of the Sanctuary" (1855), pp. 53, 54, where he came out against those who believed that probation closes as soon as the antitypical cleansing of the sanctuary begins.

<sup>3</sup>Although Smith did not consider the term "investigative" a very happy one, he nevertheless defended its use as "best expressing the nature" of the pre-Advent activity it connoted (see Smith, "The Sanctuary" (1887), p. 616). The term was coined by James White who, ironically, had opposed the concept for many years (see White, "The Judgment," RH, 29 January 1857, p. 100 for the first use of the term. See Haddock, History of Sanctuary, pp. 91, 92, 157, 158, 167, 175-78, for a discussion of how the doctrine found acceptance in Adventism; also, Damsteegt, Foundations, pp. 165-76; B[rinsmead], 1844 ReExamined, Syllabus (Fallbrook, CA: I. H. I., 1979), pp. 63-69. This activity was thought to embrace "the examination of individual character," in which the lives of all God's professed children, living and dead, pass in "final review before the great tribunal." Unlike its typical counterpart which concerned itself with national atonement, the antitype is individualistic, for it is "as individuals [that] we must stand condemned or acquitted at the judgment bar of Christ." See "The Cleansing of the Sanctuary" (1855), p. 52. (In regard to the individualistic nature of this judgment Smith relied on texts like Dan 7:10 and Rev 20:12, 1 Pet 4:17; 1 Tim 5:24, and alluded to 2 Cor 5:10. It is not immediately clear whether these passages can sustain the burden placed upon them.)

Smith was not always consistent in his description of those who are involved in this investigation. In 1855 he indicated that the session concerned all "whose names are written in the Lamb's book of life" ("The Cleansing of the Sanctuary," p. 52). In 1877 he seemed to broaden the involvement by asserting that "every individual of every generation from the beginning of the world" comes up for review in that judgment (The Sanctuary, p. 261), a statement which seems all inclusive. In 1897, however, he qualified that last statement, asserting that the judgment involved "every individual . . . who has ever become interested in the work of Christ." (Looking Unto Jesus, p. 224; cf. "A Notable Anniversary," 1901, p. 704.) My assumption is that these statements, though apparently conflicting, were meant to convey essentially the same idea.

Smith was not unaware that there was apparently no investigative judgment, as such, in the type. But he cited "an almost infinite difference between earthly things and heavenly" as the reason for its absence. It would not have been an appropriate activity in the type since the ministering high priests were unable to read hearts. But what happened on the day of atonement was, nevertheless, in nature a work of judgment, prefiguring a "greater and more solemn work" to transpire near the close of the age. In support of this contention he pointed to Heb 10:1 which indicates that the Old Testament cultus only provided the shadow and not the true form of the heavenly realities (see Looking Unto Jesus, pp. 222-25; "A Notable Anniversary," p. 704; Smith did not use this argument in his 1877 book on the sanctuary).

He saw the logic for a "preliminary work of judgment" deeply rooted in Scripture: (1) the scriptures (1 Thess 4:10--he probably meant 1 Thess 4:16, 17; Rev 20:5) indicate that at the second Advent the saints are changed instantaneously into the immortal state, while the unrighteous are passed by until after the millennium. This, to him, suggested a prior determination of their individual standing before God, for the rapidity of their change from mortality to immortality rules out any process of evaluation of their standing at that point (The Sanctuary (1877), pp. 256, 257; Looking Unto Jesus, pp. 220, 221; "The Sanctuary," p. 616; "The Great Central Subject," p. 328). Such a prior determination must be regarded as "a work of judgment," for in the very nature of things (he cites Rev 20:12) "all awards of good or evil are a part of judgment" (Looking Unto Jesus, p. 221; The Sanctuary, 1877, p. 257; cf. "The Great Central Subject," p. 328. Smith, "The Judgment," RH, 8 June 1897, pp. 360, 361. For a good example of Smith's use of Scripture to defend the doctrine, see "About the Judgment," RH, 15 October 1901, p. 672).

(2) The term "Laodicea" (Rev 3:14) means "the judging of the people" and refers, according to Smith, to the last age of the church before the Advent. Therefore, the period of Laodicea brings to view a closing work of probation and of judgment. This is corroborated by Rev 14:6-12 which clearly describes a work of investigative judgment. Thoughts on Revelation, pp. 58, 59, 232.

This awesome activity, which Smith regarded as synonymous with the cleansing of the sanctuary,<sup>1</sup> was foreshadowed by the entrance of the high priest into the most holy place of the ancient tabernacle "bearing the breastplate of judgment." On this breastplate were written "the names of the twelve tribes of Israel."<sup>2</sup> Says Smith, this transaction was a prefiguring of "the solemn fact [that] in the great plan of salvation, a time of decision was coming for the human race; a work of atonement," whose purpose would be to acquit and cleanse the people of God "from all sin."<sup>3</sup>

---

(3) Acts 15:14 describes an aspect of the priestly work of Christ in which he gathers together a special people "for his name and kingdom. . . ." This act of gathering and consolidating a special people "involves an examination of the books" of record, which is a work of judgment (Looking Unto Jesus, p. 222).

Smith regarded the concept of an investigative judgment as a deterrent to the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. For since an investigation of every case must ensue before the conferral of immortality, it follows that the 'souls' of the righteous do not go to heaven at death (see Smith, Man's Nature and Destiny, pp. 305-07. Here by a convoluted process of reasoning, Smith managed to see the investigative judgment in Heb 9:27--"It is appointed unto man once to die, but after that the judgment").

<sup>1</sup>Ibid. Cf. The Sanctuary Service (1877), p. 258; Looking Unto Jesus, pp. 222, 224. In the last reference Smith avers that ". . . the cleansing of the sanctuary involves the examination of the records of all the deeds of our lives. It is an 'investigative' judgment."

<sup>2</sup>Smith's assertion that on the day of atonement the high priest entered the most holy place bearing the breastplate of judgment with the names of Israel upon it is not sustained by the record. According to Lev 16:4, 32, the high priest, in preparation for that solemn ritual, donned "the holy linen garments," a plain, unimposing attire. It was only after his task in the inner sanctum was complete that he enrobed in the magnificent priestly dress which included the breastplate of judgment. (Lev 16:23, 24; cf. Ex 39:1-30 which describes the two types of dress.)

<sup>3</sup>Smith, "The Cleansing of the Sanctuary," p. 52. As to duration, the investigative judgment has been in process since 1844 when the 2300 days of Dan 8:14 ended. It began, naturally, from the first generation of saints and will end with those who are alive

Though the idea of a heavenly tribunal would naturally be expected to engender fear and anxiety, Smith endeavored to foster an attitude of assurance. The judgment, paradoxically, was to be seen as a source of "hope and comfort for the church," and should be faced with full confidence in the merits of the "infinite blood of Christ."<sup>1</sup>

### An imminent eschaton

To argue that Smith used the notions of a cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary and investigative judgment to foster and maintain the belief in an imminent end of the world is not to imply a kind of mechanical manipulation of these concepts to serve that particular end. Rather, it suggests that behind all the details of his treatment of these themes, Smith was attempting, ultimately, to

---

in the end time. "Then the sealing message (Revelation 7) will have performed its work, and all antecedent questions being determined, all cases decided, everything will be ready for the coming of the Lord." (Looking Unto Jesus, p. 224. Cf. The Sanctuary, 1877, p. 261.)

I have not been able to find any discussion by Smith of the concept of vindication, as we find it in later Adventism. See, for example, Edward Heppenstall, "The Hour of God's Judgment is Come," in Doctrinal Discussions: A Compilation of Articles Originally Appearing in the Ministry, June, 1960 to July, 1960, in Answer to Walter R. Martin's Book, The Truth about Seventh-day Adventism (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., n.d.), pp. 171-86. So far as Dan 7:22 is concerned, Smith interpreted it to mean that judgment was given to the saints to exercise over others, and he tied the text to Rev 20:4 where the saints are represented as sitting in judgment. He did espouse the idea of the vindication of God, but he saw it happening through the earthly ministry of Christ: In the first place, His life refuted the charge that God's law was impossible to keep in human flesh; and secondly, His sufferings demonstrated the integrity of God's love which Satan had denied. (See Looking Unto Jesus, pp. 29-37.) However, there is nothing said about the vindication of God through the heavenly ministry of Christ.

<sup>1</sup>Thoughts on Revelation, pp. 141, 89; "A Notable Anniversary,"

draw attention to what he saw as their momentous implications. In this regard he emphasized, almost invariably, two aspects of the day of atonement ritual: the chronological factor and the chronometric factor.<sup>1</sup>

So far as the chronological dimension was concerned, Smith customarily spoke of the cleansing of the sanctuary as "the final work," as Christ's "last ministration for a fallen world."<sup>2</sup> He gleaned the idea of finality, of lastness, from the atonement day service of the Old Testament, which he often described as the closing service of the year.<sup>3</sup> Christ's ministry in the most holy

---

p. 704. It is those who have "sighted his mercy" who need to fear (Looking Unto Jesus, pp. 223, 224; The Sanctuary, 1877, pp. 260, 261).

<sup>1</sup>While "chronology" has to do with the sequence in which events occur, "chronometry" deals with the time-proportion of those sequences.

<sup>2</sup>The 2300 Days, pp. 20-23; Looking Unto Jesus, p. 134; "The Cleansing of the Sanctuary" (1855), p. 52; Smith, "The Sanctuary" (1854), p. 86; "Is the Silence in Heaven During the Cleansing of the Sanctuary?" p. 52; "The Great Central Subject," p. 328.

<sup>3</sup>See references in the preceding note. In what sense could the cleansing of the sanctuary be regarded as the closing service of the year? The ancient Jewish year, like ours, had twelve months, and the day of atonement was on the tenth day of the seventh month (Lev 16:29; 23:26). This seventh month, according to the post-exilic Jewish religious calendar, was the month of Tishri and corresponded with the first month, by the same name, of the post-exilic Jewish civil calendar. (See Horn and Wood, Chronology of Ezra 7, p. 74.) This means that in neither case could the seventh month be regarded as ending the year.

Moreover, in the listing of the Jewish feasts in Lev 23, the day of atonement was followed by the feast of tabernacles (Lev 23:26-37). If one followed the civil calendar, then atonement (cleansing of the sanctuary) would be one of the first feasts of the year. Accordingly, Jewish tradition, which regarded the day of atonement as a day of judgment, suggested that though everyone was judged on New Year's Day, he yet had nine days more before his doom was finally sealed on the day of atonement, the tenth of Tishri. (Talmud Rosh Hashanah 16a.)

place of the heavenly sanctuary, corresponding to the day-of-atonement ritual in Israel, was to be the last event in salvation-history this side of probation. The termination of that work "ends probation and closes the plan of salvation."<sup>1</sup>

It is to emphasize this momentous transaction that Smith recounted again and again, the details of the typical service. At the end of a chapter on the "Ministration of the Sanctuary in Heaven" (Looking Unto Jesus, Chapter XIV),<sup>2</sup> he says, ominously, "There are conclusions to be drawn . . . from the premises laid down, so momentous and startling that we pause a moment. . . ." This desire to heighten the interest of his readership in what he saw as the awesome implications of Christ's present ministry in the most holy place was always his deep concern. He was convinced that an investigation of that ministry would lead to "conclusions more startling than Noah's message to the antediluvians, Lot's warning to the inhabitants" of Sodom, "or our Lord's solemn admonition to the people of his day."<sup>3</sup> The events here chosen for comparison

---

In what sense then did Smith regard this service as the last of the year? A clue to what he possibly meant might be found in the fact that he conceived the day of atonement as "the chief of the annual sabbaths in the Jewish system" ("A Notable Anniversary," p. 704). This to him was the theological climax of "the complete yearly round of service in the sanctuary" after which "the work again began for another year" (Looking Unto Jesus, p. 124). The conception is perhaps excusable, provided the point is clarified to avoid confusion. (I am not aware that Smith provides such clarification.)

<sup>1</sup>"Then Shall the Sanctuary be Cleansed" (1888), p. 168.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. The Sanctuary (1877), chapter 21.

<sup>3</sup>Looking Unto Jesus, p. 148. This strong warning came in response to questions regarding the importance of the cleansing of the sanctuary and its relevance to his day.

underscore the importance Smith attached to Christ's present ministry.<sup>1</sup>

This idea of finality, of lastness, of urgency, had been emphasized by Smith from the very beginning of his work on the sanctuary, and usually came at the climax of his argument for a cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary and an investigative judgment. This tends to argue in favor of my contention that his primary objective in emphasizing these facets of the doctrine was that of keeping alive the idea of an imminent Advent. Notice how forcefully he made the point at the end of his first book on the sanctuary:

Great and momentous is that work which the world's High Priest is now consummating before the ark of God in heaven. Whether men know it or not, they have an interest there. The last great act in the plan of salvation is being accomplished; and the last messenger announcing that mercy yet lingers, is fulfilling his mission. . . . Yet a few more days will he plead his blood in the sanctuary in their behalf, ere the work is forever finished.<sup>2</sup>

Those words, "yet a few more days," bring us to the second factor emphasized by Smith in his discussion of the day of atonement ceremonies--the chronometric dimension.

Clearly, the mere fact that the day of atonement occupied the last portion of Israel's ceremonial year--at least in a manner of speaking--would not be enough to engender that sense of imminence which Smith felt desirable. Thus, he was led to heighten the sense

---

<sup>1</sup>It also tells us something of his high conception of the mission and message of the Adventists, a conception he held from the time of his conversion. (See "The Warning Voice," 31 March 1853, p. 177, where he described Adventists as "a peculiar people," heralds of God's "hour of judgment come," called to "sound th' approaching consumation" of God's plans; cf. "The Warning Voice," 28 April, p. 194.)

<sup>2</sup>The 2300 Days, p. 32 (emphasis supplied). Cf. "The Sanctuary" (1854), p. 86; The Sanctuary (1877), p. 261.



of urgency by calling attention to the chronometric relationship of the daily ministrations to the yearly in the type.

He noted the vast durational difference between the daily and yearly services. The one lasted the entire year except for one day, the other lasted for only one brief day. This led him to conclude that Christ's ministry in the most holy place would be "comparatively brief."<sup>1</sup>

The passage of time seemed to heighten rather than dampen Smith's expectation of an imminent parousia, a phenomenon which suggests that his expectation had as its basis more than the usual fulfillment of prophecy.<sup>2</sup> Such a sustained sense of urgency, it seems, derived from his theology of the sanctuary. For the chronometric ratio of daily service to yearly, the aspect of the sanctuary cultus which, in particular, fueled this sense of urgency, had within itself the potential of increasing the anticipation with every passing year. This is why Smith could use the chronometric argument fifty years after 1844 with apparently as much conviction as he did in the 1850s.<sup>3</sup> For example, in 1894 he made the following statement:

---

<sup>1</sup>"The Chronological Position of the Atonement," p. 296; cf. The Visions, p. 22. Here Smith asserted that Christ was to spend only "a very short period in the most holy place." Under his typological schema, the daily service compared with the period from the cross to 1844, while the day of atonement compared with the period from 1844 to the Advent. This time ratio suggested a comparatively shorter period for the atonement and tended to heighten the sense of urgency regarding the time of the parousia. See also "A Big Parenthesis," RH, 28 July 1891, p. 472.

<sup>2</sup>See above, p. 78, n. 1.

<sup>3</sup>For instance, see "The Cleansing of the Sanctuary" (1855), p. 54; "The Warning Voice," 4 August 1853, p. 42; The 2300 Days, p. 32.

In the type it [the atonement] occupied only an indefinite portion of one day in the year. In the antitype, though there is nothing by which to fix the exact proportion of time, it must be comparatively brief, and that auspicious day be near when . . . Christ will appear without sin . . . unto salvation, King of kings and Lord of lords. . . .<sup>1</sup>

Smith never tired of presenting this doctrine which sustained him over the years in the expectation of an imminent eschaton. It was his hope that it might bring conviction to others and lead them to look forward with him to the emergence of the great High Priest from the second apartment of the heavenly sanctuary at the conclusion of the investigative judgment and cleansing of the sanctuary.

#### Evaluation and Critique

It is clear that in addition to appreciating the importance of the doctrine of the sanctuary, in and of itself, he also saw it as a means to a more fundamental end. It became, for him, a major tool in fostering his three most basic theological concerns: (1) the salvation-historical significance of 1844; (2) the perpetuity of the decalogue and the sabbath, and (3) the belief in an imminent Second Advent. These three concerns provided the impetus for his theology of the sanctuary, and, in large measure,

---

<sup>1</sup>Smith, "The Atonement. Not made on the Cross--in Process Now," p. 70. In 1877, when "this solemn work" of investigative judgment had been in process "for nearly thirty-three years," Smith asked, gravely, "how much longer can it continue?" (The Sanctuary, p. 261). And in 1897 when he was obliged to revise the figure from 33 to "more than half a century," he seemed able to put the question with equal intensity, adding in the word of Scripture, "The great day of the Lord is near . . . and hasteth greatly." Looking Unto Jesus, p. 224. Haddock shows that in the 1890s, many Adventists believed that the investigative judgment was fast turning to the living and that the return of Christ was imminent (History of Sanctuary, p. 300).

determined the importance he attached to contemporary theological issues.

An awareness of these motivations provides a clearer insight into his theology. It shows that his sanctuary apologetics had as its primary goal the defense of what he perceived to be the foundation of Adventist faith.

In addition, however, such an awareness raises questions regarding Smith's presentation of the doctrine itself. For example, what is the possibility that the wider development of the sanctuary doctrine may have suffered from its use as an apologetic "weapon"? To what extent might the historical particularity of its development have contributed to possible theological distortions--in terms of definition, elucidation, or application? In what way did Smith's presentation serve either as an "aggravative" or as a corrective to any possible flaws inherent in the original explication of the doctrine among the earliest sabbatarian Adventists? It will be more appropriate to address some of these questions in chapter IV where the contribution of all three figures studied in this report can be considered together. Here, however, the following general observations are apropos.

Smith's appreciation of the centrality of the doctrine of the sanctuary appears to be supported by the pervasiveness of the sanctuary theme in the Old Testament and in Hebrews and the Apocalypse in the New. His role in Adventism in regard to the doctrine was that of advocate. A member of Adventism's first generation, he perceived his task as that of helping to lay a solid doctrinal

foundation. Accordingly, he endeavored to plant the doctrine of the sanctuary firmly in Scripture, and for this he should be commended. His treatment of Dan 8 and 9 represents a serious attempt to grapple with the enigma of these difficult prophetic/apocalyptic materials. The logic of his argumentation was impressive, whatever one may think about his conclusions. Moreover, he made good use of extra-biblical (historical and linguistic) sources to corroborate or substantiate the Adventist position. He played the role of an apologist well for his time.

Smith's emphasis on a two-part heavenly ministry may seem somewhat strange. But though it is possible to argue with his application of Scripture in this respect, he could not be accused of being unscriptural. For certainly his idea was eminently in keeping with the Levitical cultus and would seem to represent a reasonable extrapolation from the daily-yearly ritual pattern. However, the problem he left unsolved was that of the contextual and theological connection between Lev 16 and Dan 8:14. The assumption that the cleansing of the sanctuary referred to in Lev 16 necessarily finds a parallel in Dan 8:14, and, moreover, that both passages find their antitypical counterpart in a second round of heavenly priestly ministry, has given rise to considerable theological discussion within Adventism since Smith's time.

In at least one major way, Smith's presentation of the subject of the sanctuary probably served as a corrective to an early pioneer emphasis on a "shut door," which was seen to derive logically from the sanctuary theme. It is likely that his influence played a

strong role in ridding Adventism of this belief. Significantly, his argument was based on prophecy, rather than sentiment--on the very prophecy, moreover, which was even then assuming a larger and larger place in Adventist thinking and Adventist apologetics, namely, Rev 11:19. This was the prophecy being used more and more frequently to defend the perpetuity of the decalogue and the sabbath. Perhaps it was this prophetic base of Smith's position, rather than the empirical evidence of new conversions, which finally persuaded his fellow Adventists to back away from the "shut door" idea.

In an effort to make as vivid as possible the salvation-historical importance of 1844, Smith, in the first place, tended to exaggerate the literalness of the heavenly sanctuary. It was on account of this tendency that he found himself expounding on the mobility of God's throne and other theologically questionable themes.

In the second place, his desire to emphasize the salvation-historical importance of 1844 also led him to downplay the atonement-significance of the cross, seeing the general Protestant emphasis upon a finished atonement at the cross as a threat to the validity of 1844. In attempting to defend his position, he sometimes displayed a less than strict adherence to Old Testament typology, in spite of himself, and made use of some highly questionable exegesis.<sup>1</sup>

Smith's attitude on this question played its part in solidifying an initial Adventist resistance to the idea of atonement at

---

<sup>1</sup>See above, p. 61, n. 3.

the cross, a resistance seen as early as Crosier's historic article on the sanctuary. As will be seen in chapter III, this resistance was to form part of a major internal confrontation in the Adventist church in the mid 1950s, involving one of the figures in this investigation.

Smith's use of the sanctuary doctrine as an apologetic "weapon" was not without its problems, for in doing this he ran the risk of failing to assess independently some aspects of the sanctuary theme. For instance, he would not hear of any attempt to de-emphasize the compartmentalization of the heavenly sanctuary, for the simple reason that that idea would be potentially destructive of the theological importance of 1844.

Similarly, in seeing the sanctuary as a prophetic bulwark for the perpetuity and bindingness of the ten commandments, Smith, unfortunately, was unable to appreciate the relevance and timeliness of the vital doctrine of righteousness by faith. This was perhaps the most serious theological distortion in Smith, directly attributable to his one-sided use of the sanctuary as an apologetic weapon. Therefore, from one point of view, it is possible to see such usage as a hindrance to an objective consideration not only of certain aspects of the sanctuary doctrine itself (as was seen in the first example) but also of other important doctrines as well (as in the present example).

It has to be recognized, however, that it was precisely the understanding of the law and the sabbath in the prophetic setting of the sanctuary which enabled Smith and other Adventist pioneers to appreciate much more deeply than otherwise, their binding claims

for the present. It is conceivable that without this anchorage in the sanctuary-prophetic matrix, sabbatarian Adventism might have floundered in its developmental stage, never reaching maturity. In a similar way, the expectation of an imminent parousia, engendered by the doctrine of the sanctuary, helped to boost the morale of the early pioneers, a fact which Smith recognized and effectively utilized.

CHAPTER II  
BALLENGER'S THEOLOGY OF  
THE SANCTUARY

In Albion F. Ballenger we observe an articulation of the doctrine of the sanctuary which, at several points, stands in sharp contrast to that of Uriah Smith. This contrast, evidenced in many of the major categories, is so stark that, by itself, Ballenger's position would make interesting reading, even if presented from a purely descriptive standpoint. However, the present chapter not only describes how he articulated the doctrine of the sanctuary, it also attempts to identify the major concerns which led him to diverge so markedly from the traditional Adventist interpretation.

First, however, it presents a brief account of Ballenger's place in Adventist history and also a general overview of his sanctuary corpus.

Ballenger's Place in Adventist History

Uriah Smith was already in his sixties when Ballenger was rising into prominence within the Adventist church in the 1890s. Unlike Smith, he was part of what might be called Adventism's "second generation" which had inherited the doctrinal corpus handed down by the pioneers. In most movements or organizations, it is



usually this generation which begins the natural process of re-assessment of previously unquestioned positions, emphases, and attitudes. Already in 1888 certain elements of this group had precipitated a major reappraisal of the traditional emphasis on the role of the law (ten commandments) in Christian experience.<sup>1</sup> It was in the aftermath of this crisis (in the 1890s) that Ballenger fulfilled the major part of his ministry in the Adventist church.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain what effect the 1888 debate on righteousness by faith had on the theological emphases which became dominant in Ballenger's thinking during his later years. The little we have from his pen in the first half of the 1890s--two small pamphlets--seems to reflect, if anything, the traditional Adventist emphasis on law.<sup>2</sup>

But did these writings merely reflect the demands of his church portfolio at the time?<sup>3</sup> Or did they, indeed, indicate a

---

<sup>1</sup>See chapter I, p. 73, n. 3. .

<sup>2</sup>In 1893 Ballenger wrote the tract, Our Answer: Why Do Seventh-day Adventists Suffer Imprisonment Rather than Keep Sunday? (Battle Creek: International Religious Liberty Association). The following year he produced a 30-page pamphlet, Protestantism, True and False (Battle Creek: International Religious Liberty Association, 1894). The latter work sought to underscore Protestantism's glaring inconsistency in criticizing Roman Catholicism while holding on to the sacredness of Sunday, an idea Ballenger regarded as a legacy of the Roman Catholic Church. The title of the first work speaks for itself.

<sup>3</sup>Ballenger, in 1890, had been appointed secretary of the National Religious Liberty Association, at that time the Adventist watch group for the maintenance of separation of church and state, particularly in respect to Sunday legislation. From 1893 to 1894, he served as assistant editor of the American Sentinel, an Adventist magazine devoted to fostering and defending the principles of religious liberty in the United States, with the Sabbath-Sunday controversy again the chief focus. See SDA Ency., s.v. "Ballenger,

major personal concern of Ballenger's? It was perhaps a combination of both. The 1890s were a period of considerable ferment in the United States regarding Sunday legislation, and there was strong indication that such legislation might be imminent.<sup>1</sup> Still, one gets the impression that Ballenger's enthusiasm for the law and the Sabbath ran much deeper than the exigencies of the time. As far as can be determined, his tenacious advocacy of the binding claims of the ten commandments was sustained throughout his life and fell not a whit behind that of Uriah Smith.<sup>2</sup>

---

Albion Fox"; "National Religious Liberty Association"; "Sentinel of Christian Liberty."

<sup>1</sup>The Review and Herald gave wide coverage to the issue in the 1890s. Hardly a fortnight went by without at least one article on the subject. See, for example, "The Blair Sunday Bill in Secular Dress," editorial, 7 January 1890, pp. 8, 9; "The Breckinridge Sunday Bill for the District of Columbia," editorial, 21 January 1890, p. 40; "National Reform Convention in Cincinnati," editorial, 28 January 1890, pp. 58, 59; "Sunday Law Convention in Washington," editorial, 11 February 1890, p. 90, etc.

<sup>2</sup>See Our Answer; Protestantism, True and False; Not under Law, But under Grace (London: International Tract Society, n.d.), pp. 13, 14; Power for Witnessing (Oakland, CA: Pacific Press Publishing Assn., 1900), pp. 164, 165, 192; Forty Fatal Errors, p. 75; Proclamation of Liberty and the Unpardonable Sin (Riverside, CA: n.p., 1915), pp. 48-50, 67, 137, 142; Before Armageddon (Riverside, CA: by the author, 1918), p. 89; "Saved by Grace," GC, June 1915, p. 1.

Ballenger was a determined anti-Catholic, and he heavily faulted Protestants for observing what he regarded as the "papal Sabbath," Sunday (see his tract, Protestantism, True and False). Even when he spoke on "God's message of free salvation, 'not according to works . . .'" he inveighed against the demonic opposition to the preaching of the sabbath (see "Notes by the Way," GC, January 1917, p. [2]). In another place he emphasized that "if good works do not appear, man's claim to salvation is a fraud" ("Why Salvation Is Free," GC, February 1930, pp. 1, 12, 13. Ballenger died in 1921, and this article was evidently a reprint, although it bore no accompanying editorial note). He charged that those who "use the cross of Christ as a justification for continuing . . . to transgress any part of God's holy law . . . are in danger" of committing the unpardonable sin (Proclamation of Liberty, p. 142).

Ballenger was an evangelist, and it was primarily through his preaching, particularly his camp-meeting discourses, that he came to be known to most of his contemporary Adventists.<sup>1</sup> Unlike Smith, who perhaps partly because of a physical disability pursued a life-long editorial career, Ballenger discarded that mantle after only one year as assistant editor of The American Sentinel, preferring to return to active preaching and evangelism.<sup>2</sup>

In comparison with Smith, he was a virtual unknown and his labors in Europe<sup>3</sup> would have been uneventful were it not for the fact that, while there, he developed an independent position on the sanctuary question.<sup>4</sup> Interestingly, it is that very position that

---

Eschatologically, the keeping of the commandments was to be one of the identifying marks of God's remnant (Before Armageddon, p. 89).

It is true that Ellen G. White had found it necessary on one occasion to admonish him in regard to his proposal to keep the Sabbath question out of the American Sentinel (see White, Manuscript 59, 1905, pp. 1-3, E. G. W. Research Center, Andrews University). I think, however, that his proposal may have been, essentially, tactical, and did not at all indicate any significant softening on the question of the importance of the Sabbath.

<sup>1</sup>His inspirational preaching impressed Adventist leaders, evidently, and for a period he was invited to travel the camp-meeting circuit throughout North America. At one time, for example, Ballenger reported attending meetings in California, South Dakota, Manitoba, Texas, Arkansas, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, and Indiana. See A. F. Ballenger, "Camp-Meeting Notes," RH, 27 September 1898, p. 620. This evidently was a sample of his yearly round. See SDA Ency., s.v. "Ballenger, Albion Fox."

<sup>2</sup>See p. 11 above.

<sup>3</sup>Ballenger was transferred to Europe in 1901 according to the Missionary Worker, 14 October 1903, pp. 157, 158. Cited in Bert Haloviak, "Pioneers, Pantheists, and Progressives: A. F. Ballenger and Divergent Paths to the Sanctuary," June 1980, G.C. Archives.

<sup>4</sup>See p. 11 above. Ballenger's independent position on the sanctuary caused considerable stir in Europe (see Arthur G. Daniells to William C. White, 16 March 1905, p. 2, G. C. Archives;

has now rescued him from obscurity, making his name a not unfamiliar expression to many Adventists in the 1980s.<sup>1</sup>

### Ballenger's Sanctuary Corpus

Perhaps as a result of Ballenger's preference of the active, evangelistic life-style over the sedentary, editorial one, his literary production was not nearly as vast as that of Smith. Again, unlike Smith who pursued his interest in the subject for some fifty years (1853 until his death in 1903), Ballenger's deep interest in the sanctuary only became evident after the turn of the century, less than twenty years before his death in 1921.

He produced only two major works dealing exclusively with the subject of the sanctuary: Cast Out (1911)<sup>2</sup> and Forty Fatal Errors (1913).<sup>3</sup> Cast Out was Ballenger's first extensive written

---

Forty Fatal Errors, p. i; Minutes, SDA General Conference Committee, Birmingham, England, 14 August 1905, G. C. Archives; William A. Spicer to A. G. Daniells, 6 August 1905, Record Group 21, Outgoing Letters, book 41, p. 871, G. C. Archives.

<sup>1</sup>Perhaps the catalyst for this development was Australian-born Adventist theologian, Desmond Ford, who recently came out in favor of some of the sanctuary positions espoused by Ballenger. Faulting the Adventists for Ballenger's expulsion from their communion, Ford has maintained, basically, that the church was in error in its understanding of the significance of 1844.

Ford's position has provoked widespread reaction and comment on the part of both clergy and laity within the Adventist church. (For a transcript of Ford's lecture which provoked the new wave of interest in Ballenger's sanctuary theology, see D. Ford and E. Syme, "Investigative Judgment Forum, October 27, 1979," E. G. W. Research Center, Andrews University).

<sup>2</sup>Riverside, CA: by the author, [1911?]. See note following.

<sup>3</sup>Riverside, CA: by the author, [1913?]. The exact date of Ballenger's two books, especially Cast Out, is not easy to ascertain. On p. i of Cast Out Ballenger indicates that the time of writing (at least of the preface) was "four years" after his expulsion by the church, that is, four years after 1905. This points to 1909 as the

statement on the sanctuary question; and apart from being an explanation of the reasons for his expulsion from the Adventist ministry and membership, it also constitutes an apology for his position--an apology meant for internal consumption.<sup>1</sup>

About a year after the publication of Cast Out, Elmer E. Andross (1868-1950) came out with a rebuttal of its positions.<sup>2</sup>

---

date of the book. However, in Forty Fatal Errors, p. iii, he used the indefinite expression "after four years" in referring to the date of Cast Out. (The expression can point to 1909, 1910, or another date in this vicinity.) On the same page of Forty Fatal Errors (p. iii), he referred to a 1912 book by Elmer E. Andross (discussed below) as having been written "one year" after Cast Out. This would place the latter in 1911. Also in Forty Fatal Errors, p. iii, he spoke of his trial and expulsion as having occurred "eight years ago." Cf. *ibid*, p. 102. I have used the last two pieces of information, as being most precise, to date both Cast Out and Forty Fatal Errors. The latter I have placed at 1913 and the former at 1911. These dates must, however, be regarded as only approximate. In "Pioneers, Pantheists and Progressives," Haloviak presents some external evidence that Cast Out may have been written prior to 1911. See pp. 27, 34.

<sup>1</sup> See Cast Out, p. 77, where he makes an effort to shield Adventists should his book "fall into the hands of any of the enemies of my people." This clearly shows he was not writing for mass distribution.

<sup>2</sup> That rebuttal was in the form of a book, A More Excellent Ministry (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1912). Andross was an evangelist and administrator who, after serving in various capacities in the United States and elsewhere, was called to England, in 1899, just ahead of Ballenger. In the British Isles, Andross again served in many portfolios, including that of superintendent of the Ireland Mission of Seventh-day Adventists, succeeding Ballenger when the latter fell out of favor with the Adventist Church (see Forty Fatal Errors, p. 1; "Early Life," Ballenger obituary, GC, September-October, 1921, p. 2; SDA Ency., revised ed., s.v. "Andross, Elmer Ellsworth").

Three things should be said here about Andross' book:

(1) It was probably not officially commissioned by the Adventist church as Ballenger seemed to imply in Forty Fatal Errors, p. iii. Andross, as president of the Southern California Conference of SDA, probably took it upon himself to respond to Ballenger since the latter was then residing within his geographical boundaries. In addition, he probably felt specially qualified to respond, having

It was this which sparked Ballenger's second major work on the sanctuary, Forty Fatal Errors. Basically, this book was a reiteration and defense of the positions set forth in Cast Out. It also

---

been acquainted with the Ballenger controversy from their labors together in Europe.

(2) It was prepared in great haste and under considerable stress (see Andross to Doris E. Robinson, 15 October 1911; Andross to William C. White, 1 December 1911; Prescott to Andross, 5 December 1911, p. 1; Andross to W. C. White, 17 September 1911; Andross to Robinson, 12 October 1911, all correspondence preserved in the Heritage Room, James White Library, Andrews University).

(3) It was evidently not well received in all Adventist circles. Ballenger's observation that "some leading [Adventist] brethren had condemned Andross' book as containing more errors than 'Cast Out' which it was supposed to refute" (Forty Fatal Errors, p. iv) was probably overdrawn, but not by much. While the Pacific Press (an Adventist publishing institution in California) was favorably disposed toward Andross' manuscript, a Washington ad hoc committee (comprising W. W. Prescott, F. M. Wilcox, and C. M. Snow) expressed strong disfavor, particularly in regard to the chapter entitled "Good Things to Come." So strong was the committee's disapproval that Andross could see "no hope" of modifying his position to satisfy its members. Reacting indignantly, Andross confessed that he had "very little sympathy with the idea that everything that is published . . . must be put through a special committee at Washington" before its publication. "Residing in Washington," he observed with bitter sarcasm, did not make people "infallible in their judgment as to what constitutes orthodox teaching. . . ." (Andross to W. C. White, 12 December 1911, Heritage Room, James White Library, Andrews University.) Ballenger claimed that the manuscript for A More Excellent Ministry went through one year of "rejections and revisions" (Forty Fatal Errors, p. 2) and, given his proximity to the situation, he may well have been correct. Cf. "Extracts from a Letter," GC, October 1914, p. 5.

This probably explains the rather qualified "Foreword" by M. C. Wilcox, Signs of the Times editor. Describing Andross' work as "this modest little book," he admitted that it made "no pretention to an exhaustive study." Indeed, allowed Wilcox, the student may not in all cases accept "the interpretation, explanation, or application, of certain passages of scripture" (p. 3), a significant concession for a book written to refute alleged misinterpretation and misapplication of scripture. Perhaps the chief reason for opposition on the part of Adventist leaders to Andross' book was a certain degree of confusion over the interpretation of aspects of the sanctuary within Adventism at the time (see Bert Haloviak, "Pioneers, Pantheists, and Progressives," pp. 30, 34, 35).

sought to underscore what Ballenger perceived as contradictions and conflicts in Andross' view. He made capital from Andross' tacit admission that the expression "within the veil" (Heb 6:19, 20) did mean "within the most holy place" in heaven. As Ballenger saw it, the publication of a book containing this "admission" provided clear evidence that he and others had been unjustly expelled from the Adventist church.<sup>1</sup>

A third work by Ballenger while not directly dealing with the doctrine of the sanctuary is nevertheless of considerable importance in any effort to understand the primary motivation for his sanctuary theology. The Proclamation of Liberty and the Unpardonable Sin was published in 1915, six years before its author's death.<sup>2</sup> It probably represents the final flowering of Ballenger's

---

<sup>1</sup>See especially Forty Fatal Errors, pp. 1-7. He compared Adventist leaders to those Jewish dignitaries who ordered Stephen stoned (ibid., pp. 37, 38).

Over the years, Ballenger gave several reasons why he had been expelled by the Adventists. In Cast Out, p. i, it was "because of convictions entertained regarding the mediatorial work of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary." In Ballenger to Sister Perrine, 10 November 1912, p. [2] (Heritage Room, James White Library, Andrews University), it was for teaching that God's throne had never been located in the holy place of the heavenly sanctuary. In an article in the Gathering Call, he mentioned that it was "for the gospel of abounding grace, which is based on universal atonement" ("The Atonement: A Review of 'Signs of the Times' Articles," October 1916, p. 2).

One may say that the first two points represent a sample of the many "trees" in Ballenger's articulation of his sanctuary theology which prevented many of his church colleagues from seeing the "forest" represented in the third point. It is possible that even today many never get past these details to the deeper concerns which engendered them.

<sup>2</sup>Ballenger described this work as the "companion" book of Power for Witnessing (see Proclamation of Liberty, p. 6), and, indeed, their tone was very much alike, except for the fact that Proclamation of Liberty was much more polemical, having a strong

sanctuary theology, for in it the two basic concerns of that theology (righteousness by faith and Christian assurance) came to maturity. The work provides a ringing apologetic for complete emancipation of the entire human race through a finished atonement at the cross.<sup>1</sup>

The Gathering Call, a small monthly magazine of which Ballenger was editor for some six years (from 1914 until his death in 1921), provides additional information on his sanctuary theology. Through dozens of articles and editorials (the most important of which have been listed in the bibliography) he outlined, elaborated, and defended his position on the sanctuary question.

The amount of accessible unpublished material has been extremely meagre, and much of the information gleaned could already be found, substantially, in Ballenger's published works.<sup>2</sup> Unfortunately, the entire proceedings of the 1905 Ballenger trial has been lost.<sup>3</sup> These records should have provided more authentic, objective

---

anti-Adventist, anti-Catholic flavor (see pp. 181-86). Like Power for Witnessing, it was written for the general public (see p. 30).

<sup>1</sup>Though Proclamation of Liberty was published in 1915, it is said to have been written while Ballenger was still in Europe, that is, prior to 1905. Allegedly, the manuscript for the book "was submitted to a chosen committee and [was] rejected," a development which led Ballenger to arrange to publish it himself. "When this work was finally published he said he could now lay down his work and rest in peace. . . . His burden was gone. He had given to the world the truth which had cost him all and which was dearer to him than life" ("Early Life," GC, September-October 1921, p. 2).

<sup>2</sup>Search was made at the Heritage Room and the E. G. W. Research Center, Andrews University; the Department of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of SDA, Washington, D.C.; the Biblical Research Institute of the SDA General Conference. I also consulted the current publisher of the Gathering Call, Donald E. Mote.

<sup>3</sup>While still in its custody, these documents were classified by the G.C. Archives as Record Group 11, Outgoing Letters Book, no. 37. They included pertinent letters and other documents for the



evidence of the specific charges against Ballenger and the details of his defense. Without them, we are left only with his own account of the dimension of the issues involved.<sup>1</sup>

With this brief overview of the historical background and relevant writings of Ballenger, we will now proceed to an examination of his theology of the sanctuary.

### Ballenger's Sanctuary Theology

It is noteworthy that in the 'early' Ballenger (c. 1885-1900) there was virtually nothing in his preaching or writing to suggest a particular interest in the subject of the sanctuary. As late as 1901, a mere three years before his troubles with Adventist leaders began in earnest, his articles and reports in the Review and Herald--to which he was a fairly regular contributor--provided no significant

---

crucial period May 16, 1905 to January 1906. The explanation given by Bert A. Haloviak, an official at the Adventist Archives, for the loss of these documents was that they had been borrowed by a prominent Adventist historian (whom he would not name) and had never been returned.

<sup>1</sup>While it is not my intention to cast aspersion upon Ballenger's own statement of the case, yet one is bound to recognize that no party in a dispute is entirely objective. Cast Out, moreover, was written at least four years after the trial (see p. 1), and while it may have been based on his manuscript prepared for the trial and/or from notes taken during or shortly after the proceedings, we may be sure that no account of that episode, meant for general consumption, could be entirely free of modifications designed to enhance the merits of the author's case.

However, the concern of this chapter is not whether the Adventist church had sufficient grounds for expelling Ballenger from its membership--a judgment for which the account of the 1905 trial proceedings would be crucial. Rather, it is to seek to understand Ballenger's sanctuary theology and the concerns that inspired it. For this, any (possible) modifications or clarifications of his position may be considered facilitative.

This being so, the loss of those documents, though tragic and reprehensible, is not to be regarded as a fatal blow.

hint of an unusual interest in the topic.<sup>1</sup> His major emphasis, whether by voice or pen, was on victory over sin, the reception of the Holy Spirit, and miraculous healing.<sup>2</sup> His later writings,

---

<sup>1</sup> I have been able to locate only one instance where Ballenger alluded to the subjects of the atonement and the investigative judgment (see "Camp-Meeting Notes," RH, 11 October 1898, p. 653).

<sup>2</sup> In an article entitled "The California Camp-Meeting," (RH, 26 July 1898, p. 479), Ballenger reported on the enthusiastic reception on the part of both ministry and laity given to his sermon, "Receive Ye the Holy Ghost," at the various camp-meetings. He spoke of "deep humbling of heart, the exercise of faith for cleansing, victory over besetting sins, the fullness of the Spirit, and healing power." (Another report with the same tenor appeared in the form of "Camp-Meeting Notes," RH, 27 September 1898, pp. 620, 621.) In "Camp-Meeting Notes," RH, 15 November 1898, p. 740, he placed emphasis on miraculous healing, asserting that the minister was called to "preach the kingdom of God, and to heal the sick." Cf. "Camp-Meeting Notes," RH, 4 October 1898, p. 637, where he affirmed that "physical healing is now present truth to Seventh-day Adventists." See also his article, "Who is on the Lord's Side?" RH, 5 October 1897, p. 629.

For Ballenger's continued interest in the subject of the Holy Spirit, see "God is Weighing His People," RH, 2 April 1901, p. 217; Power for Witnessing--the entire book oozes with the theme of the Spirit, victory over sin, and Christian witnessing; "The Preaching of the Kingdom a Witness to the End," GC, February 1915, pp. 2, 3; and "Notes by the Way," GC, November 1915, p. 8.

Haloviak's attempt to demonstrate an untoward linkage between Ballenger's concept of the atonement and physical healing seems a little strained. In the exchange between Ballenger and W. W. Prescott at the former's trial (cited in Haloviak, "Pioneers, Pantheists, and Progressives," p. 26), Ballenger certainly did not infer, as Haloviak suggests, that "The benefits of the atonement included physical benefits." Also, a careful study of the context of Ballenger's reference to a case of physical healing (cited in Haloviak, *ibid.*, pp. 26, 27; Cf. Proclamation of Liberty, pp. 94, 95, 266) provides no evidence of fanaticism. Whether the healing did take place, we cannot now ascertain; but for anyone who believes in miraculous healing, Ballenger's statement was a typical description of that phenomenon. Even if it was linked to the atonement (and this is not as explicit as Haloviak inferred), that position would still, on the face of it, be theologically sound, for all the blessings we enjoy, spiritual as well as physical, may be said to derive from the benefits of Christ's atonement (see, for example, Matt 8:14-17).

however, gave every evidence of a deep interest in the subject of the sanctuary and exhibited significant divergences from the common Adventist view.

Ballenger, however, did not take issue with every aspect of the historical Adventist understanding of this doctrine. There was, for example, no significant divergence from Smith--whose position represents the historical Adventist view--on the question of the 2300-day prophecy of Dan 8:14 and its 1844-terminus.<sup>1</sup> Nor was there any basic departure in respect to the idea of a literal heavenly sanctuary. As to the importance and significance of the doctrine, his appreciation fairly matched that of Smith, so far as one can determine from the last two decades of his life (1903-1921). However, his writings demonstrate a radical process of reinterpretation in regard to other major aspects of the doctrine of the sanctuary.

In what follows, an attempt is made to show that the fundamental issues which lay at the root of his departure from traditional Adventism on this question were those of righteousness by faith and of Christian assurance, undergirded by a strong evangelistic outlook which characterized his entire life.

---

<sup>1</sup>Contrary to the claim by some, Ballenger did not abandon the significance of 1844. It is clear, as shown, that he did reinterpret the meaning of the cleansing of the sanctuary, but he did not, as G. B. Starr suggested, "set aside the message that the heavenly sanctuary was to be cleansed beginning with October . . . 1844." (See Starr's Critique of Ballenger, mimeograph, n.d., Documents, 1920s-1950s: Ballenger, A. F. and E. S. Folder, G.C. Archives; cf. D. A. Delafield, "A. F. Ballenger's Teachings on the Sanctuary," [1979?], p. 9, E. G. W. Research Center, Andrews University.) Ballenger specifically denied that his reinterpretation constituted a denial of the significance of 1844 (see Cast Out, p. 67).

This concern for righteousness by faith is far from conspicuous in most of Ballenger's writings on the sanctuary itself. It is, rather, from a careful consideration of the spirit and thrust of his works apparently unrelated to the sanctuary that one suddenly becomes alert to significant hints in regard to righteousness by faith and Christian assurance, present all the while in his explication of the sanctuary theme. Thus it can be seen that his reinterpretation of the doctrine was motivated by what he regarded as fundamental, built-in flaws in the Adventist exposition, flaws which, in his view, inevitably led the church into legalism.

This does not conflict with the conclusion that Ballenger's concern for the claims of the law was as strong as that of Uriah Smith. For the fact is that, in his case, the charge of legalism within Adventism had very little, if anything, to do with its traditional emphasis on law.<sup>1</sup> The basis of his indictment was, rather, Adventism's understanding of the doctrine of the sanctuary which, he believed, entailed a legalistic method of salvation before the cross. This is what led him to reinterpret and develop certain important aspects of that doctrine, in order to render them consistent with the principles of righteousness by faith and Christian assurance.

Three principal areas will be addressed: (1) the idea of a heavenly sanctuary ministry before the cross; (2) the concept of

---

<sup>1</sup> I have been able to find only one instance in which Ballenger juxtaposed legalism and law-keeping (see Forty Fatal Errors, pp. 13, 14): "The advocates of salvation by works, in Paul's day, attempted (as they do today), to make . . . [the] promise of God depend on man's law-keeping. They made the promise read: 'In thee and in thy seed shall all nations be blessed if they keep the law.'"

two atonements, and (3) the problem of an investigative judgment.

### The Idea of a Heavenly Sanctuary Ministry before the Cross

In accord with traditional Adventism, Ballenger continued to espouse the basic concept of a two-part heavenly ministry. Yet, he came to understand it in a way which vastly differed from the historic Adventist position. This section calls attention to his attempt to demonstrate the scriptural untenableness of the common Adventist view, briefly describes the new position he advanced, and ends with a statement as to the underlying purpose for his reinterpretation.

#### Objections to traditional view of heavenly ministry

In calling into question the scriptural validity of the standard Adventist position in regard to a heavenly priestly ministry, Ballenger made Heb 6:19, 20 his major point of departure: "Which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that within the veil; whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus, made a high priest forever after the order of Melchisedec" (KJV). This was the passage which, above all else, invalidated for him the Adventist view that Christ began His ministry in the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary in 1844. As far as he could see, it provided undeniable evidence that Christ took up His ministry in the most holy place immediately upon His ascension.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Cast Out, pp. 19, 29, 27, 32, 46, etc.; Forty Fatal Errors, p. ii, 3; Proclamation of Liberty, p. 32; Ballenger, "But How about

The crucial part of the text was the phrase "within the veil." The fact that it appears here without explanation and without qualification clearly indicates, Ballenger insisted, that it was a term very familiar to the readers of Hebrews, as unambiguous to them as the Sabbath or Pentecost. This could only mean that it had already been sufficiently explained in the Old Testament.<sup>1</sup>

Turning, then, to the Old Testament, Ballenger built his argument upon the use of the Hebrew word paroketh (veil). He pointed out that in all of its twenty-five occurrences, it always referred to the curtain dividing the holy place from the most holy and never to the outer curtain of the sanctuary. Moreover, this latter was referred to as the "door of the tabernacle" (or some modification of the same) but never as "the first veil."<sup>2</sup>

Of the twenty-five occurrences of paroketh, Ballenger drew attention to five which contain the identical copula "within the veil," pointing out that "invariably" the expression applied to "the most holy place." In addition, the six instances of the term "without the

---

the Testimonies?" GC, March 1916, pp. 2-4; Ballenger to Sister Perrine, 10 November 1912, pp. [1, 2].

<sup>1</sup>Cast Out, pp. 19, 20.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 20, 21, 27. However, one student of Ballenger has noted two cases (Lev 21:23; Num 18:7) in which the meaning of paroketh is not unequivocal. He also listed eight instances to show that the second veil was not invariably referred to as "the veil," without modification--Ex 27:21; 30:6; 35:12; 39:34; 40:21; Lev 4:6; 24:3; Num 4:5. (See William G. Johnsson, "The Significance of the Day of Atonement Allusions in the Book of Hebrews," an unpublished preliminary study prepared for the meeting of the SDA Biblical Research Institute Committee, January 17-21, 1979, pp. 4, 5.)

veil" and "before the veil" "always" signified the holy place of the tabernacle.<sup>1</sup>

Ballenger also turned to the Septuagint for support, finding that in this Greek translation of the Old Testament, the word katapetasma (veil) was never once used to refer to the first curtain, "except in the direction for making and moving of the tabernacle." However, even then, he said, it was only when the context plainly showed which curtain was being discussed.<sup>2</sup> So confident was Ballenger on this point that he could declare that "whenever the term veil appears in the Septuagint without qualification it refers to the veil separating the holy from the most holy."<sup>3</sup>

In the New Testament, the word veil (also katapetasma) occurs only in the synoptics and Hebrews.<sup>4</sup> In regard to its occurrence in

---

<sup>1</sup> Cast Out, pp. 28-30. The texts cited were: Ex 26:35; 27:20, 21; 40:22, 26; Lev 4:6, 17 (counting for two references); and Lev 24:1-3.

<sup>2</sup> Cast Out, p. 27. Ballenger contended that this was the reason why, in the book of Leviticus which deals exclusively with the provisions of the law (and not, like Exodus, with the construction and transportation of the tabernacle), the first curtain is never referred to as a veil.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., pp. 27, 28. Again, on this point, Johnsson points to a flaw in Ballenger's conclusion, by calling attention to Ex 26:37, an instance in which "the unqualified use [of katapetasma] refers to the first veil (see "Significance of the Day of Atonement Allusions," p. 6. Johnsson gave credit to L. A. Willis, a student at Andrews University in Michigan, for this insight).

<sup>4</sup> In the synoptics, it is used in connection with the death of Christ (Matt 27:50-52; Mark 15:37; Luke 23:44-45). The references in Hebrews are 6:19, 20; 9:3; and 10:20.

the former, Ballenger was confident that the reference was to the veil separating the holy place from the most holy.<sup>1</sup> And as for the passages in Hebrews, he doubted that the Holy Spirit would contradict what He had already clearly defined in other parts of Scripture.<sup>2</sup>

Thus, with little attempt to grapple with the meaning of katapetasma in Hebrews itself, he came immediately to his conclusion: "The term 'veil' when used without qualification applies invariably to the curtain between the holy and the most holy, and the term 'within the veil' applies just as invariably to the most holy place. . . ."<sup>3</sup>

So Christ, upon His ascension, went directly into the second

---

<sup>1</sup>Cast Out, pp. 30, 31.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 32.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 32. Ballenger's position was not helped by the reference in Heb 9:3 to a "second veil." This obvious departure from Old Testament usage does seem to fly in the face of his contention that the curtain forming the door of the tabernacle was "never" called a veil (ibid., pp. 21, 27).

Another consideration which led him to this nontraditionalist position involved the location of God's throne. Taking Ps 110:1 ("The Lord says to my Lord: 'sit at my right hand, till I make your enemies your footstool'") as a prophecy of the priestly ministry of Christ, he found references to its fulfillment in several New Testament passages which, in one way or another, affirmed Christ's session at the right hand of God upon His ascension. (The texts were Acts 2:34, 35; 7:55-58; Eph 1:20; Col 3:11; Heb 1:2; 1:13; 8:1; 10:12, 13; 12:2; and Rev 3:21.) Reasoning from the type, and from the writings of Ellen White, he located the throne in the second apartment of the heavenly sanctuary. Hence his conclusion that Christ went there at His ascension. (See Cast Out, pp. 3-7.)

The references to Ellen G. White were Testimonies for the Church, 9 vols. (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Publishing Assn., 1882), 8:284; and Great Controversy (1888), pp. 414, 415. Although White's concern in these pages was different from that of Ballenger, his use of her writings in support of his present argument (the location of the throne) was not unwarranted.



apartment of the heavenly sanctuary, and the cross then becomes the antitypical day of atonement.<sup>1</sup>

#### Ballenger's new interpretation

But if Christ did begin His ministry in the most holy place at His ascension, was there ever a ministry in the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary? This question was of major importance to Ballenger, and his discussion of the meaning of Heb 6:19, 20 was consciously designed to bring it to the fore. It allowed him to elucidate his concept of a heavenly ministry "from the fall . . . to the death of Christ."<sup>2</sup>

Ballenger maintained that as soon as man fell, the heavenly sanctuary became the center of human salvation. It was to it only that the attention of the penitent was directed during the first "2500 years" of human history--he means before Moses--and it would

---

<sup>1</sup>Cast Out, p. 7. Ballenger confessed that his former belief on this question did not arise from personal investigation but was simply imbibed through Adventist indoctrination (*ibid.*, p. 3). It turned out that the SDA position was "the most unscriptural . . . that could be taken," more "unreasonable and absurd" than the advocacy of Sunday sacredness (*ibid.*, pp. 7, 8).

In his response to Ballenger, Andross conceded that "within the veil" did mean the most holy place. He explained, however, that what Heb 6:19, 20 described was a ceremony of dedication. Christ, he said, entered the most holy place "and with His own blood performed the services of consecration." (Andross based his position on the story of the dedication of the Old Testament tabernacle in Ex 40:9; 30:26-28.) Immediately following the dedication service, Christ returned to the holy place to commence the first part of his ministry there. (More Excellent Ministry, pp. 52, 53; see also pp. 42-51.)

<sup>2</sup>Cast Out, pp. 35ff. These ideas evidently formed a part of Ballenger's presentation at the 1905 trial (see his "Nine Theses," in Cast Out, pp. 98-102).

have remained unrivaled till the cross had it not been eclipsed in the mind of the Israelites during their bondage experience in Egypt. This eclipse necessitated an earthly counterpart which, however, was only to serve as a reminder of the heavenly sanctuary service right then in progress.<sup>1</sup>

Serving as ministers in this first apartment ministry in the heavenly sanctuary were, first, the angels.<sup>2</sup> These angel-priests offered before the heavenly throne the prayers of the penitent, represented on earth by the sacrificial blood and, in turn, received "the prayed-for pardon" on behalf of the penitent.<sup>3</sup> The Levitical

---

<sup>1</sup>Forty Fatal Errors, pp. 81-82, 84-85. Referring to the dedication in Solomon's time, he called attention to the king's prayer (1 Kgs 8:22ff.; 2 Chr 6:12ff.) which, he maintained, was directed to the heavenly sanctuary. The king knew, he said, that "the real sanctuary service on behalf of sinning men was at that very time going on in heaven" (Cast Out, p. 36).

<sup>2</sup>Cast Out, pp. 39, 40; Forty Fatal Errors, pp. 28, 29, 76. One of the scriptural passages used in support of this idea was Isa 6:1-7 which records the prophet's temple vision in which an angel touched him. As Ballenger saw it, the passage shows that "ministering angels were present to minister pardon from the sanctuary to the sinner" (ibid., p. 39). Also, he saw in Heb 1:14 ("Are they not all ministering spirits . . .") and in Rev 8:3, 4 (the angel with a censer) evidence of "a priestly work in the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary carried on before the cross" (ibid., p. 87; Forty Fatal Errors, p. 77; cf. ibid., pp. 90, 102).

<sup>3</sup>Cast Out, pp. 40, 43, 88; Forty Fatal Errors, p. 78. It should be noted that in Ballenger's theology the blood of the ordinary (daily) sacrifice did not represent the blood of Christ, but rather "the sinner's confession of sin and prayer for pardon through faith in the blood of Christ." It bore the same relationship to the death of Christ as the bread and wine of the Lord's supper today (Cast Out, pp. 41, 42. Emphasis supplied).

Ballenger displayed inconsistency regarding the symbolism of sacrificial blood. In spite of the above, he did make the following statements: ". . . the blood of all the sacrifices from Abel onward, was a type of the blood of Christ" (Forty Fatal Errors, p. 81); ". . . the blood of all the victims used in the people's worship did represent the blood of Christ to be shed on calvary, and in that sense did represent the 'good things to come'" (ibid.,

priesthood, introduced "2500 years" after the fall, became a type of these angel-priests and brought about a kind of double mediation.<sup>1</sup>

In addition to these angel-priests, Melchisedec also served in the heavenly sanctuary. Though neither his function nor his relationship to these angel-priests was ever precisely defined, one would assume that, in Ballenger's mind, he was a kind of chief priest,<sup>2</sup> his priesthood extending even to the present time.<sup>3</sup> It is to be noted that according to this scheme, the Levitical priesthood was a type, not of Christ's, but of the Melchisedec and angelic priesthood. Also, according to his system,

---

p. 88); the sacrificial blood stood for the "blood" or "death" of the sinner (Cast Out, p. 62).

<sup>1</sup>That is to say, man then needed to approach God through the angels, by way of the priests (Forty Fatal Errors, pp. 82, 102). Ballenger taught that even in the Christian dispensation, the worshipper must approach the throne through the angels: "Now that the shadowy middle-men [the Levitical priests] have been abolished, we sustain the same relation to the throne that Abraham did before the middlemen were imposed. Once more it is the worshipper, the ministering angels, and the throne" (ibid., pp. 83, 77). This is truly a startling concept, and one is led to wonder how Ballenger could hold it in the face of the declaration of 1 Tim 2:5 which makes Christ the "one mediator between God and men. . . ." Also, did not the author of Hebrews (4:16) invite the penitent to "draw near to the throne of grace" with "confidence," implying free access, with all barriers broken down?

<sup>2</sup>Ballenger on at least one occasion expressed the idea that Adventist theology had made no room for an "advocate," "intercessor," or "intervening priest" from the fall to the cross (Cast Out, pp. 53, 54). The use of the singular number suggests that in a very important sense, he placed ultimate responsibility for that ministry in a single individual. So that, although he never directly attributed the role of "mediator" or "intercessor" to Melchisedec, it is apparent that he considered him far superior to the angels (see, ibid., pp. 83-85).

<sup>3</sup>Ibid. Ballenger did not elaborate on the relationship of the contemporary Melchisedec priesthood to that of Christ.

Christ never ministers in the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary.<sup>1</sup> Thus he summarizes his reinterpretation of the meaning of the two-part ministry in the Old Testament cultus: "The ministry in the first apartment during the year was a type of the ministry in the heavenly sanctuary until the cross, and the ministry in the second apartment was a type of the ministry of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary from the cross onward."<sup>2</sup>

Ballenger considered his reason for this radical reinterpretation an important one, and to this we now turn.

#### Motive for reinterpretation

The extensive treatment it received in his two major works on the sanctuary shows the importance to Ballenger of the notion of a pre-cross heavenly sanctuary ministry. Of the twelve chapters of Cast Out, five treat this theme at great length, while seventy-four of the 118 pages of Forty Fatal Errors are devoted to its elaboration.<sup>3</sup> What, then, was the underlying motive for his reinterpretation of the traditional Adventist position? Ballenger has provided his own answer.

After concluding the arguments for his position in Cast Out, he turned to "some fragmentary thoughts," a sort of reflection

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., pp. 45, 100; Forty Fatal Errors, p. 90.

<sup>2</sup> Cast Out, p. 54.

<sup>3</sup> Cast Out, chaps. 4, 5, 8, 9, and 10; Forty Fatal Errors, pp. 24-97. Notice how this theme dominates Cast Out, pp. 98, 99. Pages 98-101 contain, essentially, the "nine theses" of Ballenger, presented at his 1905 trial ("The Nine Theses," Record Group 11, Presidential: Documents, Reports, Narrative, 1901-1950 folder, G. C. Archives). This suggests that this aspect of Ballenger's theology had been emphasized from the beginning.

on what had gone before.<sup>1</sup> It is these "fragmentary thoughts" which provide the first hard evidence of his basic motivation.<sup>2</sup> Referring back to the arguments he had set forth, he commented:

Consequently we are driven to one of two conclusions: either men were saved by their own merits for the first four thousand years, or else there was a priestly service connected with the heavenly sanctuary from creation to the cross. . . .<sup>3</sup>

The clear implication is that the traditional Adventist interpretation of the Levitical cultus had adopted the first alternative, namely, that "men were saved by their own merits" in the old dispensation. It fostered the error that "no pardon was ministered from the [heavenly] sanctuary" from the fall of man to the cross, and that "heaven was closed to the cries of sinners for four thousand years."<sup>4</sup> Instead of leading people to "look through the Old Testament services to the real service then being conducted in the heavenly sanctuary, it encouraged them to "look to" these ancient services as the source of their salvation.<sup>5</sup> Thus, according to Adventist doctrine, "the only throne of Grace" accessible to men

---

<sup>1</sup>See Cast Out, p. 89ff.

<sup>2</sup>Studies of Ballenger often ignore these "fragmentary thoughts," perhaps because of their title. For example, D. A. Delafield, in "A. F. Ballenger Teachings on the Sanctuary," pp. 9, 10, tried to make sense of Ballenger's idea of a heavenly sanctuary ministry prior to the cross. No wonder he was forced to "resort to a distortion of . . . [his] own mind to try to grasp the significance of Ballenger's interpretation of the type and antitype," an exercise which still left him in "some confusion."

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 90.

<sup>4</sup>Forty Fatal Errors, pp. I, II, III [sic], 23, 36, 39, 40, 44, etc. Cast Out, pp. 36, 53, 54, 94. Cf. ibid., pp. 98-101.

<sup>5</sup>Forty Fatal Errors, pp. 44, 45. Reacting to this earth-centered Adventist emphasis (as he perceived it), Ballenger, on a few occasions came close to denegrating the earthly sanctuary. See Cast Out, p. 94; Forty Fatal Errors, p. 40.

from Moses to the Cross was "a 1½ by 2½ golden plated wooden box, which men carried about on two poles!"<sup>1</sup>

Accordingly, Ballenger saw the traditional Seventh-day Adventist position as a "stumblingblock," focusing attention on an earthly building as the center of human salvation.<sup>2</sup> In so doing, it gave the world "no [real] priest, no [real] advocate, no [real] intercessor, to present their prayers before God" during the entire period prior to the cross.<sup>3</sup>

The foregoing leads to the conclusion that in his radical reinterpretation of the traditional Adventist position, Ballenger was attempting to restore the doctrine of righteousness by faith as the basis of salvation in both dispensations. He wanted to call attention to "the oneness that exists in the great plan of salvation, extending from the creation to the crowning."<sup>4</sup> Though this ought to have been a major plank of "present truth"--and Ballenger admitted that to a certain extent it was<sup>5</sup>--yet, he maintained, "there is still lurking in the doctrines of the denomination that which[,] logically followed, teaches that all those who

---

<sup>1</sup>Cast Out, p. 94. Asked Ballenger, disdainfully, "How could men believe that the only ministers between the most high and the human race were Aaron, Hophni and Phineas--one man and his two sons!" Cf. Forty Fatal Errors, pp. 24, 26, 27, 37, 40.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 36. Ballenger charged that Adventists, like the Jews, had transformed a "glory-deserted sanctuary," with its "stone-furnished holy of holies," into the dwelling place of God, "the only place from which pardon was ministered to sinful men!" (ibid., cf. pp. 37, 48).

<sup>3</sup>Cast Out, p. 53.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 89.

<sup>5</sup>Here Ballenger called attention to certain changes in Adventist theology since their 1888 General Conference at Minneapolis. Before that conference, he noticed, the church taught that the new

were saved before the cross were saved by their own works, without the righteousness of Christ."<sup>1</sup>

Accordingly, he offered his reinterpretation as a corrective to what he regarded as the Adventist belief "that men were saved by works before the cross and by grace afterwards."<sup>2</sup> His basic motive was to correct what he saw as a gross misconception of the gospel. He felt assured that his new interpretation of the heavenly sanctuary ministry, if accepted, would bring "a flood of light" into the path of "the waiting, praying pilgrim," leading to the finishing of the gospel commission.<sup>3</sup>

#### The Concept of Two Atonements

The concept of two atonements is perhaps the most confusing aspect of Ballenger's sanctuary theology, an area where it is easy to miss the forest for the trees. An attempt is made, however, to show that running through this entire discussion (involving the

---

covenant was operative only in the Christian dispensation. This meant that before the cross people were saved on the basis of the old covenant; "and since the Old had no power to save, then there was no salvation prior to the cross!" However, since the 1888 "agitation," "the New Covenant has been extended . . . back to creation" (Cast Out, pp. 90, 91).

Ballenger regretted, however, that although the new covenant had now been extended back to creation, "the New Covenant priesthood . . . [was] still denied the patriarchs." He contended that "there must have been a priesthood by which these blessings were ministered from the New Covenant sanctuary to sinful man," and he saw the changes brought about by the 1888 debate as providing, at least, a "foundation" for his new interpretation (*ibid.*, p. 91; emphasis supplied).

<sup>1</sup>Cast Out, p. 89.

<sup>2</sup>*Ibid.*; cf. Forty Fatal Errors, p. 88.

<sup>3</sup>Cast Out, pp. 35, 67. Ballenger believed that his new position was designed to clear the Adventist church of "errors that have impeded its progress from the beginning" (*ibid.*, p. 67).

defilement and cleansing of the sanctuary and the role of the scape-goat) was a common thread. It can be seen that the central emphasis was that which Ballenger considered the basis of righteousness by faith and Christian assurance--the finished, universal work of Christ.

Ballenger's charge that Adventists had failed to provide people in the old dispensation with a heavenly sanctuary and priesthood--discussed in the previous section--may seem purely academic. After all, Adventist theology in the nineteenth century could have had no effect on previous generations. Why, then, did he dwell so extensively upon that issue? The reason, as he expressed it, was that "the past mistake affects the present." In this way:

The ministry "before the veil" which should have been understood as in progress from creation to the cross has been applied to the time from the cross to 1844. Thus Christ has been barred from the mercy seat for more than eighteen centuries, no blood sprinkled . . . to satisfy the demands of the law.<sup>1</sup>

Ballenger's reasoning is somewhat enigmatic at this point. But his meaning becomes a little less obscure when it is known that, for him, the sprinkling of the blood upon the mercy seat was pregnant with meaning. It signified that through Christ's death, "The death of the sinner, who had broken the law [ensconced beneath the mercy seat], had taken place." Hence his rejection of the Adventist view which, as he saw it, delayed the sprinkling of Christ's blood in the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary "for eighteen hundred years."<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., p. 95.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., p. 72; Forty Fatal Errors, pp. 9-15.



This means, according to Ballenger, that for 1800 years from the cross to 1844 the life of the sinner was still demanded by the law, that in spite of the cross, death still hung over the entire human race. No one could come boldly "within the veil" for the standing of none was secure.

This condition, the logical result of the traditional Adventist position, was, as Ballenger saw it, the nemesis of righteousness by faith and Christian assurance.<sup>1</sup> Not only did it put off the atonement "until after men's probation is closed,"<sup>2</sup> it also made "the atonement for sin and sinners depend upon what man had done for God instead of what God has done for man." Ballenger is almost certainly referring here to the common Adventist association of the atonement with the investigative judgment, as we saw in Uriah Smith.<sup>3</sup> And since the outcome of the investigative judgment depends, in part at least, on man's acts, then, as Ballenger saw it, this makes the atonement "depend on what man had done for

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., pp. 9-15, 52.

<sup>2</sup> Ballenger's reference here to the close of probation should be understood against the background of what he perceived as the "logic" of the Adventist position instead of any direct belief on their part. In Forty Fatal Errors, pp. 112ff., he argued that Andross' "new invention [referring to the notions of sin-laden and sin-free blood] closes probation in 1844." In particular he was referring to Andross' statement that when the Lord's goat was offered on the day of atonement, "there were no sins to be transferred to the sanctuary," but that all sins "for which atonement was to be made were already resting there." (See More Excellent Ministry, p. 94.) As late as 1919, Ballenger still believed that Adventist teaching logically involved the close of probation in 1844 (see "The Open Door," GC, March 1919, pp. 1, 2).

<sup>3</sup> See above, p. 58, n. 1.

God," instead of vice versa. This legalistic approach to the atonement frustrates "the Grace of God . . . making the promise of none effect."<sup>1</sup>

Ballenger attempted to correct this "error" by a complete reinterpretation of the atonement, the defiling and cleansing of the sanctuary, and the role of the scapegoat.

### The "Atonement for Iniquity"

Ballenger took the position that Lev 16 described not just one but two atonements: an "atonement for iniquity" and an "atonement of judgment," separate and distinct from each other. Symbolized by the two goats, the former was made "on the mercy seat, on account of the iniquities of man," the latter "on the head of the scapegoat" who represented the devil.<sup>2</sup> The "atonement for iniquity," the process whereby the alienation between God and man was removed,<sup>3</sup> included both the death of Christ and the immediate presentation of His shed blood in the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Forty Fatal Errors, pp. 99, 100.      <sup>2</sup> Cast Out, p. 74.

<sup>3</sup> Forty Fatal Errors, pp. 99, 100.

<sup>4</sup> Cast Out, pp. 67- 72; Forty Fatal Errors, pp. 97, 99; see also "The Atonement: A Review of Signs of the Times Articles," GC, October 1916, p. 2.

Ballenger exhibited some confusion as to what actually constituted the "atonement for iniquity." On the one hand he seemed to emphasize that that atonement was totally comprehended in the event of the cross (see Forty Fatal Errors, p. 101; "A Correction," GC, March 1916, pp. 4, 5), on the other he stressed that the atonement was not complete until made "at the mercy seat within the veil" (Forty Fatal Errors, pp. 97, 99, 100; "The Atonement: A Review of Signs of the Times Articles," p. 2). This ambivalence was probably adopted in order to wage war on two fronts. He wanted to oppose the "postponement" of the atonement until 1844 as Smith had done, hence the stress on the cross. But he also wanted to emphasize, against Andross, that Christ's presentation of His blood in the

The "atonement of judgment" is equivalent to the eschatological "cleansing of the sanctuary."

This was a radical departure from the traditional Adventist view, and Ballenger meant to emphasize the fact: "I believe that the scriptures teach that the atonement was general and was accomplished as promised within the seventy weeks . . . the denomination teaches that it was limited to the saved and delayed until 1844."<sup>1</sup>

This statement is the evident key which unlocks the meaning of much of Ballenger's polemic on the subject of the "atonement for iniquity." It was the two aspects of finality and universality which engaged him in much of his treatment of this theme.

In his book, Proclamation of Liberty, which is his major work on the atonement, Ballenger made the matter of the finality of Christ's work on the cross "the central thought--the all-absorbing theme." His purpose, he said, was to "reveal something of the

---

most holy place at His ascension was not a mere "ceremony" but indeed a vital part of the atonement.

Ballenger's strong condemnation of Andross' notion of a dedication "ceremony" provides evidence that his primary concern was not that of the meaning of the expression "within the veil"--a point which Andross tacitly conceded to him anyway. He was really struggling to preserve the significance of what transpired "within the veil" at Christ's ascension. His primary concern was for a finished atonement, which, to him, was the foundation of righteousness by faith and Christian assurance (Cast Out, pp. 68, 71, 72; Forty Fatal Errors, pp. iii, 10ff., 66, 67, 80, 103, 104, 117). Against this background, it is easier to understand his reference to Andross' position as the "keystone" of the Adventist "arch of errors," and as cutting "the heart out of the glorious gospel of a finished work . . ." (Forty Fatal Errors, pp. 9, 10).

<sup>1</sup>"Notes by the Way," GC, April 1914, p. 4.

unsearchable riches of redemption declared finished" by our Lord upon the cross.<sup>1</sup>

His evangelistic outlook is clearly evident here, inextricably intertwined with his theological concerns. His emphasis on the "finished work" of Christ was for the purpose of bringing to all people the assurance "that they need wait no longer for full salvation." It was to show that, without delay, each person may take "by faith" that gift guaranteed through the work of Christ "of which He declared with His final breath, 'It is finished'."<sup>2</sup>

The same evangelistic outlook urged him to emphasize the universality of the atonement, believing that salvation by grace, which is the central theme of the gospel, had its "foundation in free and universal atonement."<sup>3</sup> Therefore, he urged the view that the entire human race has been reconciled by the death of Christ, "without their consent or knowledge," a universal reconciliation corresponding to the spectre of universal death in Adam.<sup>4</sup> In

---

<sup>1</sup> Proclamation of Liberty, p. 5; cf. *ibid.*, pp. 6, 20, 164.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 6; Forty Fatal Errors, pp. ii, 22-23, 66-67, 103-104. The idea of a finished, "once-for-all" work was, indeed, a major emphasis of Ballenger's, for which he leaned heavily on Heb 9 and 10 (see, for example, *ibid.*, pp. 17-19). For him, it was a denial of the atonement to teach, as he felt Adventists did, that Christ, since 1844, has been making "millions" of separate offerings for sin at the mercy seat ("The Atonement: A Review of 'Signs of the Times' Articles," p. 3. Cf. Forty Fatal Errors, pp. 16-19).

<sup>3</sup> "The Atonement: A Review of 'Signs of the Times' Articles," p. 3.

<sup>4</sup> "The Atonement: A Review of 'Signs of the Times' Articles," p. 2; cf. "Notes by the Way," GC, June 1916, pp. 4, 5; "Universal Atonement and the Catholic Doctrine of Indulgences," GC, June 1916, pp. 1, 2; Cast Out, pp. 76, 77.

Apparently, Ballenger had not completely thought through the implications of his concept of universal, unconditional atonement.

speaking of a universal atonement, he seemed to envision more than provisional or potential benefit. Rather, he had in mind something tangible and automatic--available to the whole human race "without condition."<sup>1</sup>

Nowhere is this more clearly seen than in his (astonishing) "pier" illustration, which demonstrates how radically he understood the universal scope of the atonement. This illustration centered around a son, who, unable to swim, was pushed off a pier by his father. Though not responsible for his own plight, the son was yet hopeless, unless he could receive outside help. In order for him to have any opportunity to make a choice for life, he must first be rescued and brought back onto the pier.<sup>2</sup>

Like that son, mankind, without its choice, has been pushed off the pier by father Adam. Through His death, Christ rescued,

---

He spoke in the same breath, for example, of "the infidels of the Roman guard" keeping watch over the tomb of Christ, not knowing "that they . . . were standing guard at the tomb of a buried world." Did that "buried world" not include those very "infidels"? Ballenger seemed to forget that they were, therefore, "infidels" no more. The fact of the matter seems to be that he was operating with a somewhat abstract concept of "world" several notches removed from reality.

<sup>1</sup>"Extracts from a Letter," GC, November 1914, p. 3. As evidence of man's benefit from the atonement, he cited passages like Rom 5:12-15; 2 Tim 1:9; Gen 22:18. Drawing support also from 1 Tim 4:10 (which indicates that God is the "savior of all men, especially of those who believe") and 1 Tim 2:6 (that Jesus "gave himself as a ransom for all"), he expressed the theological conundrum that "this salvation which has saved men before the[y] believe is what they believe before they are saved" (see *ibid.*). At any rate, his aim was to counteract the traditional Adventist view, as he understood it, that atonement was made just for "the elect few" ("The Atonement: A Review of 'Signs of the Times' Articles," p. 3; Cast Out, pp. 63-65).

<sup>2</sup>"Extracts from a Letter," GC, November 1914, pp. 2, 3; Proclamation of Liberty, pp. 62, 63.

redeemed, all men, placing them back upon the "pier." This deliverance is not salvation, however. It merely affords man the opportunity to choose his own destiny, which he could never do otherwise.<sup>1</sup> The "pier," Ballenger explained, is simply "the platform of life and innocency before the law." In placing mankind back upon it, Christ "placed them where Adam stood and where they stood in Adam before . . . [he] pushed them off into sin and death." By being placed in this pre-fall state, man can now choose whether he will "go higher into eternal life or lower into the second death."<sup>2</sup>

Thus, in Ballenger's thinking, the death of Christ was in a very real sense, "the death of the world." It "justified" all men, placing the entire human race under grace.<sup>3</sup> Calvary, he confidently asserted, cannot be revoked; the death of Christ was not "conditional." "Either he bore our sins or He did not bear them. If he

---

<sup>1</sup>"Notes by the Way," GC, April 1914, p. 4.

<sup>2</sup>("Extracts from a Letter," November 1914, pp. 2, 3, emphasis supplied; Proclamation of Liberty, pp. 62, 63; "Notes by the Way," GC, April 1914, p. 4).

Ballenger sometimes varied the illustration by using a book to replace the son. Here he would place a book on the pulpit to represent Adam "in his upright condition." He would then push the book off the pulpit to signify Adam's fall into sin, and the fall of the world in him. The book was then retrieved to signify "the redemption of the world from the ruin of Adam's fall," so that again mankind could be in a position to choose (*ibid.*).

If the suggestion that by virtue of the death of Christ all men were returned to "innocency before the law," to the place where Adam stood before he fell, is not meaningless theological language, then the problems it raises, theologically and practically, are indeed considerable as we see below.

<sup>3</sup>See Proclamation of Liberty, p. 132. Here he made the following statement: "It would be in perfect harmony with the Word of God if a crimson line were drawn across the word 'died' on all the tombstones and monuments in all the white city cemeteries of the world; and above this word were written that which in the gospel has superseded it, the words 'fallen asleep'." See also "The

bore them, they are borne, and borne forever."<sup>1</sup>

It is, therefore, clear that Ballenger's purpose in reformulating the doctrine of the atonement ("for iniquity") was that of accentuating its finality and universality. In his thinking, the enormous sense of assurance generated by this twin emphasis was indispensable for the effective preaching of the gospel. It was this "glorious gospel of a finished work"<sup>2</sup> that was to dispel the ennui that had come to settle over Adventist evangelism "for nearly seventy years."<sup>3</sup>

The defilement and cleansing  
of the heavenly sanctuary

Ballenger's reinterpretation of the defilement and cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary was, again, related to his concern to

Atonement: A Review of 'Signs of the Times' Articles," GC, October 1916, p. 3; "Extracts from a Letter," GC, October 1914, p. 4. In equating Christ's death with that of the world, Ballenger cited 2 Cor 5:14 (" . . . one died for all, therefore all died").

<sup>1</sup>Proclamation by Liberty, p. 128.

<sup>2</sup>Forty Fatal Errors, p. 9.

<sup>3</sup>Forty Fatal Errors, pp. 117, 118. Cf. chapter 11 of Cast Out. This chapter, which is a reprint of chapter 37 of Power for Witnessing, was included here to emphasize the point that, so long as Adventism continued to preach "fables," then the "confirming signs" associated with the coming of the Spirit would not be seen (see Cast Out, pp. 194, 195). The Holy Spirit, in other words, will not set His seal upon erroneous ideas which, since 1844, have plunged "the whole human race into blackness of darkness, into hopeless despair . . ." (see Forty Fatal Errors, p. 114; Cast Out, p. 67).

Just how much importance Ballenger attached to the unction of the Spirit in the preaching of the gospel may be seen in this impassioned testimony in which he reflected on an address he presented at the Ohio State Penitentiary: "Enthused by the glorious gospel of abounding grace and the sea of faces [more than 1000, by his estimate] of sinning men and women looking into mine, I was enabled by the Spirit of God to pour forth upon them that great Niagara stream

preserve the idea of a general atonement.

Contrary to the generally held Adventist belief that the sanctuary was defiled by the sins of the penitent conveyed in the sacrificial blood,<sup>1</sup> he took the position that defilement was caused by the simple commission of sin on the part of the whole world and had nothing to do with confession or non-confession.<sup>2</sup> In fact,

---

of saving grace which is the gift of God to the chief of sinners." ("Notes by the Way," GC, January 1914, p. [1].)

<sup>1</sup>Cast Out, pp. 41, 60, 61.

<sup>2</sup>Cast Out, pp. 58, 59; cf. Forty Fatal Errors, pp. 106-12; Ballenger, "Atonement in Type and Antitype: The Two Goats," GC, December 1916, p. 3; Ballenger, "Satan and the Cleansing of the Sanctuary," GC, November 1916, p. 3.

Ballenger understood the defilement of the earthly sanctuary in the light of texts like Lev 20:1-3, Num 19:20, and Lev 21:9. In Lev 20:1-3, for example, the man who offered his child to Molech was regarded as having defiled the sanctuary, while in Num 19:20, the sanctuary was defiled by the man who refused to purify himself. Evidence of this kind led him to the conclusion that the sanctuary was defiled by the sins and transgressions of Israel, and not by their confession of such misdeeds. In fact, he affirmed, the sanctuary was defiled not only "before" such confessions occurred but even if they were never made, that is to say, it was defiled by the mere commission of sin on the part of Israel. (See above references.)

Ballenger based this concept of defilement on the identification of God with Israel in the old dispensation, an identification symbolized by the presence of the sanctuary. In view of the fact that the surrounding nations had come to associate Israel with the character of its God, then whenever Israel sinned this brought reproach (defilement) upon the symbol of God's presence among them, the sanctuary (Cast Out, pp. 59, 60).

In a similar way, but on a larger scale, God, at the creation, identified Himself with the whole of humanity, which therefore became "a part of his household." Consequently, the sins of all men (and not just those of the righteous) defile the heavenly sanctuary whether or not those sins have been confessed (Cast Out, pp. 61, 62).

Furthermore, Ballenger made the point that it was the crime of a child which defiled the household, and not the child's admission and confession of wrongdoing. Confession, like punishment, belongs to the process of cleansing and not defilement. This is why the shedding of the murderer's blood, a form of national confession, cleansed the land, while the shedding of blood by the murderer defiled it (Cast Out, pp. 60, 61). This meant that the



even the sins of the devil are involved in the defilement of the sanctuary.<sup>1</sup>

Therefore, when Christ sprinkled his blood upon the mercy seat of the heavenly sanctuary, it was to atone for the sins of the whole world. And since the sprinkled blood was evidence that the demand of the law for the death of the sinner had been met,<sup>2</sup> it followed that when Christ, at His ascension, sprinkled His blood onto the mercy seat, He thereby cleansed the sanctuary of

---

blood of the sinner--as well as that of his substitute--cleansed rather than defiled (ibid., p. 61). Thus the blood of Christ is always represented in scripture as cleansing rather than defiling. He cited, among others, Rev 1:5--Christ "washed us from our sins in his own blood"; and 1 John 1:7--"The blood of Jesus . . . cleanseth us from all sin." He also cited Heb 9:13, 14, 22.

This was a significant departure from the standard Adventist view that it was confessed sins, transmitted in the sacrificial blood, which defiled the sanctuary. Ballenger argued that the blood of the penitent represented the penitent's death in which, according to Rom 6:7, "sin cannot inhere" (Cast Out, p. 62). He ridiculed the idea that the altar, which in the first place had been defiled by sin-laden blood, should be cleansed "by the sprinkling of more sin-laden blood" (ibid.).

<sup>1</sup>"Satan and the Cleansing of the Sanctuary," p. 3; "Atonement in Type and Antitype: The Two Goats," p. 3.

<sup>2</sup>Cast Out, pp. 58-62; "Notes by the Way," GC, April 1914, p. 4. In the latter reference, Ballenger referred to Lev 16:33 which indicates that atonement was made "for all the people." From this he reasoned that the antitypical atonement was made for all mankind.

The argument is not persuasive, however, for the expression "all the people" in Lev 16:33 is qualified by the words, "of the congregation." Therefore, if one is to come to Ballenger's conclusion, one must first accept his premise that all mankind constitutes God's people in that special sense in which Israel was. This, however, would seem to violate the general emphasis of both the Old and New Testaments upon a special people of God. (See, for example, Ex 19:4-6; Judg 5:11, 13; Deut 4:20; 7:6; Isa 48:20; Mal 3:17; Rom 11:1-2; Titus 2:14; Heb 11:25; 1 Pe 2:9-10.) Neither the New Testament nor the Old knows of Ballenger's concept of God's household as the entire human race. Ballenger's concern to establish the concept of atonement for all is praiseworthy, but his argumentation in its favor is not always commendable.

the sins of men.<sup>1</sup> The debt was fully paid, and man only needed to accept his new status.<sup>2</sup> It is clear that this interpretation was designed to foster the concept of Christian assurance.

But if the sins of all men were cancelled, obliterated, cleansed from the sanctuary by the death of Christ, what, then, was the meaning of the cleansing of the sanctuary referred to in Dan 8:14? Ballenger addressed himself to this question by postulating the idea of a dual responsibility for sin. Every sin involves "two sinners," he said; an "instigator" (Satan) and an "agent" (man). The "atonement for iniquity" made at the cross obliterated the guilt of man only and did not affect that of the instigator, which is unpardonable. However, the guilt of man, though atoned for, continued on record in the heavenly sanctuary, charged not to man's account but to Satan's.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Ballenger maintained that the sprinkled blood of Christ "cleanses from the [heavenly] sanctuary the defiling disgrace heaped upon it by the sinning of the sinners" ("Atonement in Type and Antitype: The Two Goats," pp. 3, 4; cf. Cast Out, p. 74). Since he also taught that the cleansing of the sanctuary spoken of in Dan 8:14 took place in 1844 (as will presently be shown), then we may conclude that there were two cleansings of the heavenly sanctuary.

A short time before making the above statement, however, Ballenger had denied that the sanctuary was ever cleansed by the sprinkling of blood in the most holy place. He maintained that the cleansing of the sanctuary occurred only when "the sins which had defiled . . . [it] were confessed over the head of the scapegoat, a symbol of Satan . . ." ("The Atonement: A Review of 'Signs of the Times' Articles," p. 2).

<sup>2</sup>This is the basic message of both Power for Witnessing and its "companion" Proclamation of Liberty.

<sup>3</sup>Cast Out, pp. 73-75; "Satan and the Cleansing of the Sanctuary," p. 3; "Atonement in Type and Antitype: The Two Goats," p. 2. It might be noted here that traditional Seventh-day Adventists also espoused the concept of dual responsibility for sin, but that they did not make as radical a dichotomy as Ballenger made. In their teachings, for example, the sins in the sanctuary, though

The work begun in 1844 is symbolized by the scapegoat ceremony in the Old Testament cultus on the day of atonement. In that ceremony, the sins lodged in the sanctuary were confessed over the head of the scapegoat, the typological "instigator." This was the "atonement of judgment," and its antitypical counterpart was the event which commenced (or took place)<sup>1</sup> in 1844. Its purpose was to bring down judgment upon "the head of the scapegoat."<sup>2</sup> As in the type, he will bear away the sins of men (really his own) from the sanctuary, thereby cleansing it. It is this cleansing that is referred to in Dan 8:14.<sup>3</sup>

---

forgiven, were not regarded as Satan's until placed upon him at the end of the investigative judgment. (See, for example, Smith, The Sanctuary, 1877, pp. 324-27; Looking Unto Jesus, pp. 268-72; "The Scape-goat," RH, 27 November 1856, p. 28.)

<sup>1</sup>Ballenger never clearly explained whether this event took place in 1844 in a punctiliar sense, or whether 1844 was merely the time when it commenced. Nor did he explain the need for an extended period of time since 1844 if, indeed, the cases of human beings are not involved. With the fate of the devil only at stake, delay could hardly be justified.

<sup>2</sup>Cast Out, pp. 76, 77; "Atonement in Type and Antitype: The Two Goats," p. 2. Said Ballenger in the first reference: ". . . there comes a time when the original offender must be dealt with; there comes a time when the judgment begins, when the cleansing of the sanctuary must begin, when the judgment is set, and the books are opened, when the cases of men are investigated."

Ballenger cited two Old Testament examples of an "atonement of judgment." Achan's was one such case (Josh 7), his death assuaging the fierce anger of the Lord. Phineas' swift action at Baal-peor (Num 25:12, 13) resulting in an end of a judgment plague on Israel was another example. In both cases, the camp was cleansed, as it were, by judgment (see Cast Out, p. 74).

<sup>3</sup>Thus in Ballenger's system, Satan plays a vital role in the cleansing of the sanctuary, for it was this bearing away of sin on his part which accomplished the cleansing ("Satan and the Cleansing of the Sanctuary," p. 3; "Atonement in Type and Antitype: The Two Goats," p. 3). Ballenger, however, denied having ever taught that the sanctuary was cleansed by the death of Satan at the close of the millennium ("Satan and the Cleansing of the Sanctuary," pp. 2, 3).

This new interpretation stays clear of any human involvement. The transaction of cleansing the sanctuary is designed to give to the archfiend his just deserts. Therefore, the only one who needs to fear is the devil himself. The sins of men having already been cancelled by the death of Christ, men can afford to face the cleansing of the sanctuary without anxiety.

This interpretation again reflects Ballenger's concern for righteousness by faith and Christian assurance.

#### The Role of the Scapegoat (Azazel)

Again, on the question of the role of the scapegoat, Ballenger believed himself to be in sharp contrast with the traditional Adventist view.<sup>1</sup> His first major work on the sanctuary

---

<sup>1</sup>The basic traditional Adventist view on the scapegoat, taken from the writings of Uriah Smith, may be summarized as follows: The scapegoat symbolized not Christ but Satan ("The Scapegoat," RH 27 November 1856, p. 28; The Sanctuary, 1877, pp. 306ff.; Looking Unto Jesus, pp. 258-59; "Satan as the Scapegoat," RH, 3 July 1883, p. 424; cf. Cast Out, p. 81). Its role on the day of atonement was to serve as a receptacle for the sins of the people from the hands of the high priest. Its task was to carry these sins into forgetfulness ("The Scapegoat," p. 29). It neither made nor assisted in making the atonement; rather, the priest was to "make atonement with him." This meant that upon him was heaped the "foul load" of Israel's iniquity, so that with it, he could be banished forever into the dreary waste (Looking Unto Jesus, pp. 265, 266).

The Adventist position gave the scapegoat no part in the accomplishment of the atonement: ". . . as the antitype, Satan has nothing to do of himself in making the atonement. He has no share in the work; but our High Priest has something to do with him in carrying out the result of his work, by making him bear away the sins which have been taken from the sanctuary, that he may perish with them, and thus a final disposition be made of both them and him. . . . The atonement is all made, and every case decided before Satan comes into the program" (ibid., p. 266; cf. "The Scapegoat," p. 29).

In spite of the above, Ballenger (as is shown below) was able to find statements in Smith (and in other Adventist writers) which seemed to imply that Satan was in some sense man's savior.

included a strong critique of the historical position, as represented in Uriah Smith.<sup>1</sup> Basically, Ballenger saw the traditional interpretation as a denigration of the provisions of the "atonement for iniquity." To him, this interpretation was a scheme devised by the devil to obscure the true meaning of the cross.<sup>2</sup>

What seemed most irksome to him was a statement by Smith to the effect that Christ's death on the cross merely provided a means "through which sin, with its guilt, may be removed from us and transferred to some other party." Through this transaction, Smith asserted, "we can be saved" while sin meets "its just deserts in some other quarter."<sup>3</sup> As Ballenger saw it, this was tantamount to saying that Christ did "not suffer all the punishment" for the sins of the saved, but that it will be necessary for Satan finally to suffer the punishment they would have borne, if lost, making the devil their "real substitute and sin bearer in the place of Jesus Christ."<sup>4</sup> Ballenger argued that this concept of the role of Azazel,

---

<sup>1</sup> See Cast Out, pp. 77-82.

<sup>2</sup> "The Atonement: A Review of 'Signs of the Times' Articles," p. 3.

<sup>3</sup> Looking Unto Jesus, p. 268 (cited in Cast Out, p. 79). Ballenger discovered similar sentiments in the Bible Students' Library. (The series of pamphlets bearing this title was written by several Adventist authors between 1889 and 1915. Published by Pacific Press Publishing Association, Oakland, California, the pamphlets covered a variety of doctrinal positions held by SDAs.) Here Ballenger referred, in particular, to the one entitled, The Judgment: Its Events and Their Order (Oakland, CA: Pacific Press, 1890). The author of the piece affirmed that Satan will eventually bear "the full punishment" for the sins of the righteous (ibid., p. 81, cited in Cast Out, p. 80). How, Ballenger questioned, could Christ and Satan both bear "the full punishment" for the sins of the righteous? Therefore, if Satan was described as bearing it, then, by implication, Christ did not.

<sup>4</sup> Cast Out, p. 79. Ballenger's point was that "if Satan

combined with the Adventist interpretation of the defilement and cleansing of the sanctuary, tended to place a "premium on devilry"; for it implied that the more souls the devil managed ultimately to deceive the lighter will be his punishment, since each such soul will bear his own punishment. Thus the devil is rewarded for his fiendish industry.<sup>1</sup>

Accordingly, in reinterpreting the notions of the defilement and cleansing of the sanctuary, Ballenger's major purpose was to avoid the twin problem of making Satan man's saviour on the one hand, and placing a "premium on devilry" on the other. According to his reinterpretation, atonement having already been made for all mankind, the sins remaining in the sanctuary belong to Satan only. Therefore, when, at the conclusion of the "atonement of judgment" (or cleansing of the sanctuary), the sins from the sanctuary are placed on the head of the antitypical scapegoat, it will be on account of his own responsibility as the "original offender."<sup>2</sup>

---

suffers any, or all of man's guilt, which man deserved himself to suffer, to that extent Satan becomes man's savior" (ibid., p. 77).

<sup>1</sup>Cast Out, pp. 63, 64; cf. Smith, "The Scapegoat," p. 29. Ballenger is referring here to the general Adventist belief that only confessed sins defile the sanctuary and that, therefore, the cleansing of the sanctuary involved the sins of the righteous only. Consequently, the only sins placed on Satan's head at the conclusion of the antitypical atonement would be those of the righteous alone.

On the basis of this belief, he argued, it would certainly be in the devil's interest to prevent as many as possible from confessing their sins, for thereby his own punishment is reduced; since, according to the Adventist view, the wicked bear the penalty of their own sin. This Ballenger regarded as placing a premium on devilry. It ensures a reward to him for diligence and industry.

<sup>2</sup>Cast Out, pp. 75, 76. A careful examination of Ballenger's position shows him remarkably close to Smith, at least in regard to one side of the issue. He could have succeeded in putting significant distance between himself and the Adventist position if he

In understanding it this way, Ballenger thought that he had come up with an explanation of the role of Azazel which did not eclipse Calvary.

Though Ballenger's discourse on the "atonement for iniquity," the "atonement of judgment," and the scapegoat may appear as a jumbled mass of ideas thrown together, it is quite evident that there was an underlying purpose. He sought, by emphasizing the finality

---

had been able to state, categorically--in keeping with the logic of his position--that in consequence of the "atonement of iniquity," man's side of the responsibility for sin had been obliterated completely and that only Satan's remained. However, he seemed unable to rid himself of the belief that "man's sin still remained on the books of record in the heavenly sanctuary." Though he tried to show that these "sins of men" were now charged against their "instigator," nevertheless, they were still described as the "sins of men." (See Cast Out, p. 79. Emphasis supplied.) He even spoke of Christ who, "in fulfillment of the type," will finally confess over the scapegoat "all the sins of the world" ("Atonement in Type and Antitype: The Two Goats," p. 2). He seemed unable to state, categorically, that the sins now recorded in the sanctuary belong to Satan, ipso jure.

So while Ballenger could not be charged with placing a "premium on deviltry," it is open to question as to what degree he succeeded in avoiding the other pitfall--that of seeming to make Satan man's sinbearer. It is of interest, moreover, that, notwithstanding his fear that too much salvatory importance be attributed to the scapegoat, he managed himself to make some startling statements in this regard.

For example, he contended that the scapegoat had "a part with the Lord's goat in the sin-offering which was made on the day of atonement." Again, since the scapegoat was "a type of Satan, it follows that we are bound to conclude that Satan will be offered as a 'sin-offering,' and that 'atonement' will be made with him . . ." ("Satan and the Cleansing of the Sanctuary," p. 3). Ballenger did explain what he meant by the expression "making atonement with the scapegoat (or Satan)." It signified the act by which Christ would roll back upon the head of Satan "the defiling, dishonoring sins with which he has defiled and disgraced the throne of the universe" ("Atonement in Type and Antitype: The Two Goats," p. 3). However, one is unable to find what the offering of Satan "as a sin-offering" might entail.

Ballenger did make a serious effort to grapple with the complicated role of the scapegoat (azazel), but he left the issue as intractable as he found it. Moreover, in trying to plug what he felt were major loopholes in the general Adventist position, he may have opened up some loopholes of his own.

and universal efficacy of the act of the cross, to call fresh attention to the doctrine of righteousness by faith and Christian assurance.

Moreover, his reinterpretation of the defilement and cleansing of the sanctuary and the role of the scapegoat cleared the way for his eventual rejection of the notion of an investigative judgment. For him, that concept represented a total eclipse of the provisions of a finished atonement, a subversion of the principles of righteousness by faith, and a complete erosion of Christian assurance.

Let us briefly examine his approach to this cardinal tenet of Adventist sanctuary theology.

#### The Investigative Judgment

As noted at the beginning of this chapter, Ballenger, in the first years of his ministry, maintained an almost total silence on the subject of the sanctuary. The one instance in which he made passing reference to it, had to do with the investigative judgment. Using a common Adventist synonym for investigative judgment, and betraying a bent towards the notion of sinless perfection, prevalent in his early teachings,<sup>1</sup> Ballenger wrote: "We are now in the

---

<sup>1</sup>This was the undergirding motif of his emphasis on the reception of the Holy Spirit: "We cannot have apostolic power in the church until we have apostolic purity." All the Achans, Judases, and Ananiases must be eliminated. "First a Holy Church[,] then the Holy Ghost," ST, 15 November 1899, p. 738. Cf. "Victory," The Daily Bulletin (General Conference of SDA), 1899, p. 96: "Righteousness by faith was given us of God to stop our sinning. Let no man say he has received righteousness by faith until he has stopped sinning." (Emphasis his.) See also Power for Witnessing, passim.



antitypical day of atonement; and if our cases are reached while sin smolders in the heart, we are lost."<sup>1</sup>

I suspect that it was this understanding of the investigative judgment which led him to rethink completely his position on the sanctuary question. And it is not without significance that while he radically reinterpreted many facets of the doctrine, the investigative judgment was the only one which he eventually totally repudiated.

This repudiation did not occur suddenly. First, of course, he merely avoided discussion of the subject, as he did in regard to the rest of the sanctuary themes. But even when he turned his attention to the sanctuary, the idea of an investigative judgment remained largely in the background, as if to indicate that the matter had not yet been resolved. For example, there is only one oblique reference to it in his first book on the sanctuary, and there, interestingly enough, he seemed still to be advocating it: ". . . there comes a time when the judgment begins, when the cleansing of the sanctuary must begin, when the judgment is set, and the books are opened, when the cases of men are investigated. . . ." <sup>2</sup>

But even here, one already senses an effort to preserve the idea of Christian assurance. This investigation, he emphasized, was "not to see whether Christ made an atonement for" men, for that had already been secured at the cross. Its purpose was, rather, to determine "who have and who have not accepted" the reconciliation

---

<sup>1</sup>"Camp-Meeting Notes," RH, 11 October 1898, p. 653.

<sup>2</sup>Cast Out, pp. 76, 77.

effected at the cross. Those found to have failed to appropriate that atonement will be "cut off from among the people of God."<sup>1</sup>

The passing of the years witnessed an increasing distance between him and traditional Adventism on this point, the change perhaps reflecting a deepening appreciation, on his part, of Christ's accomplishment at the cross. By 1915, his belief that Christ's death cancelled the guilt of the whole human race<sup>2</sup> seemed to take a more radical turn:

If Christ was not put to death in the place of the sinner, if it was not the sinner's guilt under which he died, if his death was not the death of the sinner, and if his freedom through death did not set the sinner free, then his death on the cross was a meaningless tragedy.<sup>3</sup>

Seen in their proper context, these sentiments are not to be equated with the traditional evangelical attempt to extol the act of the cross. Rather, they sound a note of 'automatism'--that the death of Christ, ipso facto, cancelled the sins of all men. This universal absolution rendered the notion of an investigative judgment unnecessary.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 76, 77. (To support the concept of a universal atonement, he cited Rom 5:8-11, 18-20; 2 Cor 5:19-21; 1 John 22; Lev 16:33.)

Ballenger's position on the investigative judgment at this stage of his theological development was still basically Adventist. It is significant, however, that he did not make use of the standard scriptural passages regularly used by Adventists in support of the doctrine--such as Dan 7:9, 10; Rev 14:6-7; 20:12; 22:12; Matt 10:32, 33, etc. (See, for example, Looking Unto Jesus, pp. 200-25.) There is one passing reference (see Forty Fatal Errors, p. 74) where he admitted that Dan 7:9, 10 and Rev 20:11, 12 did picture a judgment scene.

<sup>2</sup>Cast Out, pp. 72-76.

<sup>3</sup>"The Atonement: A Review of 'Signs of the Times' Articles," p. 3; cf. Proclamation of Liberty, p. 128.

<sup>4</sup>Having described such sweeping provisions of the cross,

Accordingly, Ballenger abandoned such a judgment. Invented by Adventists as a rationale for the delay of the parousia, it carried with it a heavy freight of legalism. For instead of teaching that man's salvation was based on Christ's "universal atonement" at the cross, it taught that God must "first investigate the record of his life" before his ultimate destiny is determined. In other words, it made salvation "dependent in reality on what the sinner had done for God, instead of what God had done for the sinner."<sup>1</sup> This, Ballenger believed, was the very essence of legalism.

---

Ballenger felt it necessary to explain why some will yet be lost. He accordingly developed the theory of a "second sin." It ran as follows:

The fact that there will be "a universal resurrection" provides "positive proof" that the sins which caused "the first death" were remitted at Calvary else there could be no resurrection, for "the first sinning would hold the sinner in death." On the other hand, the fact of a "second death" points to the existence of a "second sin" ("Extracts from a Letter," October 1914, p. 5; cf. Proclamation of Liberty, p. 61).

This "second sin" was explained by Ballenger as "the wilful sinning of the sinner after he has come to a 'knowledge of the truth'," "a falling away from the fullness of gospel light," "a final choosing to continue in sin" (ibid., pp. 133, 116, 117). It represents a kind of sinning for which no sacrifice has been made, a "wilful reenactment of those sins" which Christ bore in His death (ibid., pp. 117, 162).

Ballenger took the concept of the reenactment or recommission of sin from the second commandment (Ex 20:4-6), which indicates that the sins of the fathers are visited upon the children (v. 5). This visitation is not an automatic process, he suggested, but occurs when God-hating children recommit the sins of their fathers. Jesus' terrible denunciation of the Pharisees (Matt 23:32-36) resulted from the fact that they had recommitted the sins of their fathers (ibid., pp. 160-62).

<sup>1</sup>"The Atonement: A Review of 'Signs of the Times' Articles," p. 3; cf. Forty Fatal Errors, pp. 51-53. Ballenger believed that the doctrine of "an investigation into the life record of the sinner" was responsible for many defections and expulsions from the Adventist church. "Every soul who accepts the message of salvation by grace" (which, according to him, "has its foundation in free and universal atonement") will "sooner or later be separated from the [Adventist] denomination" (ibid.).

Perhaps his strongest attack on the concept came three years before his death, in his book Before Armageddon. Here he advocated the reinterpretation of Rev 14:6, 7, one of the major prophetic passages used by Adventists to substantiate the idea of an investigative judgment.<sup>1</sup> Ballenger argued that the judgment referred to here is not "investigative" but "punitive." It harks back to chapter 6:9, 10 which records the plea of the martyrs for justice and vengeance upon their persecutors. Chapter 14:7 constituted a response to this plea, announcing the commencement of God's "destructive judgment." This, Ballenger held, was the more natural meaning of the text, since the martyrs of chapter 6 were certainly "not begging the Lord to start an investigation. . . ." <sup>2</sup>

Accordingly, Ballenger saw fit to render the phrase euaggelion aiōniōn (Rev 14:6) as "eternal good tidings" rather than "everlasting gospel," for it was this announcement which had evoked that shout of praise on the part of the inhabitants of heaven and earth (Rev 19:4-6). Their rejoicing resulted from the fact that God's punitive judgment had brought deliverance.<sup>3</sup> Thus, Rev 14:6

---

<sup>1</sup> See Before Armageddon, pp. 119-23.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., pp. 120, 121.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., pp. 121, 122. Ballenger also saw Rev 16:4-7; 17:1; and 18:6-10--passages which clearly refer to God's retributive judgment--as a response to the martyrs' plea.

According to his interpretation, this judgment would take place when a "federation" of European powers formed an alliance with the Roman Catholic church. This confederation, in league with its 'image' in the Western Hemisphere, would eventually bring persecution upon God's people. And it is in response to this final persecution that the judgment of Rev 14:7 would come. Ballenger, therefore, concluded that "the first angel's message . . . in its full and final meaning is future. . . ." (Ibid., pp. 96, 123.)

should be seen to announce "eternal good tidings" rather than an "everlasting gospel."

One hardly needs to surmise as to Ballenger's motive for this reinterpretation and retranslation. The notion of an investigative judgment, he felt, was man-centered, focusing attention on man and his good deeds. The idea of punitive, destructive judgment, on the other hand, coming in response to the plea of helpless martyrs, directed attention to God and to His sovereign intervention in behalf of His saints. The first is based on human works, the second on God's divine works. The first engenders fear, the second confidence and assurance.

We may, therefore, conclude that Ballenger eventually discarded his belief in an investigative judgment because he found it logically incompatible with the two foundational concerns of his theology--righteousness by faith and Christian assurance.

#### Analysis and Comment

This section will be developed in two parts, a retrospective assessment and an evaluation and critique.

#### Retrospective Assessment

The questions may reasonably arise as to how it was possible for Ballenger to develop such an extensive reinterpretation of the doctrine of the sanctuary during the brief period of his stay in Europe, and whether it is reasonable to expect to find basic underlying motivations for such reinterpretation. Why not rather conclude that his was an ad hoc venture aimed solely at making the doctrine of the sanctuary compatible with scripture as he understood it?

My contention is, however, that Ballenger's departure on the question of the sanctuary was not a sudden phenomenon. There is more, I think, to his initial silence on the subject than meets the eye. Certainly, such a cardinal doctrine of Adventism could not fail to exercise a rising Adventist evangelist, especially in a period when Uriah Smith's Daniel and Revelation was undergoing six editions in seven years (1881-1888),<sup>1</sup> and at a time when Smith's final work on the sanctuary, Looking Unto Jesus (1897), was perhaps generating new interest in the subject.

Notwithstanding all this, Ballenger maintained his silence on the sanctuary doctrine. He chose, instead, to emphasize victory over sin, the Holy Spirit, and miraculous healing. One suspects that his concentration on these themes, regardless of their importance or his interest in them as such, provided an inconspicuous way of avoiding the subject of the sanctuary, the traditional Adventist interpretation of which had begun to give him increasing unease. His silent years may properly be conceived, then, as a period of mulling over the implications of this doctrine, especially as traditionally understood.<sup>2</sup> The strong evangelical tendency of

---

<sup>1</sup>See chapter I, p. 22, n. 4.

<sup>2</sup>In Cast Out, p. 96, Ballenger made the following significant observation: "If there is anything that Seventh Day Adventists [sic] boast of possessing it is 'the truth'. And if there is any 'truth' in . . . [their] creed, which they glory in above another it is the doctrines [sic] of the sanctuary." Obviously, Ballenger did not discover this in 1911 or even in 1905. One suspects that he understood this all along; and that it was this Adventist sensitivity on the question of the sanctuary which, for many years, prevented him from putting forward his reservations on the subject, believing that on such a sensitive issue, silence was golden.

Perhaps unwittingly, Ballenger has himself provided an ideological connection between the silent, early Ballenger and the

his preaching in those 'silent' years, moreover, would lead one to suspect that that outlook, coupled with his evangelistic bent, exercised a strong influence on his (re)assessment of the sanctuary theme.

It is, therefore, significant that the first clear indication that he was having serious difficulty with the traditional interpretation came at the close of an evangelistic sermon in London shortly after the turn of the century, probably about 1902. He is reported to have vowed to a fellow worker, Elmer E. Andross, "never" to preach again on the subject of the sanctuary "until I know what I am preaching."<sup>1</sup>

This London experience represented the outbreak of a crisis which had been smoldering for many years, a crisis fanned by his

---

outspoken, later Ballenger through the reprint of chapter 37 of Power for Witnessing in Cast Out (see pp. 103-05). The major contention of that chapter is that God could not fully pour out His Spirit upon a church that was teaching error. The republication of the chapter in Cast Out probably shows that Ballenger was speaking not only to Protestants in general, but to Seventh-day Adventists in particular when he first penned those sentiments in 1900.

<sup>1</sup>See W. Richard Leshar, "Landmark Truth versus 'Specious Error'," RH, 6 March 1980, p. 244. It was perhaps to this experience that Ballenger referred when he spoke of the "difficulty" he encountered in his attempt to defend from Scripture certain aspects of the sanctuary before the general public (see Cast Out, p. 3). As he indicated, he then realized that his preaching had been based on "the deductions of others," rather than on any "personal investigation of the Scriptures" (ibid.).

That London experience was not the only occasion when Ballenger's attempt to present Adventist doctrine in an evangelistic setting precipitated a reassessment of his position. It occurred at least one other time while holding public meetings in Wales (about 1903/1904). There he became dissatisfied with the "traditional teaching" on the meaning of Rev 17. (See Before Armageddon, p. 3.) That reassessment, as already noted, led him to repudiate many details in the Adventist interpretation of prophecy and, eventually, the notion of an investigative judgment (see above, under "Investigative Judgment").

perception of the incompatibility of the Adventist interpretation of certain aspects of the sanctuary doctrine with the more evangelical emphases of the gospel. It may logically be concluded that the reinterpretation which followed that London experience was not simply an isolated, self-contained venture for the purpose of rendering the doctrine more compatible with scripture. Rather, from the very start, it had as its purpose the re-establishment of certain gospel fundamentals--righteousness by faith and Christian assurance--threatened, even eclipsed, by some aspects of the sanctuary doctrine as traditionally understood.

#### Evaluation and Critique

Ballenger's pariah status in Adventism should not be a deterrent to the pursuit of a rigorous evaluation of the basic elements of his theology of the sanctuary. Nor should such an assessment be construed either as a defense of, or an attack upon, the traditional Adventist view. The strength or weakness of Ballenger's position does not suggest, ipso facto, the opposite in regard to the traditional Adventist stance.

A point to note at the outset is that Ballenger was not a particularly systematic thinker, and consequently confusions and contradictions abound in his writings.<sup>1</sup> However, the approach taken by the present chapter has allowed us to look beyond these flaws to the major thrust of his arguments. Accordingly, this evaluation and critique will concern itself with some of the salient features of his sanctuary theology. I will comment on the following items:

---

<sup>1</sup>This has been noted from time to time in the chapter.



"within the veil," the relation of blood to defilement, the investigative judgment, the atonement, and the concept of a heavenly sanctuary service before the cross.

"Within the veil"

As already indicated, Ballenger's assessment of the scriptural meaning of the phrase "within the veil" does not give evidence of any significant flaw. To be sure, his case is not as airtight as he evidently thought. For example, he contended that the Septuagint never used the expression katapetasma to refer to the first veil, "except in the directions for the making and moving of the tabernacle. . . ." <sup>1</sup> What he failed to demonstrate, however, was why the latter application should not be germane to an attempt to determine the meaning of the expression in the book of Hebrews. Furthermore, if Ballenger's point is that wherever in the Pentateuch the expression is used in a ritual setting (as in Leviticus), it always refers to the second veil, then there still remains the task of determining how strictly the author of Hebrews may have complied with this principle, especially as there is some evidence that in other cases he deviated somewhat from compliance with strict Old Testament usage. <sup>2</sup> Also, Ballenger's conclusion that "whenever

---

<sup>1</sup>Cast Out, p. 27.

<sup>2</sup>In Heb 9:4 the author lists the altar of incense as a furniture of the most holy place (instead of the holy place, as it should be). Johnsson calls attention to others: In 9:19 he mentions "calves and goats" in connection with the covenant ceremony, whereas the Masoretic Text mentions "oxen" and the Septuagint has "young calves." Also, the account of this ceremony in Ex 24:3-8 indicates only that the blood was thrown on the altar and on the people, but Hebrews includes the "book" (biblion) as one of the objects sprinkled. See "Defilement and Purgation in the Book of Hebrews"

the term veil appears in the Septuagint without qualification it refers to the veil separating the holy from the most holy"<sup>1</sup> has been shown to constitute an over-statement of the case.<sup>2</sup>

However, these objections leave virtually untouched his major contentions (1) that the first curtain in Leviticus is never termed a veil in the Septuagint; (2) that in the Septuagint the expression "within the veil" always applies to the holy of holies; (3) that in the Septuagint the terms "before the veil" and "without the veil" always apply to the first apartment of the sanctuary; and (4) that the twenty-two Leviticus references to the first curtain in the Septuagint are always to "the door of the tabernacle, in distinction from the second curtain which in every instance (seven times) is referred to as the veil in such expressions as 'the veil,' 'the veil of the sanctuary,' 'within the veil' and 'outside the veil'."<sup>3</sup> Ballenger's conclusions with regard to the meaning of "the veil" and "within the veil" in the Old Testament also remain substantially intact.

Unless the author of Hebrews radically departed from this (almost) universally accepted usage, then it is clear that Ballenger is correct, and "within the veil" in Heb 6:19 does point to the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary. Though the conclusions drawn from this fact need not be exaggerated, it is clear that it does have some implications for the generally accepted Adventist view,

---

(Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1973), pp. 227-28, also p. 228, ns. 25, 26.

<sup>1</sup>Cast Out, pp. 27, 28.

<sup>2</sup>See above, p. 110, n. 3.

<sup>3</sup>Cast Out, p. 28.

first expressed by Hiram Edson, that in 1844 Christ, for the first time, entered the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary.

Relation of blood to defilement

Although some aspects of the discussion vis-à-vis the relation of blood to defilement seem futile, the matter does have some importance, if only because blood plays such a basic role in the entire cultic system.

In addressing himself to the present question, Ballenger sought to make two principal points: (1) that the sanctuary was defiled not by the sinner's confession of sin, but by his commission of sin; and (2) that the blood of the sacrifice never defiled, but "always cleansed."<sup>1</sup>

To substantiate the first point, he turned to passages like Lev 20:1-3; Num 19:20; 35:31, 33, 34, etc. It probably escaped Ballenger's attention that what these texts had in common was the fact that none, perhaps with the exception of Num 19:20, was concerned with ritual defilement. For want of a better term, one may say that they were concerned with non-ritual ideological defilement caused by brazen sins of idolatry, murder, and treason, and called for summary judgment, as the context of the passages show. And if Ballenger is correct--that the death of the murderer, for example, brings about the cleansing of the land or the sanctuary, then the cleansing of the sanctuary in Lev 16 is not primarily concerned with that type of defilement. The sanctuary cultus, as such, is concerned with ritual defilement, and it is questionable whether the

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 58-61.

passages mentioned really help in unravelling for us exactly how ritual defilement came about.

Exegetically, the difficulty for the historic Adventist position--that the sanctuary was defiled by the transfer to it of sins from the penitent via the blood of the victim--is that the Old Testament nowhere explicitly indicates the meaning of the cultic rituals. For example, the penitent's placing his hand upon the head of the sacrificial victim in the daily cultus (Lev 1:4; 3:2, 8, 12; etc.) is not explained. It is tempting to see a parallel in the atonement day ritual in which the high priest laid both hands on the head of the scapegoat while confessing the sins of Israel, an act explicitly described by the text as one of transference of sin presumably from the sanctuary to the scapegoat via the priest (Lev 16:20, 21). But the book of Leviticus nowhere connects this ritual with the laying on of hands in the daily cultus. However, two recent studies have concluded in favor of the historical Adventist view.<sup>1</sup>

Similarly, there is no biblical interpretation either of the sprinkling of the sacrificia's blood by the priest in the daily cultus (Lev 1:5, 11; 3:2, 8, etc.), or of his eating, in some cases, part of the flesh of the animal sacrifice (Lev 6:24-26; 10:16, 17).

The Adventist position is, therefore, based in large measure upon a kind of interpretative intuition, a fact which obviously does not strengthen the case. But by the same token, whatever alternative

---

<sup>1</sup>See Angel Rodriguez, "Substitution in the Hebrew Cultus and in Cultic-Related Texts," Th.D. dissertation, Andrews University, 1979, pp. 193-232, 305; Gerhard F. Hasel, "Blood and OT Sacrifice: Cleansing and Defilement by Blood," [1980], pp. 10, 18, 19, G. C. Archives.

interpretation one happens to favor, the same difficulty arises: the silence of the Old Testament text.

Therefore, inasmuch as the passages cited by Ballenger are almost all in a non-ritual setting, and bear no explicit relationship to the cleansing of the sanctuary on the day of atonement, their use in explaining the defilement of the sanctuary as envisioned in Lev 16 is somewhat precarious. And whereas the Old Testament provides no explicit explanation of the manner by which the sanctuary was defiled the viability of the traditional Adventist interpretation cannot be rejected out of hand.<sup>1</sup>

Ballenger's other point, that the blood of the sinner or his sacrifice never defiled, but always cleansed, does not strike me as one which merits the attention he gave to it. Basically, it is an exercise in semantics, complicated by the fact that the discussion centers around symbolic expressions. It is perhaps true that when Adventists declared that the sanctuary was defiled by the blood of the animal victim they were using language improperly. Spurred by Ballenger to think in more precise terms, Andross explained that, "strictly speaking," it was not the blood, but rather the sin, which defiled the sanctuary. Blood, he observed, always performed a cleansing function, in the daily service as well as in the yearly service. In "each instance it is the cleansing blood, first cleansing the sinner, then the sanctuary."<sup>2</sup> If Andross'

---

<sup>1</sup>Hasel, though recognizing "the virtual lack of explicit mention of the rightful defilement of the sanctuary/temple by means of blood in the sacrificial cultus," nevertheless argues strongly for the traditional Adventist position (ibid., p. 8; cf. pp. 1, 5-10).

<sup>2</sup>More Excellent Ministry, p. 178. However, instead of letting the matter rest there, Andross felt urged to affirm that in

interpretation of the Adventist position is correct, then Adventists ought to have taken greater pains to make themselves clear.<sup>1</sup>

### The investigative judgment

As was noted, the notion of an investigative judgment was perhaps the only aspect of the sanctuary doctrine to be abandoned by Ballenger. Eventually coming to see it as inimical to the concepts of righteousness by faith and Christian assurance, he reinterpreted a major passage used by Adventists in its defense (Rev 14:6, 7) to serve the interest of Christian assurance. The judgment announced in that passage, he said, refers to punitive, not investigative, judgment and speaks of God's intervention in behalf of His maligned and persecuted saints.

This says two things about the historic Adventist position in regard to this doctrine. First, it has been developed in a way which has tended to a lessening of Christian assurance and confidence. Second, in their concentration on the word "investigative," Adventists tended to ignore the larger dimensions of this pre-Advent activity of judgment. Part of this larger dimension involves precisely what Ballenger was suggesting in regard to Rev 14 and is calculated to bring enormous confidence to the people of God. In short, the notion of vindication, both of God and of His people, was

---

scripture blood does represent sin (ibid., pp. 179, 180, 181), using passages like Deut 21:1, 6-9; Acts 18:6; and Acts 20:26. This unhappy emphasis was a failure, and Ballenger had little difficulty demonstrating its untenableness (see Forty Fatal Errors, pp. 110, 111).

<sup>1</sup>Possibly, however, Adventists did mean to state the case in the way they did. In this connection, see Gerhard Hasel, "Blood and Sacrifice," where this contemporary Adventist scholar defends the position that blood was the agent of defilement as well as of cleansing.

hardly noticed, let alone developed, in the traditional Adventist explication of this judgment. Ballenger's repudiation of this aspect of the sanctuary doctrine probably underscored the need for a de-emphasis of the investigative aspect of this judgment and a new emphasis on the vindicative aspect of it.<sup>1</sup>

### The atonement

Ballenger's belief in a complete atonement at the cross flew in the face of Uriah Smith's unyielding resistance to the idea. In a sense, it was a question of definition of terms, for certainly Smith would have had no hesitation in affirming the completeness and universal efficacy of the act of the cross. The only difference was that to him that act was not the atonement, whereas to Ballenger it was, indeed.

---

<sup>1</sup>Uriah Smith did espouse the idea of the vindication of God, but he saw this happening through the earthly ministry of Christ. In His life, Smith suggested, Christ refuted Satan's charge that God's law was impossible to keep in human flesh. Also, through his sufferings, Christ demonstrated the integrity of God's love which Satan had denied. See Looking Unto Jesus, pp. 29-33, cf. pp. 24-37; "The Blood of the Cross," RH, 30 March 1897, p. 202. Nevertheless, Smith said nothing about the vindication of God in terms of a pre-Advent judgment, neither did he refer to the vindication of the saints.

In more recent years, Adventist writers have placed considerable emphasis on the notion of vindication as an aspect of a pre-Advent judgment. See, for example, Edward Heppenstall, "The Hour of God's Judgment is Come," in Doctrinal Discussions: A Compilation of Articles Originally Appearing in the Ministry, June, 1960 to July, 1960, in Answer to Walter R. Martin's Book, The Truth about Seventh-day Adventism (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., n.d.), pp. 171-86; Heppenstall, Our High Priest: Jesus Christ in the Heavenly Sanctuary (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1972), pp. 157-217; Francis D. Nichol, ed., Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1955), 4:844, 845; Problems in Bible Translation: A Study of Certain Principles of Bible Translation and Interpretation, Together with an Examination of Several Bible Texts in the Light of these Principles (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1954), pp. 174-77.

Ballenger rightly perceived that the common Adventist denial of a complete atonement at the cross tended, unwittingly, to put the cross in the background, calling attention, rather, to the transaction in the most holy place, the so-called antitypical atonement. In this respect, Ballenger's emphasis on atonement at the cross was a needed corrective to a theology in danger of relegating the cross to second place.

In accomplishing this, however, Ballenger failed to allow for the possibility that, in keeping with the Old Testament typical system, there could still be another aspect of the atonement affecting human beings, and not only Satan, still in process in the heavenly sanctuary. His substitution of an "atonement of judgment" in place of the Adventist notion of an investigative judgment does not seem to be a theological improvement. For while the Adventist belief in the human dimension of "the antitypical day of atonement," or the investigative judgment, provided them with a plausible reason for the delay of the parousia, Ballenger's contention that only the devil was involved in the "atonement of judgment" since 1844 made the case more difficult to explain.<sup>1</sup>

All this, however, should not detract from the fact that Ballenger's emphasis on the completeness of the atonement at the

---

<sup>1</sup>The passage of time since 1844 has been pointed to in ridicule of the Adventist belief that the investigative judgment began on that date. Why, critics ask, does God need so many decades to decide the destiny of men, something which He is capable of accomplishing in an instant? (See, for example, L. J. U. Smay, The Sanctuary and the Sabbath: A Critical Examination of Seventh-day Adventism (Cleveland, Ohio: Publishing House of the Evangelical Assn., 1915), p. 111; (no author), A Scriptural Examination of the 1844 Investigative Judgment Doctrine (Stanberry, MO: The Bible Advocate Press, [1966]), pp. 15, 16.



cross was both valid and urgent. It was eminently in keeping with Scripture and a corrective to the traditional Adventist insistence that atonement was not made at the cross.

The other major aspect of the atonement emphasized by Ballenger was its universality. In calling attention to this facet of the doctrine, he seemed to go far beyond the general Protestant understanding of it. His was a radical universality, bordering on universalism.<sup>1</sup>

His "pier" illustration,<sup>2</sup> developed in pursuit of a radical universality, was misguided. In the first place, the specter of a father pushing his son off the pier is somewhat revolting. Ballenger might have improved what was, in any case, a bad illustration by picturing a father and son standing arm in arm on the pier; the father (Adam) then slips and brings his son down with him. This would have resembled more closely the picture we find in scripture.

But a more serious weakness of the illustration is that neither theologically nor empirically is there any evidence that Christ's death brought man back to the Edenic state. At what point in his life does a real person experience this condition? And if brought back to that state, why the further need for a savior, as such?

Ballenger indicated that the entire human race has been

---

<sup>1</sup>It would not be fair to Ballenger, nor would it be true to the facts, to refer to his position as universalism. He does speak of those who will be lost, as is seen below.

<sup>2</sup>See above, p. 124.

"saved," "redeemed," "reconciled," "placed under grace," without its knowledge or consent. On the face of it, such declarations sound completely Pauline.<sup>1</sup> However, as the "pier" illustration indicates, there is a subtle, but important difference. One leaves the writings of Paul wondering, "Why should anyone be lost?" On the other hand, one leaves the writings of Ballenger wondering, "How could anyone be lost?" The difference lies in Ballenger's accentuation of an automatic saving benefit experienced by all men by virtue of Christ's provisions at the cross. This note of "automatism" is not in Paul.

It is important to remember, though, that in developing this aspect of his theology, Ballenger was reacting to what he regarded as a flaw in the generally held Adventist position on the atonement. That position not only restricted the term "atonement" to the transaction in the heavenly sanctuary since 1844, but also emphasized that the benefits of that transaction applied only to those who were penitent. It was against this restricted understanding of the provisions of the atonement that Ballenger felt constrained to underscore the universality of the transaction at the cross. Though he seemed to go beyond the bounds of biblical and empirical realism, there was much in his emphasis worthy of serious consideration.

In spite of his attempt to establish the idea of Christian assurance, however, Ballenger was forced to take account of those aspects of human existence--rebellion, ungodliness, rejection of

---

<sup>1</sup> Compare, for example, Rom 5:11, 18; 2 Cor 5:19; Col 1:20.

God--which could not easily be brushed aside by an optimistic notion of a radical universal atonement. Just here, the element of uncertainty is re-introduced into the human/Christian experience, and Ballenger's attempt to distance himself from Adventist Arminianism breaks down. He introduced the idea of a "second sin": the repentant sinner can renounce his repentance, and "recommit" those sins which had been erased at the cross. Even more ominously, Ballenger suggested that for this "second sin" there can be no pardon.<sup>1</sup>

In adopting this notion of a "second sin," Ballenger seems to have negated the concept of Christian assurance which he had struggled so hard to promote. And in the end, he still had to conclude that "the sinner in order to realize the benefits of this great salvation [one may say 'atonement'] must accept it by faith."<sup>2</sup>

Thus, although there was a difference from Smith in the way he came at the doctrine of the atonement, it may be said that, ultimately, there was no innate, functional distinction in the outcome of the two positions, insofar as Christian assurance was concerned.<sup>3</sup> Yet, though it may be a matter of emphasis, there is in Ballenger a note of assurance that is missing from Smith.

---

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 137, n. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Proclamation of Liberty, p. 127; cf. *ibid.*, p. 90.

<sup>3</sup> Smith espoused the notion of conditional pardon. That is, the sins of men, though forgiven, still remain in the heavenly sanctuary to which they had been transferred upon repentance. From that point they no longer threatened the head of the (repentant) sinner, provided he remained in a repentant state. At the conclusion of the investigative judgment, these sins are finally placed upon the scapegoat (see Smith, "The Scapegoat," p. 29; Looking Unto Jesus, pp. 257ff.; The Sanctuary, 1877, pp. 306ff.). There is essentially no difference between Ballenger's "second sin" and Smith's "failure to maintain a repentant state."

The concept of a heavenly sanctuary  
service before the cross

At least three things need to be said in regard to the notion of a heavenly sanctuary priestly service before the cross: (1) it is based on inadequate scriptural support; (2) it was devised in response to a false theological premise; and (3) it compromises the uniqueness of Christ.

Scriptural support

One cannot but be impressed by Ballenger's use of scripture to defend his position on the meaning of the expression "within the veil" in Heb 6:19, 20. Though there were a few important details which he overlooked,<sup>1</sup> his basic adherence to the scriptural data on this issue was, on the whole, commendable.

This makes it all the more disappointing to find that in his attempt to establish the notion of a heavenly ministry before the cross, he failed to employ the same exegetical rigor. One would expect that this phase of his sanctuary theology, so basic to all the rest, would have been developed with the utmost exegetical care. What we discover, however, is that his treatment of this important area is severely deficient in its adherence to any sober exegesis. In fact, in page after page of Cast Out (pages 40-57), Ballenger merely plods along, apparently oblivious to the need of documenting his claims. However, he does make an effort elsewhere, and we should examine a few examples of these.

In Cast Out, p. 35, he relied on Ex 25:40 and Heb 8:5 to

---

<sup>1</sup>See above p. 109, n. 2; p. 110, n. 3.

show that the heavenly sanctuary "existed long before the shadow was built." Though there is no scriptural basis to deny the prior existence of the heavenly sanctuary, it is questionable whether it is proper to make this extrapolation from the passages in question. The basic point made by the two texts is that Moses was to build the earthly tabernacle according to a revealed pattern. And while it is true, according to the Hebrews text, that this pattern was the "heavenly sanctuary," nothing is said in respect to time of existence. It would seem that the passages make equal room for conceiving the heavenly original in either a prior or a proleptic sense.<sup>1</sup>

But even if one were to concede the existence of a heavenly sanctuary prior to the earthly, it would still be necessary to determine whether "services were in progress there while the services were going on in the earthly sanctuary."<sup>2</sup> Ballenger attempted this by pointing to the dedicatory prayer of Solomon recorded in 1 Kgs 8 and 2 Chr 7. It might be noted, however, that Solomon's prayer gave no specific indication either of a heavenly sanctuary or of "services" being carried on there. The king simply appealed to God "in heaven" or "from heaven." The passages in question provide no solid evidence that "heaven" is to be equated with "sanctuary,"

---

<sup>1</sup>Ballenger also used, in support of his view, passages in the Psalms in which David speaks of God's enthronement in heaven, for example, Ps 11:4 and 99:1. While these texts do seem to allude to a heavenly sanctuary, there is nothing in them to indicate that God was "enthroned above the mercy seat in the heavenly sanctuary when the earth was built"--the purpose for which Ballenger uses them.

<sup>2</sup>Cast Out, p. 36.

let alone the notion of a service in progress.<sup>1</sup>

For Ballenger's system to stand, one must not only be able to prove that "services were in progress" in the heavenly sanctuary prior to the cross, but must also be able to demonstrate that those services were transpiring in the first apartment. Not even the most generous assessment of Ballenger's arguments on this point can give him credit for demonstrating this. The passage in Isaiah which he used as a major text on this question (Isa 6:1-7)<sup>2</sup> clearly seems to allude equally to the most holy place as to the holy; for it refers to the Lord "sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up . . ." (v. 1). If, as Ballenger himself argued so vigorously,<sup>3</sup> the throne of God is located in the most holy place, then the implication is clear: the activity in question transpires in the most holy place as well as in the holy place.

It is, therefore, impossible to make a persuasive argument for a service in the holy, over against the most holy, place of the heavenly sanctuary on the basis of this text. And since this was the strongest passage used by Ballenger to support his idea, it is appropriate to conclude that he has not proved his case. He was unable to come up with a single text which unequivocally pointed to a precross priestly ministry in the holy place of the heavenly sanctuary.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ballenger's attempt to find definitive evidence for a heavenly sanctuary in texts like Deut 26:15 and Isa 66:1, 2 (ibid., pp. 37, 38) also appear to be inappropriate. The first text is a prayer that God will bless His people and their land "from heaven." In the second passage, heaven is referred to as the place of God's throne. In neither case is the evidence unequivocal. Ballenger's easy equation of 'heaven' and 'sanctuary' seems unwarranted.

<sup>2</sup>See Cast Out, pp. 38, 39.

<sup>3</sup>See above p. 111, n. 3.

Ballenger's notion of an angelic priestly ministry also seems wanting in scriptural support. It is questionable whether the touching of the prophet's lips in vision by an angel (Isa 6:6, 7) can be used to support the idea of an angelic priesthood.<sup>1</sup> His use of Rev 8:3, 4 (which refers to an angel with a golden censer) to support an angelic priestly ministry in the first apartment either before or after the cross<sup>2</sup> is obviously inappropriate, for it builds a major doctrinal position on what is clearly a symbolic vision.

The notion of a Melchisedekian heavenly priesthood is speculative. It places too heavy a burden on the few references to this figure in scripture.<sup>3</sup>

Ballenger expressed his readiness to have his position subjected to the test of scripture and be rejected if found incompatible with or unsupported by it. Notwithstanding his confidence, one is forced to conclude that this part of his theory falls far short of the mark. Once, when commenting on Andross' use (or misuse) of scripture, Ballenger asked, incisively, ". . . if a man had no theory to support, and was only seeking for truth, what would these

---

<sup>1</sup>Cast Out, pp. 38, 39, 86, 87; cf. Forty Fatal Errors, pp. 28, 32, 33, etc. Another scriptural passage used in support of the idea of a precross, angelic priestly ministry in the heavenly sanctuary was Heb 1:14.

<sup>2</sup>See Cast Out, p. 87; Forty Fatal Errors, p. 77.

<sup>3</sup>Apart from the brief, historical account of Abraham's encounter with this king-priest (Gen 14:18-20), he is mentioned only once in the Old Testament (Ps 110:4) when the writer refers to a priesthood "after the order of Melchisedek." The third and last mention of Melchisedek comes in the book of Hebrews (5:6, 10; 6:20; 7:1, 10, 11, 15, 17). Not everything is clear in regard to this intriguing personality, but the author of Hebrews seems to dampen any esoteric speculations by anchoring his existence in history (see Heb 7:1).

scriptures teach him?"<sup>1</sup>--a fitting question to ask regarding his own use of scripture to support this particular plank of his sanctuary theology.

#### Theological premise

We have seen how Ballenger, in developing this idea of a priestly ministry before the cross was motivated by the need to establish the fact that in both dispensations salvation has been available on the same terms: by faith. For him, this meant that attention must be drawn away from the earthly sanctuary, whose services were centered around human works, to the heavenly sanctuary, where the real priestly service was in progress. The basic flaw in this approach is the belief that somehow there must be "services . . . in progress" in heaven in order for sins to be forgiven.<sup>2</sup>

It would seem that Ballenger need not have broken from the traditional Adventist interpretation in order to establish a harmony in the process of salvation in both dispensations. Andross, in his response to him, had pointed out that as soon as sin entered the world the plan of salvation through Christ was set in motion. It was administered from heaven, its historical reality being foreshadowed in the sacrificial offerings, both before and after Moses.<sup>3</sup>

Regarding Andross' affirmations as an "admission" of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., p. 111.

<sup>2</sup> See Cast Out, pp. 36, 38, 101; Forty Fatal Errors, pp. 24, 25, 39. This idea lay at the root of his contention that there had to be a heavenly ministry before the cross.

<sup>3</sup> See A More Excellent Ministry, pp. 107, 151-55; cf. Smith, "Queries on the Sanctuary," RH, 21 January 1890, p. 40, where a similar position is advanced.



validity of his position,<sup>1</sup> Ballenger failed to notice two ingredients that could have made a fundamental difference in his approach. In the first place, Andross' emphasis was on the mediatorship of Christ in both dispensations, proleptically in the Old Testament period and factually in the New. In the second place, there was no concern in Andross that there be a "service" in heaven before pardon could be administered. In spite of these differences, Ballenger believed Andross had actually come around to his view.

Ballenger's insistence that there be "services . . . in progress" before any pardon can be ministered from heaven not only seems unnecessary but also appears itself to be a new kind of "legalism". Attention may also be drawn to the fact that his soteriology seems to ignore the decisive importance of the cross, which plays only a kind of auxiliary or preliminary role in his thinking. He seems to think that it is the intercession in the heavenly sanctuary which has saving power, hence the stress on "services in progress."<sup>2</sup>

It is because Ballenger operated under a false theological premise that he felt the need to develop some of the quaint ideas that have marred his theology of the sanctuary.

#### Uniqueness of Christ

One gets the impression that Ballenger's theory of a precross heavenly ministry puts in jeopardy a most fundamental assumption

---

<sup>1</sup> Forty Fatal Errors, pp. 78-80.

<sup>2</sup> I am indebted to Fritz Guy of Andrews University for this insight. Guy also observed that this was a characteristic of Uriah Smith's use of the term "atonement," for here again the focus is away from the cross to certain activities in heaven.

of the gospel, namely, the uniqueness of Christ in terms of His redemptive function.<sup>1</sup> We learn from it that during the entire period from the fall to the cross, Christ was "barred from his Father's face." Under no condition could He approach the veil to plead for the sinner. Angels "guarded the approach to the throne. . . ."<sup>2</sup> Christ, in this entire period, was upstaged, so to say, by other mediators between God and man.

Nor was this situation completely abolished by the cross. What the cross did was to abolish the Levitical "middlemen," but the angels continue their function as priests and mediators, and Melchisedec still maintains his priestly office in the heavenly sanctuary.<sup>3</sup> And although Ballenger did deny the position of high priest to any of the angels,<sup>4</sup> there was no corresponding denial in respect to Melchisedec. Presumably, then, Melchisedec served in that capacity in the precross period, and possibly even in the Christian dispensation.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>See, for example, Matt 1:21, 23; 3:17; 17:6; John 3:16; Acts 4:12; 1 Tim 2:5; Heb 1:13; Rev 1:8, 17.

<sup>2</sup>Cast Out, p. 45.

<sup>3</sup>See above, p. 114.

<sup>4</sup>Forty Fatal Errors, p. 77.

<sup>5</sup>It is difficult to escape this conclusion from Ballenger's treatment of Melchisedec in Cast Out, pp. 83-86. The language he used to exalt this personality seems to show that, for him, Melchisedec and Christ are completely equal: "He who degrades the priesthood of Melchisedec, thereby degrades the priesthood of Christ" (p. 83). "Christ's priesthood was not the beginning of a new order of priests . . . but the continuance of an old order which existed at least as early as the days of Abraham" (p. 85). ". . . since Christ belongs to the same order of priests as Melchisedec, the latter is therefore a priest of the same order as Christ . . ." (p. 85). The Melchisedekian priesthood "is contemporaneous with the gospel" (p. 86). The question which opened the particular chapter in which the above references were taken is significant: "Inasmuch as it seems clear from Heb 7:28

This compromise of the uniqueness of Christ surely underestimates the work of the antitypical priest. This comes out in the reason Ballenger gives for regarding angels as priests. They performed, he said, the two main functions of a priest: offering the prayers of the penitent before the heavenly veil and carrying back the blessing of pardon and life offered under the new covenant. Asked Ballenger, "What more could a priest do?"<sup>1</sup>

That question perhaps betrays a deep misunderstanding of the work of man's high priest. (Under the new dispensation, priest and high-priest inhere in one Person.) One wonders about the need for Christ's ministry if the angels were already doing all that could be done in man's behalf. It is also surprising that Ballenger should seem to ignore what the book of Hebrews clearly regards as a basic qualification of our High Priest, namely, solidarity with those for whom He ministers, a solidarity manifested in his becoming one with us, experiencing Himself the feelings of our infirmities.<sup>2</sup>

I have argued that the concept of a heavenly sanctuary service before the cross was foundational to Ballenger's concept of the sanctuary. The foregoing evaluation has shown that that foundation cannot stand on the basis of scripture. It is perhaps significant that the last place we hear of a precross heavenly ministry was in Forty Fatal Errors. There is no evidence that Ballenger ever repudiated the doctrine, but he certainly ceased to advocate it in

---

that Christ did not become high priest until after his incarnation, 'who then', it is asked, 'was priest in the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary for the first four thousand years?' (p. 83). If Ballenger did not actually think of Melchisedec as high priest, he certainly considered his function essentially the same as Christ's.

<sup>1</sup>Cast Out, p. 87.

<sup>2</sup>See Heb 2:14-18; 5:1-9.

his later writings. It is possible that he eventually came to see its weakness.

### Concluding observations

Naively or not, Ballenger probably put forward his position on the sanctuary with a genuine hope that it might be accepted by the Adventist church. He had a deep desire to see the Adventist message brought "before thousands."<sup>1</sup> And one might even say that, at rock bottom, his motivation was more evangelistic than theological. He believed that "the long expected 'latter rain' will not be realized" so long as the doctrine of a complete and universal atonement, the foundation of righteousness by faith and Christian assurance, was "rejected and opposed" by the Adventist church. Accordingly, he attempted to shift the doctrinal/theological emphasis of the church to a more evangelical orientation, hoping to save it from the stagnancy that had bedeviled it for "nearly seventy years."<sup>2</sup>

The method he employed to bring this about proved to be unsound, both biblically and theologically, at many points. But in rejecting his position out of hand,<sup>3</sup> Adventist leaders apparently

---

<sup>1</sup>See Ellen G. White, Manuscript 59, 1905, p. [2], E. G. W. Research Center, Andrews University.

<sup>2</sup>Forty Fatal Errors, pp. 117, 118.

<sup>3</sup>There is some evidence that the case against Ballenger had been prejudiced even before he arrived for the trial, and that G. B. Starr's contention to the effect that "much personal, brotherly labor" preceded his ouster is probably incorrect (see Starr's critique of Ballenger, mimeograph, p. 1). In an early 1905 report to A. G. Daniels, then president of the Adventist General Conference, Eugene W. Fransworth, an Adventist administrator in England, already referred to Ballenger's position as "this dark cloud of apostasy." In the same report he confessed to being "sick and tired of employing and paying ministers who are not more than half in the truth"

failed to appreciate the importance and relevance of the concerns which motivated it, namely, the concern to show that righteousness by faith and Christian assurance constituted a major thrust of the doctrine of the sanctuary. Had sufficient attention been given to the "forest" of Ballenger's thought (rather than to the "trees"), this underlying motivation might have been discovered. Conceivably, this could have saved him for the church, and even corrected a lingering legalism which, thanks in large measure to Uriah Smith, was still a significant problem for many in the Adventist communion.

---

(A. G. Daniells to W. C. White, 16 March 1905, pp. 2, 3, E. G. W. Research Center, Andrews University).

Farnsworth recommended that "these lame preachers" (referring to Ballenger and his colleague William Hutchinson, another Adventist minister) should be returned to the United States. Daniells agreed, adding: "I think the best place for such men is on some farm where they can live a quiet and peaceable life, and do as little damage to humanity as possible" (ibid., pp. 3, 4).

It is hard to see how it might be possible to give an accused an unprejudiced hearing in such a climate. As if to give strength to the suspicion that the conclusion was foregone, Ballenger was promptly retired to a farm in Virginia and Hutchinson to another farm in another part of the country. In a (not meant to be) humorous aside, W. A. Spicer, shortly after Ballenger's trial, ended a letter to him thus: "Hope your [sic] are getting along nicely in Virginia. Your address [Occoquan, VA] which Brother Hutchinson gave me certainly sounds rural and enticing." (Spicer to A. F. Ballenger, 14 June 1905, Record Group 21, Outgoing Letters: Book 41, 2 June-21 August 1905, p. 118, G. C. Archives.)

## CHAPTER III

### ANDREASEN'S THEOLOGY OF THE SANCTUARY

Though an ordained minister of about three years' standing at the time of the 1905 Ballenger trial (which was held in connection with a regular General Conference session), M. L. Andreasen was yet "not considered old enough" to attend those proceedings.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, through connivance with another youthful ministerial colleague, he managed to listen in on those hearings through an open window in the trial room.<sup>2</sup> It was in company with the same clerical partner that he took the opportunity of interviewing a cooperative Ballenger on more than one occasion during the course of those Washington meetings.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>See Andreasen, "Atonement VII," 19 January 1958, p. 2, E. G. W. Research Center, Andrews University. The Ballenger trial was held in connection with a regular Adventist General Conference session, the first in Washington, D.C. Those in constant attendance at the trial included, according to Andreasen, [A. G.] Daniells, [I. H.] Evans, [S. N.] Haskell, [W. W.] Prescott, [F. C.?] Gilbert, [J. L.?] Shaw, and [W. A.] Spicer (ibid.).

<sup>2</sup>While the General Conference session itself was held in a large tent pitched for the purpose, the trial was conducted in one of the small buildings on the grounds. Andreasen tells how he and L. H. Christian took turns standing on the other's shoulders in order to both see and hear through the open upper sash of one of the windows in the building. The meetings being held in the pre-dawn darkness, it was possible for this contrivance to go undetected. (See "Atonement VII," p. 2.)

<sup>3</sup>Andreasen reported that Ballenger, already being shunned by the older ministers in attendance at the session, found himself with ample time to discuss with them the major issues being raised at the trial. Moreover, he was most willing to oblige them. (Ibid., p. 2.)

To this 1905 trial and his encounters with Ballenger in personal interviews Andreasen later traced his "great interest in the sanctuary and the atonement which has lasted throughout life."<sup>1</sup> His contribution in this area has been generally well received by Adventists, and it is true to say that for several years he was regarded as the leading spokesman in this area of Adventist theology.<sup>2</sup>

As indicated in chapter II, part of Ballenger's underlying purpose in reformulating the Adventist doctrine of the sanctuary was that he wanted to make Adventism more evangelical (in the modern sense), more "gospel oriented." It is somewhat ironic, then, that Andreasen, who traced his deep interest in the sanctuary and atonement to him, would come into serious conflict with high ranking Adventist church officials over the same basic purpose, not now advocated by a 'renegade', but by Adventist officialdom. It is also noteworthy that in this controversy it was the leaders of the church who championed (against him) a cardinal emphasis of Ballenger's, namely, that the atonement on the cross was complete.<sup>3</sup>

As is evident in this chapter, Andreasen's theology of the sanctuary was, in the main, traditional, exhibiting a basic consonance in major emphases with that of Uriah Smith.<sup>4</sup> However, he was

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 2. He characterized these discussions with Ballenger as "a preliminary course in the sanctuary and atonement."

<sup>2</sup>See SDA Ency., s.v. "Andreasen, Milian Lauritz."

<sup>3</sup>The way in which this all came about becomes clearer as the chapter proceeds.

<sup>4</sup>This immediately becomes apparent when one compares Andreasen's major work on the sanctuary, The Sanctuary Service (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1937), with

not simply a rubber stamp of the 'pioneer' view; and in presenting his sanctuary theology, this chapter endeavors to identify some of the more significant variations, even departures, on certain aspects of the doctrine.

Like Smith and Ballenger before him, Andreasen utilized the sanctuary theme to foster an overriding theological concern, a concern which, however, differed from those of the two other figures. Also, his use of the doctrine in defense of his 'hidden agenda' was not as obvious as Smith's, nor as pervasive as Ballenger's, but it is, nevertheless, still discernible.

Before entering upon a discussion of his sanctuary theology, three items are presented as a means of enhancing our understanding of that theology: (1) Andreasen's sanctuary corpus, (2) his place in Adventist history, and (3) his appreciation of the importance of the sanctuary doctrine.

#### Andreasen's Sanctuary Corpus

Andreasen wrote just one major work dealing exclusively with the doctrine, notwithstanding his association, in the Adventist mind, with the sanctuary. That work, The Sanctuary Service, grew out of his class lectures at the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary in Washington, D.C.<sup>1</sup> The material was published in book form, perhaps by popular demand, as a part of the 1938 reading course for

---

Smith's Sanctuary (1877) or the latter's Looking Unto Jesus (1897). There was a second, revised edition of Sanctuary Service published in 1947. All references to this work, except as otherwise indicated, will be to the 1937 edition.

<sup>1</sup> Sanctuary Service, p. [4].



Adventist ministers.<sup>1</sup> This means that Andreasen had probably not initially set out to write a book on the sanctuary, as such. While this work in many ways duplicates Uriah Smith's major expostulations of the sanctuary theme, two chapters stand out: "The Last Generation" and "The Judgment."<sup>2</sup> Their significance emerges as the present chapter proceeds.

Another work by Andreasen, The Book of Hebrews, deals extensively with at least one aspect of the sanctuary, namely, the atonement. Written as a supplement to the Sabbath School Lesson Quarterly for the last three quarters of 1948,<sup>3</sup> the book is of extreme importance to the present investigation, for nowhere else is Andreasen's basic concept of the atonement stated more clearly.

Five other works by Andreasen, while dealing with themes other than the sanctuary, nevertheless serve to focus attention on that which has been identified in this report as his fundamental theological concern, and for which the doctrine of the sanctuary has been used as a bolster. These were as follows: Isaiah the Gospel Prophet: A Preacher of Righteousness: Lesson Notes and Helps;<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. The Review and Herald advertised it as a "comprehensive and lucid treatment on the sanctuary service," a book which "every Seventh-day Adventist should have." (RH, 26 September 1940, p. 30.)

<sup>2</sup> See Sanctuary Service, pp. 279-311. The chapter on the scapegoat in the 1947 edition (pp. 188ff.) also exhibits some interesting modifications, as is shown below.

<sup>3</sup> See Sabbath School Lesson Quarterly, no. 212, Second Quarter, 1948: "Studies from the Book of Hebrews," Part I, Senior Division, p. 3. Also, ibid., no. 213, Third Quarter, 1948, p. 5. (This Quarterly is made up of short daily Bible study guides and is generally used in the first part of the regular weekly Sabbath services called the Sabbath School.)

<sup>4</sup> 3 vols. (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1928).

A Faith to Live By; <sup>1</sup> Following the Master; <sup>2</sup> The Faith of Jesus and the Commandments of God, <sup>3</sup> The Sabbath: Which Day and Why? <sup>4</sup> Attention is drawn below to the way in which these works served to illuminate his central concern.

Some of Andreasen's writings on the sanctuary appeared in the Review and Herald and Ministry magazines, particularly between the years 1939 and 1946. More than thirty articles appeared in this way, some of them as part of extended series. <sup>5</sup> They dealt with a wide range of sanctuary themes, mostly concentrating, however, on the Old Testament cultus. When writing for the Signs of the Times, Andreasen generally concentrated on the subject of the parousia, hardly ever treating the sanctuary theme. <sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1943.

<sup>2</sup> Nashville, TN: Southern Publishing Assn., 1947.

<sup>3</sup> Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1939. The book was also published in a revised edition (1949) and with a shorter title: The Faith of Jesus (minus the words "and the Commandments of God"). All references to this work, except as otherwise indicated, will be to the 1937 edition.

<sup>4</sup> Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1942.

<sup>5</sup> See, for instance, the ten-article series on "The Sanctuary Service," Review and Herald, 18 October 1945 to 20 December 1945. Judging by their frequency of appearance, Andreasen's articles on the sanctuary, as well as on other topics, were much sought after by editors of Adventist periodicals. Many of these articles are cited in the text, and a comprehensive listing appears in the Bibliography.

<sup>6</sup> For example, his six-article series on the Second Advent in ST, 16 August 1942 to 22 September 1942; "The Reasonableness of the Second Advent," ST, 5 August 1947; "History's Climax Near," ST, 9 January 1951; "Jesus is Coming Again," ST, 8 January 1952. I was able to locate just one article by Andreasen dealing in part with the sanctuary in this magazine: "The Message of the Book of Hebrews," 12 November 1946, pp. 10, 11, 14.

There is a considerable amount of mimeographed material, written in the last six years of his life, on the doctrine of the sanctuary and, in particular, on the atonement.<sup>1</sup> The intense polemicism which characterizes the contents can only be understood against the background of his major theological concerns--concerns which, as he saw it, stood in imminent danger of being compromised by the Adventist leadership.

Finally, there is a sizeable body of miscellaneous material at the General Conference Archives, comprising Andreasen's personal correspondence, notes, and other papers. This material, however, was not made available to me.<sup>2</sup>

#### Andreasen's Place in Adventist History

Though Andreasen was born within the period of the first generation of Adventists (1876), he did not become affiliated with the Adventist church until about 1894. Another six years were to elapse before he came into denominational employ--as a teacher in

---

<sup>1</sup>The most notable of these are his Letters to the Churches, comprised of six articles, written about 1959. They bear the designations "series" and "no.," beginning at "series A, No. 1." There are other (mimeographed) documents bearing the designations "series" and "no.," but not referred to as "Letters," which makes for a confusing situation, so far as accurate referencing is concerned. Since the designations "series" and "no." serve no indispensable identifying function, the articles in the "Letter" group are identified by the word "letter," underlined, followed by the title of the particular letter, e.g.: Letter: "The Atonement," and then the page number.

These Letters were put out by the Hudson Printing Company, Baker, Oregon. They bear no date, but internal evidence indicates that they were written in 1959. (See Letter: "The Incarnation," p. 9, "Attempted Tampering," p. 6; "A Resume," p. 5.)

<sup>2</sup>The reason given was that the material included matters of a personal or confidential nature that had not yet been processed.

a summer church school in Chicago.<sup>1</sup> This means that the pioneer period of Adventism had already passed before he formally joined the ranks of the Adventist ministry.

His term of service as an ordained minister for the Adventists covered the sixty-year period, 1902-1962.<sup>2</sup> During the first decade of this period, the attention of the Adventist church was largely engaged with the administrative problem of reorganization and the theological problem of pantheism.<sup>3</sup> So intense were the pressures arising from these factors that there was a real danger of putting in second place the proclamation of the distinctive Adventist message.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>See Virginia Steinweg, Without Fear or Favor: The Life of M. L. Andreasen (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1979), p. 55.

<sup>2</sup>This includes the period of just under a year (April 1961-March 1962) in which his credentials were suspended by vote of the Adventist General Conference committee. (See Andreasen to R. R. Bietz, 6 October 1961, p. 1, E. G. W. Research Center, Andrews University; Arthur White to Thomas A. Davis, 23 October 1978. Cited in Steinweg, Without Fear, p. 180.) He was restored to good and regular standing March 1, 1962 (see *ibid.*, pp. 181, 182), too late, however, for him to learn of the action. He had died about ten days earlier. He had regarded the suspension of his credentials as an "unjust" and "wicked" act (see Andreasen to Bietz, 6 October 1961, p. 2). The reason for the suspension is considered as the chapter proceeds.

<sup>3</sup>See Richard Schwarz, Light Bearers to the Remnant: Denominational History Textbook for Seventh-day Adventist College Classes (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Publishing Assn., 1979), p. 323. A major proponent of pantheism among Seventh-day Adventists was John H. Kellogg, a prominent Adventist physician of Battle Creek, Michigan. For more on this controversy in the Adventist church, see *ibid.*, pp. 288-90. Surprisingly, very little has been written on this crisis in Adventism. The most extensive statement on the issue and its aftermath that I have seen appears in Schwarz, John Harvey Kellogg, M.D. (Nashville, TN: Southern Publishing Assn., 1970), pp. 184-92.

<sup>4</sup>Light Bearers, p. 323. Schwarz also included here the

This condition was followed, in the next two decades (especially during the war years 1914-c. 1920), by intense and often heated discussion and debate over questions of Bible prophecy. High on the prophetic agenda were issues like the nature of the Battle of Armageddon (some seeing in the 1914-1918 conflict a fulfillment of Rev 16:16 and thus the imminence of the parousia), the role of the non-Christian nations of the East in the final conflict, the identity of the "king of the north" (Dan 11), and the meaning of the "daily" (Dan 8:12). Other topics coming up for attention were the identity of the "law" in Galatians and the deity of Christ.<sup>1</sup>

So preoccupied had many become with these questions that high Adventist officials found it necessary to call for a return to an emphasis on righteousness by faith, such as was evidenced at the 1888 General Conference at Minneapolis.<sup>2</sup>

---

financial pressures resulting from the rapid expansion of Adventism, especially in overseas fields (*ibid.*).

<sup>1</sup>Light Bearers, pp. 393-407.

<sup>2</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 395. Cf. the 1919 Bible Conference Transcript, July 3 and 10, 1919, E. G. W. Research Center, Andrews University. A partial transcript of this conference appears in Spectrum (May 1979):26-57, but does not include the dates on which the calls for righteousness by faith were made. The calls came from Arthur G. Daniells and William W. Prescott, president and field secretary, respectively, of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists. The existence of this climate points up the possible reason for a 1926 book by Daniells under the title, Christ Our Righteousness: A Study of the Principles of Righteousness by Faith in the Word of God and the Writings of the Spirit of Prophecy (Washington, D.C.: Ministerial Association of Seventh-day Adventists, 1926). The book went through several editions, the latest one in 1941. It has been regarded by Adventist historian, LeRoy E. Froom, as a major milestone in the development of the doctrine of righteousness by faith in the Adventist church (see Movement of Destiny, p. 400; cf. chart following p. 73).

This concern for righteousness by faith was also reflected in the Sabbath School Lesson Quarterly for the same period. See,

The issues debated in those first three decades should alert us to two possible major influences upon Andreasen's theology. First was the failure of yet another round of speculation within Adventism regarding the parousia. There is reason to believe that Andreasen did not participate in these speculations. In a 1942 report to General Conference officers, he lamented that "the vital doctrine of the 144,000 . . . had ceased to be preached," having been replaced by "fantastic theories in regard to the [Second World] war, Hitler, and the future." He also complained about discussion and debate over the subject of Armageddon.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, it was probably this atmosphere, an atmosphere which apparently persisted for the entire period between the wars, which led Andreasen to develop the doctrine of the sanctuary in such a way as to place the emphasis on the 144,000, where, as he saw it, it rightly belonged.

Second was the emphasis on righteousness by faith, which Adventist leaders were attempting to revive near the end of the second decade of the century. Andreasen's major stress in the development of the doctrine of the sanctuary may be seen as a response to that call for a reemphasis on righteousness by faith.

At no time in his career does Andreasen seem to have

---

for example, Senior Division, April to June, 1919. An examination shows that most of the lessons for that entire year, both in regard to title and content, carried a Christo-centric theme, with a strong emphasis on righteousness by faith. See also the lessons for 1920. It should be remembered that the content of the Sabbath School Quarterly usually reflects the topic on which church leaders wish the membership to focus, and is not, necessarily, a reliable indication of the current concerns of the church at large.

<sup>1</sup>See Andreasen to J. L. McElhany and W. H. Branson, 25 December 1942, p. 5, E. G. W. Research Center, Andrews University.

wielded that commanding influence on Adventist theology that we saw in Uriah Smith. What can be said of him, though, is that he was an important theologian within Adventist circles for more than a quarter of a century (c. 1924-c. 1950)<sup>1</sup> and was widely regarded within that church as an authority on the subject of the sanctuary. Had he died just seven years sooner than he did (1962), he would have enjoyed virtually unimpaired theological and personal esteem in the mind of Adventist administrators and church members in general. As it turned out, however, certain events originating around the middle of the 1950s brought him into sharp conflict with Adventist administrators, tarnishing in many minds a previously unsullied image.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>In 1924, he performed his first major theological assignment for the church at large, and 1950 was the year of his retirement (see Without Fear, p. 163). Three times in this period he was commissioned to prepare the Sabbath School Lesson Quarterly and/or supplementary material for said Quarterly. For the fourth quarter of 1924 he prepared lessons on the theme, "The Christian Life" (Without Fear, p. 98); his three-volume work, Gospel Prophet, was used as supplementary material for studies on the book of Isaiah during the last two quarters of 1928 and the first quarter of 1929. (See II, p. [92], advertisements.) He also wrote the corresponding lessons (Without Fear, p. 106). As already mentioned, Hebrews served a similar purpose around 1948.

<sup>2</sup>In March, 1955, Adventist leaders from the church's headquarters in Washington, D.C., commenced a series of conversations with certain evangelical leaders, with the intent of providing an accurate account of the distinctive beliefs of Seventh-day Adventists. The evangelicals involved were Walter R. Martin, George E. Cannon, and (later) Donald G. Barnhouse. Martin, a Southern Baptist clergyman, was a Ph.D. candidate at New York University, researching for a dissertation on the subject of non-Christian religions in the United States. A research polemicist, he was preparing a book against Seventh-day Adventists. George Cannon was a professor of theology on the faculty of Nyack Missionary College, New York. Donald Barnhouse was then a popular radio preacher in Philadelphia, minister of a large Presbyterian church in the same city, and editor in chief of Eternity magazine. (See Barnhouse, "Are Seventh-day Adventists Christians?" Eternity, September 1956,

This is not to say that he ceased to enjoy the high esteem of all. The fact is that he did retain many important admirers within Adventist circles. For example, even when he was held in the deepest disfavor by top ranking leaders of the church (his credentials having been suspended),<sup>1</sup> no lesser figure than

---

p. 6; T. E. Unruh, "The Seventh-day Adventist Evangelical Conferences of 1955-1956," Adventist Heritage 4 (Winter 1977):35, 36, 37, 39. Unruh's report provides the most comprehensive presentation of the background, inception, and purpose of these conversations that I have seen.

On the Adventist side were LeRoy E. Froom, W. E. Read, T. E. Unruh, and (later) Roy A. Anderson. These were all well-known Adventist ministers. Anderson was then editor of Ministry, a magazine primarily written for Adventist ministers; Unruh was president of the East Pennsylvania Conference of SDA, and served as moderator of the meetings; Read was a field secretary of the General Conference of SDA; and Froom was a prominent Adventist church historian, whose monumental four-volume Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers had so impressed Martin that the latter specially requested his presence as one of the participants. (See Unruh, "Adventist-Evangelical Conferences," pp. 35, 37, 39.)

To Andreasen, these activities represented a capitulation, a sell-out, on the part of the Adventist church. A confrontation quickly developed between him and high-ranking Adventist leaders, particularly the then president of the General Conference, Reuben R. Figuhr; and a series of strongly worded letters were exchanged. (For a resume of the letter communication between Andreasen and church headquarters in the wake of this conflict, see Letters: "Attempted Tampering," pp. 11, 12; Letters: "A Resume," pp. 8-11; Letters: "Why Not a Hearing? Inherited Passions," pp. 2-10.)

As the conflict grew, Andreasen came to see himself as the target of suppression on the part of the church's top leadership. See "Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine--The Truth about Seventh-day Adventists--Martin," October 1960, p. 2, personal files of the present writer. Cf. Andreasen to R. R. Bietz, 6 October 1961, p. 1, E. G. W. Research Center, Andrews University; Without Fear, pp. 179, 180.

<sup>1</sup> See "Suspension of Credentials of M. L. Andreasen," Minutes, General Conference Officers and [North American Division] Union Presidents Council, 6 April 1961, p. 9, E. G. W. Research Center, Andrews University.

In the Minutes, Andreasen was accused of "grave and false charges against the general leadership" of the Adventist church, and of refusal "to respond favourably to the appeals of his brethren to make a statement of his differences to the General Conference, except on his own particular terms." The Minutes argued that to permit



W. G. C. Murdoch, then dean of the Adventist Theological Seminary, canvassed his opinion regarding the "orthodoxy" of an article Murdoch was preparing for publication in the Review and Herald.<sup>1</sup>

Notwithstanding this confidence on the part of many, Andreasen ended his career a broken man. Reports of a death-bed reconciliation with offended church leaders<sup>2</sup> do not dispel the

---

ministers to retain credentials "while continuing to engage in active controversy with the duly constituted leadership" would only produce "increasing confusion in the minds of our people. . . ." The Minutes indicate that the vote to suspend Andreasen's credentials was unanimous, and that it was, nevertheless, the "greatest desire" of the participants that it would be possible to lift the suspension.

Andreasen reacted sharply to the above action, declaring it "illegal" and "void." He even called for the "impeachment" of the General Conference president. (See Andreasen to Walter R. Beach [General Conference Secretary], 20 December 1961, E. G. W. Research Center, Andrews University.) And when the church began to show some reluctance to paying his sustentation allowance on account of his intense agitation, he threatened legal action (see "Shooting the Watchdog," p. 2, n.d., E. G. W. Research Center, Andrews University). He predicted a great shaking among church leaders because of the suspension, a shaking which never materialized. (See Andreasen to Bietz, 6 October 1961, p. 2.)

<sup>1</sup>See Murdoch to Andreasen, 20 September 1961, E. G. W. Research Center, Andrews University. Murdoch's article deals with the subject of the atonement, but does not address itself to the divisive issues surrounding that topic at the time. It was published under the title, "The Atonement of Our Lord," in the RH, 11 October 1962, pp. 5, 6. (For a personal tribute to Andreasen by Murdoch, see Without Fear, p. 150.)

<sup>2</sup>For example, there is among the Andreasen papers an undated document addressed "To Whom It May Concern" alleging that, prior to his death, Andreasen met with then General Conference president, R. R. Figuhr, in a mood of "brotherly" love. It was at this meeting, according to this report, that "Andreasen indicated his regrets over the estrangement between himself and the brethren."

This document is in the custody of the E. G. W. Research Center, Andrews University. An identical copy at the Ellen G. White vault in Washington, D.C. has underneath it the name of D. A. Delafield, one of the present trustees of the Ellen G. White Estate. Delafield, in a personal interview, August 1979, could not remember writing the piece, though he conceded he may well have done so. Arthur White, another trustee, characterized it as a death-bed confession (personal interview, 23 August 1979).

atmosphere of pathos and tragedy which becloud the sunset of his life. He died a pathetic figure.<sup>1</sup> But the basic issues he so vehemently sought to defend are still alive, and they continue to evoke spirited debate within Adventism today.<sup>2</sup>

Andreasen's Perception of the Importance  
of the Sanctuary

Like Smith and Ballenger, Andreasen believed in the profound significance of the doctrine of the sanctuary. As it functioned in the Old Testament, the sanctuary cultus laid out before the ancients, in as clear a manner as possible, the entire plan of salvation. It was, he said, "the gospel in embryo." As far as he was concerned, the doctrine of the sanctuary lay at the very center of the doctrines espoused by Adventists, and Adventism could not be itself "without a sanctuary."<sup>3</sup>

Andreasen felt the need to address himself to the problem of the comparative silence of the New Testament regarding a heavenly sanctuary ministry, in spite of its importance. The reason for this

---

Andreasen's final attitude toward the controversy with church leaders therefore remains somewhat murky. His biographer, Virginia Steinweg, does tend to support a kind of reconciliation. See Without Fear, p. 181; also see T. E. Unruh, "The Seventh-day Adventist-Evangelical Conferences of 1955-1956," p. 45.

<sup>1</sup> Steinweg reports that, following the suspension of his credentials, Andreasen succumbed to deep grief, even writing letters to God. He developed a duodenal ulcer, which eventually hemorrhaged, ending his life. He spent his last night at home praying and weeping over the turn events had taken in his life. (See Without Fear, pp. 181, 182.)

<sup>2</sup> Reference is made to issues surrounding the nature of Christ and the notion of sinless perfection of the final remnant.

<sup>3</sup> Sanctuary Service, p. 52; "The Intent of the Sacrificial System," Ministry, July 1939, p. 22; "The Sabbath School," p. 1, n.d., E. G. W. Research Center, Andrews University.

silence, he explained, can be traced to the prevailing gross ignorance among first century Christians in regard to the elementary principles of the gospel. This made it necessary for New Testament writers to concentrate on these first principles, before broaching the question of a heavenly sanctuary. When one remembers that even this first step proved a massive stumbling block for the Jews, Andreasen asserted, then it is no longer puzzling that very little effort was made to introduce more advanced ideas which would only have provoked greater confusion.<sup>1</sup> Referring to Mark 4:33<sup>2</sup> and John 16:5,<sup>3</sup> Andreasen asserted that Christ yearned to open up the subject of the heavenly sanctuary to His disciples, but was deterred by their lack of sanctified curiosity.<sup>4</sup>

Thus the relative silence of the New Testament on the subject of the sanctuary should not detract from the significance of the doctrine. "Christ's work as High Priest is the very essence of Christianity, the heart of the atonement."<sup>5</sup> It is from the sanctuary that the Christian today is to receive "hope and strong consolation."<sup>6</sup>

The following section demonstrates how Andreasen developed the main aspects of this doctrine. It also shows that in spite of

---

<sup>1</sup>"The Intent of the Sacrificial System," pp. 27, 45.

<sup>2</sup>"With many such parables he spoke the word to them, as they were able to hear it."

<sup>3</sup>"But now I am going to him who sent me; yet none of you asks me, 'Where are you going?'"

<sup>4</sup>Hebrews, pp. 15, 16; "The Importance and Content of Hebrews," RH, 19 September 1946, p. 6.

<sup>5</sup>Sanctuary Service, p. 13.

<sup>6</sup>Hebrews, p. 243.

his conception of its importance in and of itself, he nevertheless used it with a "hidden" intent to bolster a yet more fundamental theological concern.

### Andreasen's Sanctuary Theology

The present approach to Andreasen's theology of the sanctuary is affected, necessarily, by what has gone before in the preceding chapters, particularly in chapter I. Because he was largely traditional in his approach to this subject, it is not necessary to provide as many explanatory details of the various facets covered, as was done for Smith. Furthermore, since much of his exposition presupposed the work of Uriah Smith and others,<sup>1</sup> Andreasen himself touched on certain sanctuary themes only briefly, if at all. Thus, there is no significant discussion of the 2300-day prophecy and its 1844 terminus, a subject which exercised Smith considerably. Nor did he dwell on the question of a literal heavenly sanctuary or of a "shut door."<sup>2</sup>

The areas retained for discussion are as follows: (1) the locus of Christ's ministry upon His ascension, (2) the defilement and cleansing of the sanctuary, (3) the investigative judgment, (4) Azazel, (5) the atonement. In developing these areas, this chapter calls attention to Andreasen's underlying theological concern,

---

<sup>1</sup>See Sanctuary Service, p. 273. Here Andreasen referred his reader to "'The Great Controversy', by Ellen G. White, and other standard Adventist works" for details in regard to the 2300-day prophecy.

<sup>2</sup>Apparently, Andreasen did lecture on the concept of a 'shut door' in his classes. There is among his papers a collection of material on this subject, drawn from the earliest numbers of the Review and Herald. The collection demonstrates that the early

namely the cosmic vindication of God through the absolute perfection of a discrete eschatological Remnant a condition upon which the eventuation of the parousia depends. It is argued that this concern lies at the foundation of his sanctuary theology.<sup>1</sup>

#### The Locus of Christ's Ministry upon His Ascension

Uriah Smith was unequivocal in his belief that upon His ascension Christ began His ministry in the holy place without ever entering the most holy place for any purpose. It was his belief that, "in fulfillment of the type, Christ must perform a portion of His ministry in the holy place." This being so, the "veil" referred to in Heb 6:19 could not be the second veil.<sup>2</sup> Ballenger completely rejected this interpretation, believing, instead, that upon His ascension Christ went directly into the most holy place where he has been ministering ever since, and that the veil in Heb 6:19 is the second veil.<sup>3</sup> Andross, in concession to Ballenger, advanced the idea that Christ, indeed, went into the most holy place at His ascension, but only for a brief ceremony of dedication, following which He returned to the holy place to commence the first part of His ministry.<sup>4</sup>

---

Adventists did espouse the notion of a 'shut door'. (See "The Shut Door," File no. 17: M. L. Andreasen, Waggoner and General, G. C. Archives.)

<sup>1</sup> Andreasen may have been influenced by Ballenger and other turn-of-the-century Adventists who tended to place considerable emphasis upon sinless perfection and personal cleansing from sin. See above, p. 135; Haloviak, "Pioneers, Pantheists, and Progressives," pp. 33, 34. Other possible influences on Andreasen are noted below.

<sup>2</sup> Looking Unto Jesus, p. 127. For Smith's full argumentation on this issue see pp. 126-31.

<sup>3</sup> See above, p. 108.

<sup>4</sup> A More Excellent Ministry, pp. 52, 53.

In his presentation of this topic, Andreasen seemed to back away from Smith's dogmatic confinement of Christ to the holy place after His ascension--giving preference, rather, to Andross' mediating position. Perhaps recognizing the sensitiveness of the issue surrounding the meaning of the "veil" in Heb 6:19, 20,<sup>1</sup> he appeared studiously to avoid a full-scale discussion of that passage. His text by text commentary on Hebrews contained less than one page of formal exposition of the passage, with no treatment whatsoever of the crucial phrase "within the veil."<sup>2</sup> Only in the "Additional Notes" on chapter 6 did he show any awareness of the controversy surrounding this phrase. Even there, however, he merely brushed aside the issue, suggesting that the whole debate missed the real point of the passage. The central focus of the text, he said, was not "the veil," but rather "that which is 'within the veil'," namely, Jesus Christ, man's high priest. What the passage meant to say was that "it was Christ who is at the other end of the line; it is he who holds the anchor." Exactly where Christ was did not really

---

<sup>1</sup>As will be recalled, Ballenger had made this passage the textus cardinalis for locating the ministry of Christ in the most holy place at His ascension, a fact with which Andreasen was certainly familiar (see above, p. 165).

<sup>2</sup>See Hebrews, pp. 238-39. This silence is unexpected, given his apologetical nature. As an Adventist minister, Andreasen authored several works that might be characterized as apologies for Seventh-day Adventism. (For example, A Faith to Live By; The Faith of Jesus; What Can a Man Believe? etc. His love for debate may be seen in A Faith to Live By, pp. 18-23; 32-34. In the midst of his quarrel with Adventist church leaders, he wrote: "It is a wonderful thing to live in such a time under such circumstances as these. I am enjoying life as never before" ("The Living Witness," p. 5, E. G. W. Research Center, Andrews University, n.d.). As the controversy worsened, he yearned for a trial or a hearing, but was disappointed (see "Memorial," 4 June 1958, p. 9, E. G. W. Research Center, Andrews University; Letters: "Why Not A Hearing?" pp. 2ff.; Andreasen to Bietz, 6 October 1961, p. 2).

matter, so long as we have the confidence that wherever He is, "there is our anchor and hope." Furthermore, the fact that the passage in question did not define the expression "within the veil" indicates that that element was not important.<sup>1</sup> This attitude allowed Andreasen tacitly to maintain, with Andross, that the "veil" in that passage was the second one.

That this position may have resulted from an appreciation of the force of Ballenger's arguments on this question is shown by Andreasen's concession, in discussing Heb 9:24,<sup>2</sup> that Christ did enter the most holy place upon His ascension,<sup>3</sup> a concession to which Smith would have taken strong exception. Since it is inconceivable that Andreasen would have been unacquainted with Smith's position on this issue, one suspects that while he may have shared the latter's view, both theologically and emotionally, he found himself at a loss to defend it exegetically.

Andreasen's concession to Ballenger was only partial, however; he preferred to follow Andross' lead in regard to what actually transpired at Christ's ascension. Avoiding any admission of a ministry in the most holy place at the ascension, he suggested

---

<sup>1</sup> Hebrews, p. 242. The issue was virtually ignored also in his other books and in his many magazine articles. In Sanctuary Service, p. 30, while describing the ancient sanctuary structure, Andreasen seemed to let slip a natural opportunity to designate the first curtain as a veil. However, he did refer to it as such in Hebrews, p. 441, though I have been unable to find any evidence that he makes the same application in regard to the heavenly sanctuary.

<sup>2</sup> The text, in the Authorized Version, reads: "For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us."

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., pp. 361, 362.

instead that Christ's mission there was a limited one in which, though appearing "openly before God," He did not see the Father. His appearance was merely for purposes of "inspection," as a result of which God assured Him that His sacrifice had been accepted.<sup>1</sup> Thus Andreasen, with Andross, saw Christ's entry into the most holy place at His ascension in terms of a dedication and consecration ceremony, corresponding somewhat to the ancient service mentioned in Ex 30:26-29; 40:1-17; and Lev 8:10.<sup>2</sup> In this "inauguration" ceremony Christ was installed into office as "our great High Priest in heaven."<sup>3</sup>

But unlike Andross, Andreasen does not mention the exit of Christ from the most holy place following this ceremony. He was probably aware that Ballenger had nothing but scorn for that idea. Andreasen did speak of a ministry in the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary,<sup>4</sup> but in regard to the present discussion he seemed to equivocate. Though Christ's entrance into the second apartment was for "inspection" only, He "appears continually before the face of God for us. . . ." Citing Delitzsch, Andreasen suggested that Christ's appearance before the Father" . . . [was] not an 'isolated point of time, but the commencement of a long linked series . . . a perpetual presentation of Himself as of Him who died

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., pp. 362, 444; cf. pp. 361-363.

<sup>2</sup> "The Sanctuary, no. 4: Dedication and Inauguration, Part I," RH, 10 October 1940, pp. 4, 5.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

<sup>4</sup> Sanctuary Service (1937), p. 273; Sanctuary Service (1947), p. 297.



for our sins and is risen for our justification'."<sup>1</sup> This leaves the reader in some doubt as to what Andreasen really meant to say.

It is also interesting that, unlike Andross, Andreasen never discussed the idea of a dedication/consecration ceremony in connection with Heb 6:19, 20. It was Heb 9:23 which provided for him the basis of that notion. This last text, after referring to the purification of the typical sanctuary and its paraphernalia, indicates that "the heavenly things themselves" were also to be purified, though "with better sacrifices."

It is at this point that we get a hint of Andreasen's hidden agenda. Though believing that Heb 9:23 alludes both to the ancient dedication/purification ceremony in Ex 30:26-29 and the cleansing of the sanctuary in Lev 16, Andreasen urged the need to keep the two concepts separate:

These two ceremonies are definitely recorded as separate events. The one sanctified, purified and dedicated the sanctuary as a necessary condition for the ministry of reconciliation; the other cleansed the sanctuary after it had been defiled with the sin of the people. Both were necessary, and we believe that both find their counterpart in the sanctuary above. But they must not be confused. They are separate in time as well as in purpose, though they both have to do with purification and are "necessary."<sup>2</sup>

Thus Andreasen attempted to make a distinction between "the ministry of reconciliation" immediately following the inauguration and the ministry of cleansing during the antitypical day of atonement commencing in 1844. To confuse the two acts of purification

---

<sup>1</sup> Hebrews, p. 363. Cf. F. Delitzsch, Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, vol. 2, trans. Thomas L. Kingsbury (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1952), pp. 127, 128.

<sup>2</sup> "Dedication and Inauguration, Part I," pp. 4, 5. Emphasis supplied.

of the heavenly sanctuary would be to misunderstand those important elements connected with the antitypical cleansing or atonement, so vital for the purification of the saints.

It is seen in the following section how closely this idea is tied to Andreasen's basic theological concern for the purification of a final Remnant.

#### The Defilement and Cleansing of the Heavenly Sanctuary

Andreasen's understanding of the process by which the earthly sanctuary was defiled generally moved along the same lines as Smith's: sin, confessed by the sinner over the head of the sacrifice, passed to the innocent animal-victim, whence it was transferred through its shed blood to the sanctuary.<sup>1</sup> It was this "sin-laden blood" which in a typical and ceremonial sense, defiled the sanctuary.<sup>2</sup> Though there were no books kept in the earthly tabernacle, the sins of the

---

<sup>1</sup>Sanctuary Service, pp. 162-67, 176; cf. Looking Unto Jesus, pp. 88-91. Andreasen did recognize that there were some questions in regard to the notion of transfer. He based the idea of transfer in the daily service on what happened on the day of atonement. The ritual described in Lev 16 in connection with Yom Kippur explicitly referred to the transfer of sin (see Sanctuary Service, pp. 133-36).

<sup>2</sup>Sanctuary Service, p. 183; "The Sanctuary Service, no. 9: Defilement and Blood," RH, 21 November 1940, p. 8. Defilement of the sanctuary also occurred in some cases where the blood was not required to be carried into the sanctuary and sprinkled before the veil in the usual manner. In such cases, (where the ruler or one of the common people sinned), the blood was placed on the horns of the altar of burnt offerings and not carried within the sanctuary at all. (Sanctuary Service, p. 163; Hebrews, p. 384.) Still defilement occurred (1) on account of the fact that the altar of burnt offerings was a vital part of the sanctuary complex, and (2) because the priest was required to eat part of the sacrifice. Thus defilement was transferred to the priest and through him to the sanctuary. (See Sanctuary Service, pp. 130-32; 184; Book of Hebrews, p. 384.)

penitent transferred there were, nevertheless, recorded--in blood.<sup>1</sup>  
Thus the sanctuary experienced "blood defilement."<sup>2</sup>

On the yearly day of atonement the sins "recorded" in the sanctuary were "blotted out," thereby cleansing it "of the record of sin accumulated through the year." "This cleansing of the record also affected the cleansing of the people whose sins already had been forgiven." It removed the "condemnation" hanging over them. It left them "cleansed, free, happy."<sup>3</sup> The means of this cleansing was the sin-free blood of the Lord's goat.<sup>4</sup>

In keeping with traditional Adventism, Andreasen used Dan 8:14 to call attention to a cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary.<sup>5</sup> He did recognize the fact that tsâdaq, the Hebrew word in Dan 8:14 rendered "cleansed" in the Authorized Version, could also, and more accurately, be translated as "justified," or "vindicated." But he evidently perceived no conflict with the traditional position since "the word contains the idea of restoration as well as cleansing." Thus if one were to render the text ". . . then shall the sanctuary be justified," or "vindicated," or even "come into its own again," it should make no change in the basic meaning of the passage.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Sanctuary Service, p. 178.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 185. This bold reference to blood-defilement seems an outright rejection of Ballenger's contention that blood always cleanses, never defiles. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 179 where his discussion of the paradox of the sanctuary's being both defiled and cleansed by blood suggests a polemic against Ballenger.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 178, 185, 186.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 183, 184.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 261ff.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 273, 274. Andreasen noted that these meanings of tsâdaq are significant inasmuch as the subject of the sanctuary

Andreasen also saw in Heb 9:23 a reference to the cleansing of the sanctuary, that "final phase" of Christ's ministry which commenced in 1844 when He "entered the most holy." This was also the beginning of the investigative judgment, a part of the cleansing of the sanctuary.<sup>1</sup>

In Andreasen's exposition of the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary, there was a strong experiential emphasis not found in Uriah Smith. We begin to sense this in his discussion of a means of defilement of the sanctuary not emphasized by the latter. It was possible, Andreasen contended, for the sanctuary to be defiled other than by the confession of sin and its transference through the blood or through the priest. Defilement could also take place through a refusal to purify oneself after touching a dead body.<sup>2</sup> Commenting on the substantiating text (Num 19:13), he made the following observation:

Here in Num 19:13 the statement is made that a man who does not purify himself, who does not confess his sin, defiles the

---

has been in a state of obscurity for so long. The implication of the text, then, is that "at the end of the twenty-three hundred days a people shall arise who will have light on the sanctuary question." This people will "follow Christ by faith into the most holy place," will have "the solution to break the mystery of iniquity," and will "go forth to battle for God's truth." Their "supreme contribution" will be their "advocacy of the sanctuary truth." They will restore the sanctuary, in other words, to its rightful state (ibid., p. 274).

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., p. 273.

<sup>2</sup> Here he cited Num 19:13: "Whoever touches a dead person . . . and does not cleanse himself, defiles the tabernacle of the Lord. . . ." (See Sanctuary Service, pp. 139, 140.) In one place Andreasen laid stress on a typical Ballenger contention that sin, as such, defiled the sanctuary (see "The Sanctuary, no. 9: Defilement and Blood," p. 8).

sanctuary of the Lord. The doctrinal import of this statement should not be overlooked.<sup>1</sup>

Andreasen's assertion regarding "the doctrinal import" of Num 19:13 is somewhat frustrating, for he did not seem to follow up with any explanation of what he meant. To understand the meaning of the remark, one needs to be aware of a fundamental concern of his theology, namely, the relationship of the atonement to sinless perfection. He discussed the text in the context of the ceremony of the red heifer (Num 19:1ff.) which preceded it, finding three aspects of that ceremony of particular significance: (1) the ceremony was not "directly connected" to the sanctuary ritual, as such; (2) in the ceremony, "purification from sin . . . [was] accomplished by the use of water . . ."; and (3) the ministration of cleansing involved in it availed "for the stranger as well as for the children of Israel."<sup>2</sup>

Andreasen interpreted this entire ceremony as a symbol of Christ, from whose side flowed blood and water when pierced upon the cross.<sup>3</sup> This phenomenon at the cross was a corroboration of the

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., emphasis supplied. This emphasis, certainly not found in Smith, did feature strongly in Ballenger. In fact, so far as the latter was concerned, it was the sinning of the sinner, rather than the confession of his sin, which actually defiled the sanctuary. See above, pp. 126-28. It may or may not be significant that the six words emphasized in the present quotation were dropped from the 1947 edition of Sanctuary Service.

It should be noted, however, that Andreasen did stress that "only confessed sins" ever entered "the sanctuary proper" (ibid., p. 167).

Another (minor) instance of a possible Ballenger influence on Andreasen may be seen in the latter's reference to the ancient sacrificial offerings as "embodied prayers." (Sanctuary Service, pp. 116, 221.) It will be recalled that this was a point strongly emphasized in Ballenger (see above, p. 113, and n. 3).

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 139-41.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 141. Cf. John 19:34.

Old Testament teaching that not only blood but water also was to be regarded as a typical agent of moral and spiritual cleansing.<sup>1</sup> He listed baptism and the "ordinance of humility"<sup>2</sup> as the New Testament counterparts of the Old Testament cultic ablutions.<sup>3</sup>

The real significance of all this becomes clearer when it is remembered that in Andreasen's soteriology baptism constituted the sixth "step" to Christ, the "step" in which the sinner is fully "cleansed, purified, justified," and made dead to sin.<sup>4</sup> From that point on, the new convert is to "abstain from sin."<sup>5</sup> Thus, baptism as a symbol of the death of Christ does result in cleansing, the cleansing of water--unrelated, as such, to the heavenly sanctuary. The cleansing thus provided, however, is not enough. There is still need for a deeper cleansing, one accomplished by the blood of atonement, effected in connection with the ministration in the heavenly sanctuary. This is the atonement which commenced in 1844.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Andreasen noted other instances of water purification in the Old Testament: the laver before the tabernacle contained water used in ceremonial cleansing; likewise the bitter water of Num 5:17. (See Sanctuary Service, pp. 140, 141.)

<sup>2</sup>A reference to the ceremony of footwashing which usually precedes the Lord's supper.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 141.

<sup>4</sup>See A Faith to Live By, p. 96; cf. The Faith of Jesus, p. 480; where he envisions baptism in the context of the flood. As such, the ceremony symbolizes the fact that all sin has been "rooted out, drowned" from the individual life. The other steps listed by Andreasen were (1) recognition of sin, (2) sorrow for sin, (3) confession, (4) restoration, (5) faith in God, and (7) abstinence from sin (Faith of Jesus, pp. 69-97; cf. Faith to Live By, pp. 67-99).

<sup>5</sup>Faith of Jesus, p. 98.

<sup>6</sup>See Sanctuary Service, pp. 176-78, 186-87, 273; cf. "The Keeping Power of God," RH, 18 June 1936, p. 299.

This need for a further cleansing even though the sinner has already been "cleansed, purified, [and] justified" through baptism rests upon the idea that the pardon and justification received in connection with that ceremony are in fact "conditional." As in the type, the sins of the penitent, transferred to the sanctuary, are not immediately obliterated but, rather, remain there until the day of atonement.<sup>1</sup>

The reason for this delay in the "blotting out" of sin, explained Andreasen, was that "the sinner's future course" had to be taken into consideration. Citing Ezek 18:24 (which suggests that the righteous man who turns away thereby forfeits his reward), Andreasen maintained that salvation is offered not only on condition of repentance but also on condition of "perseverance." God, he said, waits until the end of life. If at that time men "are still of the same mind [still repentant], God counts them faithful, and in the day of judgment their record is cleared."<sup>2</sup> Therefore, as it was in the ancient cultus, the time of complete release from sin does not come until one is declared through the antitypical atonement "clean from all your sins."<sup>3</sup>

Andreasen's experiential understanding of the notion of defilement and cleansing of the sanctuary constituted a major thrust of his sanctuary theology. In this scheme, the sanctuary to be cleansed at the end of the 2300 days is not simply the

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., p. 176.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., pp. 176, 177.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., p. 178. One wonders whether Andreasen does not depart from his own logic when he suggests, on the basis of 1 John 1:9, that we may have that atonement-day experience ("cleansed . . . from all your sins") now (see *ibid.*).

heavenly, but the earthly sanctuary of the human heart. In fact, the cleansing of the former depends upon that of the latter, and the two are part of a single whole.<sup>1</sup>

### The Investigative Judgment

Again, in his general approach to the concept of an investigative judgment, Andreasen followed the traditional pattern, as found in Smith, seeing such a proceeding first as a logical necessity. "It is evident," he declared, "that some kind of investigation must take place before . . . [the saints] are permitted to enter into eternal bliss," since it would not be "reasonable" to save them before they were judged. It is necessary that their "life and attitude" should be investigated before the Advent, for when Christ returns, His reward is ready, according to Rev 22:12.<sup>2</sup>

The investigative judgment consists of a "review of each life with the purpose of determining" (1) what use has been made of

---

<sup>1</sup>In Hebrews, p. 344, Andreasen made the statement that "the Jewish tabernacle was in reality a type of the Christian church." In making this application, he was thinking not only of the church in its "composite capacity" but also of "each individual member" (citing 1 Cor 3:16, 17). He drew the implication of the foregoing subtly: According to Heb 9:11, he argued, Christ entered the heavenly holy place(s) by "a greater and more perfect tabernacle." This statement was meant to give "emphasis to the work of Christ" in making His human body "a fit dwelling place for God. . . ." It was meant to emphasize "the fact that Christ gained entrance by virtue of His blood, His life, and that the perfect body which He presented for inspection to the Father, met the standard set . . . ." (p. 346).

The suggestion is that we, too, must develop our bodies as perfect temples of God, so as to pass a corresponding inspection. The Jews, Andreasen said, failed to understand that "God wanted them to finish transgression and make an end of sin" in their body temples (p. 345). Cf. "The Sanctuary," RH, 19 October 1944, pp. 66, 67.

<sup>2</sup>Sanctuary Service, p. 305.



that life, (2) whether it was lived in accordance with "the rules of life," and (3) whether on the basis of the two conditions just mentioned, "future and prolonged life would be a blessing or a curse, the welfare of other created beings being taken into consideration." In reaching this decision, the personal life record is carefully scrutinized, words, deeds, and motives being weighed in the balance. Even unperformed actions and attitudes based on "what would have been done had opportunity presented itself" are considered and "in many cases credit or debit . . . [is] entered."<sup>1</sup>

To render the prospect even more ominous, Andreasen introduced the idea of post-mortem responsibility:

Taking for granted a belief in punishment and reward, we would first remark that no man's record can be made up completely at death. His life is closed but his influence continues--his "works do follow" him. If we are responsible for our influence--and this must be admitted, we believe--the record cannot be made up fully until the end of time.<sup>2</sup>

This, Andreasen explained, should not be taken to mean "that a man has not sealed his destiny when he dies,"<sup>3</sup> though it is difficult to see what else it could possibly mean in the context.

Perhaps faced with objections to the term "investigative

---

<sup>1</sup> Faith of Jesus, p. 301.

<sup>2</sup> Sanctuary Service, p. 302. Part of Andreasen's purpose for making this statement was to prove that the dead could not receive their reward at death, since the full result of their influence could not be known at that point. Judgment, he contended must be delayed "until all the facts are in, at which time a just estimate can be arrived at." He found indirect support for the concept in 2 Pet 2:9 which asserts that God will "reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished" (KJV). Andreasen's statement that a person's "works do follow" him is probably based on Rev 14:13: ". . . that they may rest from their labours; and their works do follow them."

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

judgment," Andreasen expressed his willingness to abandon it, if "another which is better [could] be found." Still, as far as he was concerned, the expression in question "best fits the case in regard to the judgment of the righteous."<sup>1</sup> It was certainly "not an executive judgment," he pointed out, since the Bible referred to it as "the 'hour of judgment' as contrasted with the 'day of judgment'."<sup>2</sup>

The investigative judgment, he emphasized, was not designed to supply God with information not otherwise available to Him. "His all-seeing eye and His divine wisdom could settle every case without any investigation or records of any kind," and moreover, He could do it "in a moment."<sup>3</sup> But God has freely chosen to involve finite creatures in this judgment process, for their own good as well as for the future security of the universe. Thus angels play a role in the judgment, a factor which gives them the assurance that (1) heaven is not being invaded by a multitude of unworthy beings; and (2) that the decision to exclude some is a just one. It will, on the other hand, assure the saved that God has acted justly in respect to those who are finally lost. Although the

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., p. 305. Uriah Smith had encountered the same objection and had responded in the same vein (see Smith, "The Sanctuary," RH, 27 September 1887, p. 616).

<sup>2</sup> Sanctuary Service, p. 305. Andreasen cited Rev 14:7 for the "hour of judgment" and Acts 17:31 for the "day of judgment."

<sup>3</sup> Faith of Jesus, p. 301. Here Andreasen showed his awareness of the fact that some non-SDA observers had ridiculed the idea that God needed scores of years to decide on the cases of human beings, a notion which impugned both His omniscience and his omnipotence (see above, p. 151, n. 1).

saints do not participate as observers in this pre-Advent phase of the judgment, an opportunity will be provided for them to inquire into the life record of the lost during the millennium, a kind of post-Advent investigation.<sup>1</sup>

Neither the idea of a post-Advent investigation nor the notion of vindication (implied in it) received much emphasis in Smith, at least not in the same way. Smith did believe that the saints would judge the world,<sup>2</sup> but did not elaborate in regard to the details of that process. Also, he did refer to the concept of vindication, but this was with regard to (1) the subject of the sanctuary and (2) the justification of God through the earthly life of Christ.<sup>3</sup> While Andreasen advocated the same, he also went beyond.

As Andreasen explained it, the post-Advent investigation is carried on during the millennium, primarily for the benefit of the saints, but also for the security of the universe against a second occurrence of sin and rebellion. "Humanly speaking," said Andreasen, "God does not want to run any risk of dissatisfaction or questionings." The saints will need to be assured of His justice in keeping some of their loved ones and friends out of heaven. Thus they will be permitted to examine the record of the lost. This will ensure that "no question will ever arise in . . . [their] minds as to the justice of

---

<sup>1</sup>Sanctuary Service, pp. 302-04; Man Here and Hereafter, pp. 50, 51.

<sup>2</sup>See Daniel and Revelation, pp. 368, 518, 702, 703, 766.

<sup>3</sup>Looking Unto Jesus, pp. 29-33.

what was done."<sup>1</sup> Moreover, as a further assurance against future questions, they judge "their own generation and their own acquaintances."<sup>2</sup> Thus the participation of the saints is a guarantee of "a just and merciful judgment."<sup>3</sup>

Like Smith, he understood the notion of vindication in two ways. First, there is vindication of the doctrine of the sanctuary. As a result of the proclamation of God's chosen people in the last days, the doctrine of the sanctuary, so long clouded in mystery and obscurity, will be restored to its rightful place in God's plan of salvation. He based this conclusion on the meaning of tsâdaq in Dan 8:14.<sup>4</sup> Second, there is the vindication of God through the earthly life of Jesus.<sup>5</sup>

Going beyond Smith, however, Andreasen stressed the vindication of God through the investigative judgment. "God has been accused by Satan of injustice," declared Andreasen, "and . . . has set Himself the task of justifying His ways before men," as well as before the unfallen angels.<sup>6</sup> He does this partly by giving Satan time to reveal his true nature, and already has been partially

---

<sup>1</sup> Sanctuary Service, p. 303.      <sup>2</sup> Ibid., pp. 303, 304.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., p. 303. His explanation was that the saints help to fix the punishment of the lost. And since some of these would have been their loved ones and friends for whom they had prayed, they would have a tendency to be "kind to them till the last." Therefore, "no one will be punished more than he deserves." What does this say about the justice of God? Did Andreasen really mean to imply that the plight of the lost would be worse, but for the participation of the saints in the judgment?

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., pp. 273, 274. He referred to the translation of tsâdaq as "vindicated," or "justified."

<sup>5</sup> Faith of Jesus, p. 302.      <sup>6</sup> Ibid., pp. 301, 302.

vindicated on account of Satan's participation in the death of Christ and the persecution of the saints.<sup>1</sup> But there is another necessary side to the vindication of God. His action in saving some and damning others must be perceived as just. This can come only through an investigative judgment, in which both angels and men rule on the cases of the wicked. At its conclusion, following the millennium,<sup>2</sup> both angels and men will freely offer "their testimony as to the justice of the decisions made," for they will have known "the factors involved."<sup>3</sup>

Summing up the situation, Andreasen spelled out the important implications of involving finite creatures in the judgment. Much more is at stake, he said, than the assurance which comes from personal participation:

When God admits saints and angels to a part in the judgment, they are in reality passing upon God's work. The rules, the principles, the laws governing men and angels, come under scrutiny. In a certain sense God is being judged. Rom 3:4.<sup>4</sup>

It is this which gives significance to the universal declaration of the justice and righteousness of God on the part of men and angels. For "the great question has always been: Is God just, or are Satan's accusations true? At the end of the investigative judgment, the character and justice of God is vindicated before the universe."<sup>5</sup>

Running through Andreasen's discussion of the investigative

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., p. 302.

<sup>2</sup> Reference is to both the pre-Advent and post-Advent investigative judgments.

<sup>3</sup> Sanctuary Service, p. 308. He cited Rev 16:5, 7 in support.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., p. 310.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., pp. 310, 311.

judgment are echoes of his fundamental concern. The following elements may be noted: (1) Though the outcome of the judgment "hinges" upon the personal record of the individuals as presented by the angels,<sup>1</sup> the use of that record is not the same for every generation. "Instruction and education" must be taken into consideration, as well as Christ's death, "His atonement and teaching."<sup>2</sup> What this evidently implies is that the saints of the final generation must pass a closer scrutiny than those of earlier periods. (2) The mention of the word 'atonement' in this context was perhaps designed to bring to mind the significance of Christ's atonement as Andreasen conceived it. For as a part of this atonement, as is shown below, Christ perfected a character in demonstration of the power of God to keep men from sinning.<sup>3</sup> This, as may be recalled, was part of the vindication of God. What is implied is that just as Christ at His ascension underwent an "inspection" before the Father, just so those facing the investigative judgment must undergo an "inspection" or scrutiny, particularly those who will have had the benefit of Christ's final atonement.<sup>4</sup>

#### Azazel

In both the first and second editions of The Sanctuary

---

<sup>1</sup>Faith of Jesus, p. 303.

<sup>2</sup>Sanctuary Service, p. 304.

<sup>3</sup>This idea is discussed fully in the following section and is also discussed in the critique towards the conclusion of the present chapter.

<sup>4</sup>Andreasen's deep concern for the notion of an investigative judgment was shown by the way he bristled when he surmised that Adventist leaders had repudiated the sanctuary doctrine and the investigative judgment (see "The Suspension Story I," p. 1, E. G. W. Research Center, Andrews University).

Service (1937 and 1947) Andreasen followed, generally, the common Adventist interpretation of Azazel or the scapegoat.<sup>1</sup> The scapegoat typified Satan, upon whose head will be placed the sins of God's people at the conclusion of the antitypical cleansing of the sanctuary.<sup>2</sup> In the ancient ceremony, the scapegoat played no part in the atonement, but was brought into the ritual only after atonement had been "completed."<sup>3</sup> The principle of "joint responsibility for sin" was invoked by Andreasen to explain why sins, nevertheless, are finally confessed upon his head.<sup>4</sup>

On this point of joint responsibility, however, Andreasen came to exhibit a subtle but important difference from traditional Adventism. In the 1937 edition of The Sanctuary Service, he could speak of the sins being placed on the head of the scapegoat following the cleansing of the sanctuary.<sup>5</sup> But by 1947 he was much more guarded in his statements.

On the day of atonement, he said, the sins of the penitent were "blotted out." This means that "they existed no more," that "even the record was non-existent."<sup>6</sup> Sin, he contended, does not exist independently of personality, it is not a separate entity.

---

<sup>1</sup>His discourse on the scapegoat in Hebrews, pp. 405-11 was an adaptation from his 1947 Sanctuary Service.

<sup>2</sup>Sanctuary Service, pp. 196, 197.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., pp. 189, 190; 1947 edition, pp. 193, 196.

<sup>4</sup>Sanctuary Service, pp. 190-92, 194-95; 1947 edition, pp. 193-95.

<sup>5</sup>Sanctuary Service, pp. 196, 197.

<sup>6</sup>Sanctuary Service (1947), p. 197.

The "vivid description and personification of sin in the Bible," he warned, should not be taken to indicate "its actual existence as an entity."<sup>1</sup> This error leads to the belief that sin still exists after it has been "atoned for, blotted out, made an end of, annulled, cast behind God's back . . . erased from the memory of God. . . ." It also leads to the mistake that Satan is the only one who can annihilate sin. This makes the work of Christ of none effect and gives Satan "a vital part in the plan of salvation."<sup>2</sup>

How then was the role of the antitypical scapegoat to be understood? Four alternatives were suggested for examination: "Satan bears and is punished for (1) the confessed sins of the righteous only, (2) the sins of the wicked only, (3) the confessed and unconfessed sins of all men, (4) his own sins and those which he has caused others to commit."<sup>3</sup> Of these alternatives, Andreasen rejected numbers one and two outright. The third alternative also proved unsatisfactory since confessed sins are borne by Christ only.<sup>4</sup>

Returning to the concept of shared responsibility for sin, Andreasen took the case of a man and woman in an adultery situation, in which the woman repents. In such a situation, he argued, the sin of the woman is borne by Christ, the man bears his own penalty, and Satan suffers for his part in causing the sin of adultery, that is,

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., p. 198.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., pp. 198, 201. In the 1937 edition, Andreasen could affirm that "the banishment of the scapegoat represents the final eradication of sin." The scapegoat, therefore, plays "an important part in the services of the day of atonement," for it was "in him" that sin was "finally destroyed," making Israel safe. These sentiments were expunged from the 1947 version.

<sup>3</sup> Sanctuary Service, p. 149.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., p. 201.



his part in both the woman's sin and the man's. In the same way, he concluded, Christ suffers for the sins of the righteous, the wicked bear their own penalty, and Satan suffers for his own sins. The only difference is that Satan's sins include both "those he has personally committed and those he has caused others to commit."<sup>1</sup> Thus, Andreasen emphasized that the sins placed on the head of the scapegoat were not those that had been atoned for. Rather, they comprised "Satan's share" in the sins of the righteous, "for which no atonement was made and which were not provided for in the Lord's goat."<sup>2</sup>

Andreasen felt so strongly about this revised position that he once approached an official of the Ellen G. White Estate with a "proposal" for a "change" in the Ellen G. White writings in regard to the scapegoat, a proposal which, however, was never seriously considered.<sup>3</sup> Perhaps his strong feeling on this point should be

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., pp. 202-05.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., pp. 204, 205. This seems to reflect a strong Ballenger influence, even though the two positions are distinct, due largely to the difference of the two figures in their understanding of the atonement and the cleansing of the sanctuary.

<sup>3</sup> Arthur L. White, "The Charge that the E. G. White writings are Being Changed--'Attempted Tampering'," memorandum, pp. 2, 9, E. G. W. Research Center, Andrews University.

Surprisingly, Andreasen did quote from E. G. White in his 1947 Sanctuary Service, including sentiments which were clearly contradictory to the views he was espousing. For example, he cited her statement in Great Controversy, p. 658, where she declared that at the conclusion of the final atonement, "the sins of God's people will be placed upon Satan. . . ." (Emphasis supplied.) Perhaps his reason for quoting the statement was that he saw in one of its clauses a possible explanation of its intent. For in completion of the sentence just quoted, White said: ". . . he will be declared guilty of all the evil which he has caused them [God's people] to commit." Possibly, Andreasen saw this part of the sentence as standing in apposition to the first, and thus in keeping with his own interpretation.

understood in the light of his fundamental concern for an efficacious atonement in the most holy place. He evidently saw it as a reflection on the adequacy of that atonement if at its conclusion the very sins it was designed to obliterate were still viable. Thus his radical declaration: "For Satan to bear . . . forgiven sins, white sins, cancelled sins, nonexistent sins--would be a farce."<sup>1</sup> He cherished the conviction that his revised position constituted "the true view which harmonizes with the general purpose of the atonement."<sup>2</sup>

#### The Atonement

The central focus of Andreasen's sanctuary theology was the doctrine of the atonement. In what follows, an attempt is made to show that his uncompromising insistence on maintaining a strict Adventist traditionalism in regard to the doctrine of the atonement was directly related to his fundamental theological concern: the cosmic vindication of God through the absolute perfection of a discrete eschatological Remnant.

It is possible to discern two periods in Andreasen's presentation of the atonement. The first period reaches up to the middle 1950s, the second stretches from that point to his death in 1962. The first period, though not entirely free from the polemical element, nevertheless exhibits a mood that is irenic and deliberative. The second period, by contrast, is intensely combative and polemical.

While it is tempting to conclude from this that there were two Andreasens, an earlier and a later, close observation of his

---

<sup>1</sup> Sanctuary Service (1947), p. 199.    <sup>2</sup> Ibid., p. 188.

writings suggests that his basic concern was the same throughout. The drastic change of temper which characterized the seven-year period before his death was occasioned by what he saw as a sinister attempt on the part of highly placed Adventist officials to compromise or destroy the very essence of Adventism, the atonement. That important episode had the effect of enhancing Andreasen's elucidation of the concept of the atonement, and to this extent it is germane to the present discussion. Thus, after delineating Andreasen's basic position on the subject, an effort is made to show how the conflict with Adventist church leaders was motivated by his fundamental theological concern.

#### Andreasen's understanding of the atonement

One of the lessons of the Old Testament ritual services, as Andreasen saw it, was that the plan of salvation comprehended more than the forgiveness of sins.<sup>1</sup> In the ancient cultus, the daily service emphasized the forgiveness of sins, the yearly service on the day of atonement pointed forward to the blotting out of sins and to judgment. It took both acts to complete God's plan of salvation.<sup>2</sup>

This means, he contended, that the work of atonement could not have been completed on the cross, but that Christ's final work as high priest must also be included. Indeed, he claimed, that high priestly work constitutes "the very essence of Christianity, the

---

<sup>1</sup>See A Faith to Live By, p. 54; cf. Gospel Prophet, I, p. 28; "The Sanctuary, no. 11: The Work of Judgment," RH, 12 December 1940, p. 7.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., cf. Sanctuary Service, p. 187.

heart of the atonement."<sup>1</sup> Calling attention to the passover ceremony, which included for its completion the application of blood to the doorpost,<sup>2</sup> Andreasen argued that the mere shedding of blood (as at the cross) was insufficient. To be effective, the blood must be "applied."<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 13. Andreasen, however, did recognize the event of the cross as an "integral" and "vital" part of the atonement, generally conceived (ibid., p. 24; Hebrews, p. 437). But, always, he took pains to ensure that Christ's ministry in the heavenly sanctuary was not eclipsed: "But we are not to think that there is no atoning efficacy in Christ's ministering His blood in the heavenly sanctuary. . . . The cross is vital, the cross is central, Christ finished his earthly work there. But then he ascended to heaven to continue His work of redemption in the sanctuary above. This work is now going on and will continue until the end" (ibid.).

So while stressing the centrality of Christ's finished work on the cross, he strongly emphasized that it would be "destructive of sound doctrine to confine the totality of the atonement to the cross." To limit the atonement to the cross is to limit the atonement (ibid., cf. Andreasen?, "The Atonement Central," p. 9, paper in Andreasen's Lecture Notes, File no. 17: "M. L. Andreasen--Atonement--Waggoner and General," G.C. Archives). In an eloquent statement in Hebrews, p. 350, Andreasen affirmed that the belief that Christ "by one action on Calvary set redemption in motion," leaving it "to work by itself" was akin to that which held that "God created the world . . . set it in motion, then left it to turn by itself."

<sup>2</sup>See Ex 12:3-7, 13.

<sup>3</sup>"The Intent of the Sacrificial System," p. 45. Cf. Hebrews, pp. 13, 16.

Andreasen found it very difficult to reconcile himself to the notion of a complete atonement at the cross. Shortly after those 1905 encounters with Ballenger, and perhaps because of them, he visited the home of Ellen G. White at St. Helena, California, spending three months, according to his recollection, reading the original manuscripts of her published works. Part of the reason for his visit was that of investigating what he regarded as conflicting statements by her on the subject of the atonement (see A Faith to Live By, pp. 299, 300, 301; "The Atonement IX," p. 1; cf. Hedwig Jemison to Bruno W. Steinweg, 28 November 1977, E. G. W. Research Center, Andrews University).

What Andreasen found confusing in White was the fact that some of her statements affirmed a perfect, finished atonement at the cross, while others spoke of a final atonement to be made after

Perhaps in no other place did he outline his position on the atonement more clearly than in Hebrews, particularly in his comments on Heb 1:3. The text indicates that ". . . when he [Christ] had by himself purged our sins, [he] sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high" (KJV). Refusing to see in the passage any suggestion that atonement was complete at the cross, Andreasen instead used it as his point of departure for expounding the idea that the atonement is to be divided into three phases.<sup>1</sup>

The first phase comprehends Christ's earthly life and ministry, during which He made an end of sins.<sup>2</sup> Involved in this process was the "complete eradication" of sin from the person, or "sanctification"--the "uprooting of every evil," resulting in a life "completely controlled by the Holy Spirit."<sup>3</sup> According to Andreasen, all this was accomplished in Christ's own person.<sup>4</sup> In His earthly life, He demonstrated that sin could be wholly resisted, and that complete victory was possible. "This part of His work He finished before the cross."<sup>5</sup>

---

1844. "This apparent discrepancy was one of the problems I wanted to have clarified . . ." ("The Atonement IX," p. 1). Unfortunately, he never said whether the conflict was ever resolved in his mind.

<sup>1</sup> See Hebrews, pp. 52-60.

<sup>2</sup> An allusion to Dan 9:24 where the idea of making "an end of sins" is mentioned in connection with the seventy prophetic weeks allotted to the Jewish people, a period Andreasen regarded as coming to an end in A.D. 34, some three years after the ascension of Christ. (See Hebrews, p. 54.) The reader is reminded that Ballenger used this passage to defend the concept of the finished atonement at the cross. (See chapter II.)

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., pp. 54, 55.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., pp. 55, 56. Emphasis supplied. Andreasen saw this as part of the affirmation of Heb 1:3. He argued that the word "our"

The second phase of the atonement "began in Gethsemane, and was completed on the cross."<sup>1</sup> It involved Christ's suffering and dying for the sins of the world. Here He bore the curse, took the transgressor's place, and paid the penalty.<sup>2</sup>

The third phase of Christ's atoning work embraces His session in the heavenly sanctuary and involves "the demonstration which He must make in His saints on earth." In that "demonstration" He shows that His complete victory over sin was not a unique phenomenon, but, rather, is repeatable in His saints on earth. This will constitute the end of the atonement. Christ will have "at last completed His work" and will stand "glorified in His saints." He will have demonstrated that it was "possible to be completely victorious over sin." The moment will have arrived at last "for the appearing of the sons of God." The 144,000 will constitute the focus of this demonstration.<sup>3</sup>

---

in the clause "purged our sins" should be dropped, on the basis of the best manuscript evidence. This would allow a "more inclusive view" of the meaning of the text, which would then read: "when he had by himself purged sins," "or better, 'made purification of sins'." The phrase "by himself," though questioned by some, is to be retained since the Greek for "purification for sins" is in the middle voice, thus inherently possessing a reflexive meaning. (Hebrews, pp. 52, 53.)

Since the middle voice in Greek sees the action as terminating on the subject, Andreasen argued, the phrase "purification for sins" has reference to Christ Himself and suggests that "in his own life He overcame temptation," remaining uncontaminated by the sins of the world laid upon Him.

But the phrase in question had a second meaning, according to Andreasen. Not only does it entail the purging of sins but also "the purification of sinners." The first transaction terminated at the cross, the second is "still in progress" and will be "until the last soul is saved." (Hebrews, p. 53.) This is the work that began in earnest in 1844.

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 56.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 56-58.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., pp. 58, 59.

This process of "eliminating and destroying sin in His saints on earth" is a "part of the cleansing of the true sanctuary."<sup>1</sup> Thus Andreasen saw a vital connection between phase three of the atonement and the cleansing of the sanctuary.

In setting forth the matter in this way, Andreasen was governed by his underlying theological concern for a perfect Remnant. Two points stand out in this connection: (1) that the victory of Christ over sin, in the first phase of the atonement, was not unique but was to be repeated in the end-time saints; (2) that Christ gained access into the heavenly holy places after he had "made purification for [purged] sins." This last idea, vaguely hinted at in his discussion of Heb 1:3,<sup>2</sup> becomes more explicit in his exposition of Heb 10:19, 20, a passage which speaks of a new and living way opened "through the curtain, that is through his [Christ's] flesh." Andreasen noted the significance of the statement:

And when His work was done, He presented Himself before God; the body in which He conquered temptation and gained complete victory . . . the body cleansed and purified from every defilement; the temple body which He would raise up in three days . . . the cleansed, holy, sanctified, consecrated body in which God's ideal for man was at last realized--this body Christ presents before the Father, and the Father accepts it, and through it He gains entrance.<sup>3</sup>

What Andreasen meant to emphasize was that God's end-time saints must

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., pp. 58, 60. For two other presentations of the three phases of the atonement, see Letters: "The Atonement," pp. 3-13; "The Atonement IX," pp. 3-10. The events of each phase of the atonement, as Andreasen explained them, are clear and precise, except for the third phase. He seemed uncertain about the period from the cross to 1844. He never made it clear whether that period was also part of the third phase. If it was, then his description of the purpose of the third phase should have been modified somewhat to render it consistent with this fact.

<sup>2</sup> Hebrews, pp. 54, 55.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., p. 443.

gain a similar victory in preparation for a similar scrutiny. Just as the Father was "justified" through Christ's victory over sin, so also will He be "justified," "vindicated," "glorified," through the absolute sinlessness of His end-time saints. This was the point of Andreasen's atonement theology.

### Conflict with church leaders

The most common reasons suggested for Andreasen's conflict with Adventist leaders in the period from 1955 to his death in 1962 fall short of accounting for the strong reaction which characterized his attitude in that dispute.<sup>1</sup> We only grasp the full situation when we understand that to him the attitude and actions of certain important church leaders constituted a deliberate attempt to sabotage the very essence of Adventism, namely (1) the preservation of an

---

<sup>1</sup>One plausible reason suggested for this strong reaction on Andreasen's part was the failure of church leaders to consult him regarding such delicate talks, involving subjects in which he felt a high degree of expertise. This reason has been advanced by Arthur L. White. White suggested that the failure to consult Andreasen was not meant to be a slight on the part of church leaders, but was simply due to the fact that Andreasen had by then retired and was well advanced in age (see A. L. White, "The Charge that the E. G. White Writings Are Being Changed--'Attempted Tampering'," Memorandum on M. L. Andreasen, 6 August 1971, p. 4, E. G. W. Research Center, Andrews University. Cf. Without Fear, p. 172).

Andreasen's biographer, Virginia Steinweg, mentions another possible reason why Andreasen was not consulted. According to her, Andreasen had been requested by the General Conference Sabbath School Department to update his three-volume commentary, Isaiah, the Gospel Prophet, in connection with the church's daily Bible study guides for the first two quarters of 1957. However, due to a change in both personnel and policy, Andreasen's book was no longer needed, and this after he had gone to considerable time and effort to prepare a new manuscript. As a matter of principle, Andreasen demanded reimbursement to the tune of \$3000.00. Consequently, some believe that it was because of the hard feelings generated by this unhappy incident that he was not consulted in these conversations. (See Without Fear, p. 173.)



intact, discrete Remnant; (2) the perfecting of that Remnant through the atoning ministry of Christ in the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary; and (3) the absolute perfection of the saints necessary for the vindication of God and the actualization of the parousia.<sup>1</sup>

The alleged positions of Adventist leaders which seemed to threaten this threefold concern had to do with the nature of Christ and the atonement. Both areas, as is shown, were closely connected in Andreasen's theology.

"Novel" position on the nature of Christ

In regard to the nature of Christ during His incarnation, Donald G. Barnhouse, a participant in an extensive dialogue between Adventists and evangelicals in 1955,<sup>2</sup> reported that Adventist leaders had affirmed that it was "sinless, holy and perfect," and that any

---

<sup>1</sup>We should also bear in mind that Andreasen was fiercely loyal to his church. Even in the period of bitter conflict with church leaders, he would not hear of the idea of forming an off-shoot group (Letters: "A Resume," p. 13; cf. Andreasen to Bietz, 6 October 1961.) He approached doctrinal statements with extreme earnestness. In The Sabbath, Which Day? Andreasen indicated that the time had come for the fearless, uncompromising preaching of the total gospel, not a "water-and-milk gospel, an emasculated gospel of sickly sentimentality and spineless platitudes. . . ." The condition of the world, he said, called for a "positive, virile, strong, aggressive" Christianity, and "the best defense is offence." The strongholds of Satan must be "invaded and his defenses broken down. . . ." The present was not the time for the "apologetic attitude," but one in which the Remnant should move forward, "bearing aloft the banner: THE COMMANDMENTS OF GOD AND THE FAITH OF JESUS." (See pp. 212, 213.)

For more on Andreasen's strong conviction, see Gospel Prophet, I, p. 35; Gospel Prophet, II, p. 90; Faith of Jesus, p. 47; "The Suspension Story I," pp. 1, 2; Letters: "The Atonement," p. 16; "Shooting the Watchdog," p. 2, E. G. W. Research Center, Andrews University.

<sup>2</sup>See above, p. 174, n. 2.

other position was "completely repugnant" to them.<sup>1</sup> This affirmation offended Andreasen precisely because it put in jeopardy the idea of the sinless perfection of the Remnant. Whether Andreasen's concept of sinless perfection found its origin in an anthropological or in a Christological concern is difficult to determine with any degree of certainty.<sup>2</sup> What is clear is that he eventually came to deduct the notion almost, if not completely, from Christological considerations. This, in other words, was what supplied the working hypothesis, the underlying rationale, for his belief in the possibility of sinless perfection.

---

<sup>1</sup> See "Are Seventh-day Adventists Christians?" Eternity, September 1956, p. 6.

<sup>2</sup> However, there appears to be some evidence for an anthropological origin. In his discourse on the nature of man, Andreasen noted two characteristics which, above all, distinguished man from beast, namely, man's intellectual and spiritual qualities. Of these, by far the greater was the spiritual.

It is in his spiritual nature that man is most like God. Citing Eph 4:24, he noted that "man 'after God is created in righteousness and true holiness'." The meaning of this, claimed Andreasen, was that "man is created with a desire to emulate God in these aspects." Faith to Live By, p. 244; Man, Here and Hereafter: Whence Came We and Whither We Go? (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Publishing Assn., 1937), pp. 22, 23.

The significance of these "spiritual possibilities," as Andreasen saw it, was that "men may be raised above present earthly conditions and become fit companions for the angels in light." The spiritual likeness to God implies man's freedom of choice, he can "choose and determine his course of conduct and direct his energy toward carrying out his determination." Like his first parents, he can "will to sin," or "will to do right." (Faith to Live By, p. 245; Here and Hereafter, pp. 24, 25.)

Thus, man was created both with the desire for and the possibility of righteousness and true holiness. In Andreasen's theology, this meant sinless perfection, which man has the ability to choose. All this seems to point to an anthropological origin for his notion of perfection. However, there is no evidence that Andreasen's linkage of perfection to anthropology predated its connection in his mind with the perfection Christ attained.

As Andreasen understood it, Christ in His incarnation took upon Himself sinful human nature. He was not, as the book Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine<sup>1</sup> affirmed, "exempt from the inherited passions and pollutions that corrupt the natural descendants of Adam."<sup>2</sup> For him, no "heresy" could be "more harmful" than that which asserted that "God extended special favors and exemptions to Christ."<sup>3</sup> In effect, such a theory placed an indictment on God "as the author of a scheme to deceive both men and

---

<sup>1</sup> Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine: An Explanation of Certain Major Aspects of Seventh-day Adventist Belief (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1957). This book was a product of the SDA-evangelical conversations and represented the Adventist response to questions put to them by the evangelicals.

The book encountered a mixed reception among its Adventist audience. By all official accounts, it was widely hailed by the church's international leadership, as well as by a large number of its Bible teachers and theologians (see Reuben R. Figuhr to Andreasen 16 December 1957; Figuhr, "A Non-Adventist Examines Our Beliefs: The Background of Articles Appearing in 'Eternity' Magazine," RH, 13 December 1956, pp. 3, 4; Figuhr, "Questions on Doctrine," Ministry, January 1956, p. 29; Questions on Doctrine, pp. 7, 8). On the other hand, there were many who held misgivings (see Andreasen, "Atonement IV," 14 November 1957, p. 1, E. G. W. Research Center, Andrews University; "The Atonement," 15 February 1957, p. 3, E. G. W. Research Center, Andrews University; "Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine. Then [sic] Truth About Seventh-day Adventists (Martin)," October 1960, pp. 1, 2, E. G. W. Research Center, Andrews University; Vernon A. Jennings to Officers of the General Conference, et al., n.d. G.C. Archives; Merlin L. Neff, "Questions Concerning the Atonement as Discussed in Questions on Doctrine and in the Recent Letters of Elders Andreasen and Figuhr," n.d., G.C. Archives; Figuhr to Neff, 14 January 1958, G.C. Archives; A. L. Hudson to [Adventist] General Conference Executive Committee, 28 April 1958, G.C. Archives; Group Letter (with 21 signatures) to Committee for the Revision of 'Questions on Doctrine', n.d., G.C. Archives).

<sup>2</sup> See Questions on Doctrine, p. 383.

<sup>3</sup> Letters: "Was Christ Exempt?" p. 7.

Satan."<sup>1</sup> For since the original charge leveled by the devil was that obedience to the moral law, i.e., the ten commandments, was impossible for finite beings, Christ's incarnation was designed to "demonstrate" that man can, indeed, gain the victory over sin.<sup>2</sup>

Thus, to exempt from "inherited passions and pollutions" the very One who came to demonstrate that God's law can be perfectly kept would constitute an act of deception, a fraud. This would, ipso facto, invalidate Christ's role as our example; for "one who has not struggled with passions can have no understanding of their power," nor can he ever have "the joy of overcoming them."<sup>3</sup> Accordingly, the "new theology" of Questions on Doctrine must be regarded as the "acme of all heresy."<sup>4</sup>

It is now clear that Andreasen's opposition to the exemption idea was not "a matter of semantics only."<sup>5</sup> He genuinely felt that the position of church leaders, if accepted, would destroy "all

---

<sup>1</sup>Letters: "The Atonement," p. 15.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.; Letters: "The Incarnation," p. 11. In coming to this conclusion, Andreasen underscored the fact that he stood in very orthodox company, namely, Bible Readings for the Home Circle (Nashville, TN: Southern Publishing Assn., 1944), an official Adventist publication on doctrines, widely circulated amongst the public by the church's colporteurs. A statement on p. 21 of this work was an almost exact copy of Andreasen's position. (The statement is cited in Letters: "The Incarnation," p. 11.)

Andreasen maintained that "if Christ did not make perfection attainable, then He failed in the very point where the sacrificial law failed . . ." (Hebrews, p. 421).

<sup>3</sup>Letters: "The Atonement," p. 15; Letters: "The Incarnation," p. 7; "Review I," p. 2.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 8. In another place he described it as "heathenism of the worst kind" ("A Most Dangerous Heresy," p. 11; cf. pp. 4, 5).

<sup>5</sup>"Memorial," p. 10.

true religion" and completely nullify the plan of redemption.<sup>1</sup> His concern was that any denial of the consonance of Christ's human nature with ours automatically invalidates His experience as a model for us to copy. Thus it undermines and destroys the first phase of the atonement. The relevance of man's only true example of absolute perfection is destroyed, and with it the notion of the vindication of God in and through a sinless latter day Remnant. Moreover, all this makes for an uncertain parousia, since the occurrence of that event depends upon the perfecting of a final Remnant.<sup>2</sup>

"Novel" positions on the atonement

Two matters in respect to Adventism's "novel" position on the atonement disturbed Andreasen: (1) the idea that the atonement at the cross was "final" and (2) the concept of "bloodless atonement."

If the notion that Christ was "exempt" from "inherited passions and pollutions" destroyed the first phase of the atonement, the idea that the atonement at the cross was "final"<sup>3</sup> destroyed the

---

<sup>1</sup> Letters: "The Incarnation," p. 8.

<sup>2</sup> See Gospel Prophet III, p. 81; The Sabbath, Which Day? pp. 246, 255.

<sup>3</sup> See LeRoy E. Froom, "The Priestly Application of the Atoning Act," Ministry, February 1957, p. 10. What Froom was trying to do, evidently, was to put to rest allegations that Adventists somehow regarded the transaction at the cross as insufficient. Thus, he emphasized that what happened at the cross was "a single, transcendent act --once for all, all-sufficient, all-efficient, and never to be repeated." It was in this sense that he conceived of it as "final."

Froom had made it clear at the beginning of his article; however, that the atonement could neither be "limited just to the sacrificial death of Christ on the cross," nor to the ministry of Christ "in the sanctuary above, on the antitypical day of atonement . . ." (ibid., p. 10).

third phase of the atonement, that transpiring in the most holy place. In Andreasen's sanctuary theology, this last phase was a most crucial one. Regarding it as a "distinctly Adventist" position, he believed that it was in this phase that Christ was to fulfill His pledge to make men overcomers. It provided the setting for "the final demonstration of what God can do in humanity." Using "the last generation," the generation in which the moral and spiritual deterioration of the centuries is most pronounced, God will demonstrate His power to keep it from the strongest temptation. The work of atonement, therefore, cannot be finished without this final demonstration.<sup>1</sup>

So strong was his contention on this point that he suggested that "no Adventist can believe in a final atonement on the cross and remain an Adventist," for the belief in a final atonement at the cross "automatically cancels any other final atonement in 1844." Said Andreasen, "our message stands or falls with the question of the atonement."<sup>2</sup>

Thus he saw it as a grave error to de-emphasize the importance of the present atoning ministry of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary, for this would imperil the vital concept of the perfecting

---

<sup>1</sup>Letters: "The Atonement," pp. 11-14; cf. "The Atonement IX," p. 9. For pre-1955 references to sinless perfection in Andreasen, see Hebrews, pp. 52-61, 278, 279, 443; Following the Master (Nashville, TN: Southern Publishing Assn., 1947), pp. 59-63; Faith to Live By, pp. 53, 97-99, 312-13.

<sup>2</sup>"The Living Witness," p. 2. In the same article Andreasen charged top Adventist leaders with "base apostacy" [sic] and called upon them to either "repent or resign" (ibid.).

of the saints.<sup>1</sup> Linking the first and third phases of the atonement, he referred to a "fund" of obedience in heaven, provided through the perfect obedience of Christ during the first phase of the atonement. Through Christ's heavenly ministry since the cross, that "fund" has been freely drawn upon by Christians, but especially was this true "since 1844 . . . as God's people advance to holiness. . . ."<sup>2</sup> Therefore, to undermine the efficacy of Christ's closing ministry in the most holy place is to cut off the saints of the last generation from this vital "fund" of obedience laid up in heaven, precisely when it was most needed.<sup>3</sup>

In an effort to illustrate the richness of the Hebrew word "kaphar," Questions on Doctrine cited four instances of its use in situations unrelated to the sanctuary cultus. Of the four examples

---

<sup>1</sup>Andreasen movingly described his reaction upon first reading a statement in Questions on Doctrine, p. 381, which seemed to indicate that Christ was currently engaged in a futile, fruitless ministry in heaven (see "Atonement IV," pp. 5, 6). At first he simply "turned away and wept." If the statement was correct, then "we have lost our message" and "there was no longer any meaning to our teaching on the sanctuary" (ibid., p. 6; cf. "Atonement IX," p. 7).

It takes only a cursory examination of the context of that statement which caused Andreasen such keen distress to discern that the intention of its author(s) was quite the contrary. The aim of the passage in question was, evidently, to extoll the surpassing adequacy of Christ's sacrifice at the cross, in terms of its provisions for human salvation. Jesus, the statement indicates, pleads not as a common suppliant, but as "King." As such then that for which He pleads is not merely hoped for, but He has "already obtained it for us," it has been guaranteed by virtue of His death on the cross. See Questions on Doctrine, p. 381. (Emphasis theirs.) Far from stressing uncertainty and futility, the statement meant to stress quite the opposite.

<sup>2</sup>Letters: "Attempted Tampering," p. 6.

<sup>3</sup>This would entail a serious impediment in their striving for perfection. And so, regarding the concept of sinless perfection a hallmark of Adventism, Andreasen felt that "to repudiate Christ's ministry in the second apartment, now, is to repudiate Adventism." (Letters: "A Resume," p. 5.)

cited, only the first was described as "an atonement made evidently without a blood sacrifice, without any blood being sprinkled upon an altar."<sup>1</sup> There is really no evidence that it was designed to support a theory of "bloodless atonement." Listed along with the other three examples, it was perhaps merely intended to demonstrate the semantic range of kaphar and show the possibility of a wider concept of the atonement. However, to Andreasen, this tactic was both ill-conceived and patently contrary to sound theology. It was a betrayal of the very center of the atonement, for blood being "the means of atonement" there could be no atonement without it.<sup>2</sup>

What Andreasen was really concerned about, however, was not simply that the idea of "bloodless atonement" jeopardized the atonement, as such, but that it imperiled the third phase of that atonement. For in his commentary on Heb 9:20, he was at pains to emphasize that Christ could not enter the most holy place without blood, and it is precisely in the most holy place that the third phase of the atonement ensues. Speaking of the Levitical economy, he observed:

What gave the [earthly] priests the right of entrance [into the sanctuary]? Blood. Without this no man could enter. The high priest could enter the most holy once a year, but "not without

---

<sup>1</sup> Questions on Doctrine, p. 344.

<sup>2</sup> See Letters: "A Resume," pp. 4, 5; "Atonement VII," p. 4; "Atonement VIII: Bloodless Atonement," p. 1. Cf. Hebrews, p. 437; Sanctuary Service, pp. 92, 183; "The Intent of the Sacrificial System," p. 45. Andreasen appeared to envision the actual manipulation of blood in the heavenly sanctuary (see "Atonement VIII: Bloodless Atonement," p. 2, where he refers to the blood of Christ being "carried into the sanctuary" to be "sprinkled" onto the mercy seat).

Note that Andreasen did recognize, however, instances of bloodless sacrifices in the Old Testament. See Sanctuary Service, pp. 146-48.



blood" (Heb 9:7). Whenever he did enter, it was always "with blood of others" (Verse 25). This was the condition of admission.<sup>1</sup>

In a similar way Christ was to gain entrance to the most holy place in heaven through blood, His own.<sup>2</sup> Therefore, a "bloodless atonement" means that Christ does not enter the inner sanctuary to perform the final phase of the atonement. The idea imperils God's plan to make that final demonstration in the Remnant, the 144,000, "which constitutes the crown and pride of the finished mediatorial work of Christ."<sup>3</sup> In advocating the notion of "bloodless atonement," Andreasen warned, Adventists would thereby "forfeit . . . [their] right to exist as a separate denomination," or to "claim a special message and work beginning in 1844."<sup>4</sup> In other words, they would no longer be "the Remnant."

The concept of "the Remnant" was pervasive in the writings of Andreasen. In a work written to accompany a series of Sabbath School lessons on the book of Isaiah, he over and over again emphasized the concept of the Remnant, the peculiar people of God, whose separate identity and holiness must be preserved at all cost. They are described as the special object of divine protection.<sup>5</sup> He spoke of them as the "little hated sect" which ultimately came forth

---

<sup>1</sup> Hebrews, p. 441.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., p. 442.

<sup>3</sup> Andreasen, "Atonement VII," pp. 4, 5. It is necessary, wrote Andreasen, that both God and Satan should present their final "finished product" (A Faith to Live By, p. 307). Cf. The Sabbath, Which Day? pp. 216, 235, 236, 249.

<sup>4</sup> "Atonement VIII: Bloodless Atonement," p. 4.

<sup>5</sup> Gospel Prophet, I, pp. 29, 36, 38, 46, 49, 66, 88-90.

victorious, having withstood the 'shaking' time.<sup>1</sup> The Remnant rebuild the old waste places (Isa 58:12), restore discarded biblical truths,<sup>2</sup> are fiercely loyal to God, and exhibit perfect obedience to His commandments.<sup>3</sup> Identifying Adventists with "Laodicea," one of the seven churches of Rev 2, 3, he noted that that was "the last church of the seven." "There is no other," he said, "it is either that church or none. . . . There is no eighth church, there is no 'next' church."<sup>4</sup> In a week of prayer sermon entitled "Stay by the Ship," he plead with his audience "over and over to stay by the church no matter what--[for] it is going through to triumph."<sup>5</sup>

Accordingly, Andreasen saw the Seventh-day Adventist-Evangelical rapprochement as a threat to the discreteness of God's special eschatological people. Referring to Num 23:9, he suggested that God's people were to "dwell alone" and cease desiring "to be like the nations [churches] around" them.<sup>6</sup> He called for an end to "secret agreements" and other understandings "with other denominations who hate the law and sabbath, who ridicule our most holy faith."<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Gospel Prophet, II, pp. 21, 31, 35, 61.

<sup>2</sup>Sanctuary Service, pp. 273-74. See also The Sabbath, Which Day? pp. 223-26, 251-54.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 229; Hebrews, p. 439; Faith of Jesus, p. 9.

<sup>4</sup>"The Laodicean Message," p. 7. <sup>5</sup>Without Fear, p. 159.

<sup>6</sup>Letters: "Downgrading Mrs. White," p. 2.

<sup>7</sup>Letters: "Attempted Tampering," p. 14; Letters: "The Atonement," p. 7. In his earlier days, Andreasen had complained that "the disunion of Christendom" was "the disgrace of the twentieth century" (The Faith of Jesus, pp. 11, 12-16; cf. What Can a Man Believe? p. vi). He had suggested that all churches should

What Andreasen obviously feared was an Adventist compromise in the area of the sanctuary and atonement: "Take away from us the sanctuary question, the investigative judgment, the message of the 2300 days, Christ's work in the most holy, and we have no right to exist as a denominated people, as God's messengers to a doomed world."<sup>1</sup>

For this reason, Adventists ought to be content to "remain simply an unrecognized cult." Their role in God's final work of atonement is that of reflecting "the image of Christ fully." They have been specially selected by God to demonstrate that the work of Christ in perfecting a sinless character was not unique, but repeatable in His latter day saints.<sup>2</sup> Thus, in his theology, the Remnant constitutes the fruitage of Christ's atonement in the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary. "God," he asserted, "will yet have a people to whom He can point with pride."<sup>3</sup> In them will be fulfilled

---

put their creeds aside and simply listen to what Jesus said. In the present discussions, however, he seemed deeply concerned that Adventists were in danger of setting their creed aside.

<sup>1</sup>Letters: "Attempted Tampering," p. 14.

<sup>2</sup>"The Apostacy" [sic], p. 2; "The Atonement IX," p. 10. For more on the significance and role of a final Remnant, see Letters: "The Atonement," pp. 6, 7, 12, 13, 14; "Memorial," pp. 3, 4; "A Most Dangerous Heresy," p. 1; "The Atonement IX," p. 6; Andreasen to Froom, 2 April 1957, p. 3; "The Laodicean Message and Righteousness by Faith," RH, 9 November 1939, pp. 6, 7; What Can A Man Believe? p. 206; Faith of Jesus, pp. 549, 568; etc. Steinweg was correct when she indicated that Andreasen's "greatest contribution" to Adventist theology was "the challenge of the last generation" (Without Fear, p. 10). He described the 144,000 as "high priests" who (alluding to their Old Testament counterparts), as they prepared to enter the most holy place, must have not one "personal sin remaining," Hebrews, p. 450.

<sup>3</sup>Gospel Prophet, III, p. 63.

John 10:16.<sup>1</sup> They will provide "a demonstration of what the gospel can do for humanity."<sup>2</sup>

With this radical conception of the identity and role of the eschatological Remnant and his understanding of what transpired during these conversations, it is not surprising that Andreasen perceived the SDA-Evangelical rapprochement as a "dangerous situation." He was shocked to see "the church of the living God," a church specially commissioned to carry the gospel to the final generation, begging for entrance into the evangelical fold. "This is more than apostasy," he said, it is "giving up Adventism," the "rape of a whole people," a treasonous denial of "God's leading in the past."<sup>3</sup>

#### Summary

Andreasen's position on the sanctuary was largely patterned

---

<sup>1</sup>"And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold, and one shepherd." The Remnant then will comprise a people gathered from different places and circumstances, welded into "one fold," and listening to the voice of "one shepherd."

<sup>2</sup>Faith of Jesus, pp. 18, 10. This expression was one way in which Andreasen referred to the concept of sinless perfection. For other references in Andreasen to the Remnant motif, see *ibid.*, pp. 549, 568; Gospel Prophet, III, pp. 25, 68, 93, 94, 95; Saints and Sinners (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1951), pp. 180, 189, 190, 191; What Can a Man Believe? p. 206.

<sup>3</sup>Letters: "The Atonement," p. 7; cf. "The Apostacy" [sic], p. 1, where Andreasen described these developments as "the omega apostacy" (sic.) In a 1957 article, he made one of his strongest affirmations of the importance of the doctrine of the atonement (as traditionally understood in Adventism) for the very existence of the Adventist church. This doctrine, he declared, is the "center and core of Christianity." To tamper with it is to touch "the very heart of God." Any change in this doctrine "imperils our denominational existence, invalidates the three angel's [sic] messages, makes 1844 and the twenty-three hundred days a mistake, and completely annuls our teaching on the Spirit of Prophecy." ("Atonement IV," pp. 2, 3; cf. Letters: "Attempted Tampering," p. 14.)

after that of traditional Adventism, as reflected in Uriah Smith. This traditionalism was evident in all the major categories of the sanctuary doctrine: the locus of Christ's ministry upon His ascension, the cleansing of the sanctuary, the investigative judgment, etc.

But although his theology was, in the main, traditional, there were many instances of revisions and modifications. On the meaning of the expression "within the veil" in Heb 6:19, he seemed to abandon Smith's position, preferring to follow the lead of Andross in the latter's concession to Ballenger: Christ did enter the most holy place at His ascension for a brief ceremony of inauguration and consecration.

In regard to the defilement and cleansing of the sanctuary, there were also revisions. Thus, apart from being defiled by the transference of sin, the sanctuary, in certain instances, was also defiled by the failure to confess sin--very much the opposite of the traditional position. Andreasen also went beyond Smith in stressing a strong experiential aspect to the cleansing of the sanctuary.

So far as the investigative judgment was concerned, what stood out from the strictly historical approach was Andreasen's elucidation of the notion of the vindication of God in the process of the judgment inquiry. There was also the matter of a post-Advent investigation, elaborated in greater detail in Andreasen than ever before.

Changes which, again, seemed to reflect a Ballenger influence were evident in regard to the subject of the scapegoat.

Andreasen deviated from the common Adventist view in respect to the final disposition of sin and its penalty, coming out, even more strongly than Ballenger was able to do, with the assertion that the sins rolled back onto the head of the antitypical scapegoat (Satan) are his own, ipso jure.

Andreasen's delineation of three distinct phases of the atonement was also new, and his notion of the vindication of God through the sinless perfection of an eschatological remnant added a fresh dimension to Adventist sanctuary theology.

In spite of the difference in temper evidenced in the post-1955 period, there is only one Andreasen; his basic theological interests remain the same throughout. His fundamental concerns were for the intactness of God's final remnant, its continuance as a discrete people, its role in salvation history as a final showcase of God's power to produce absolute perfection in human beings, thus giving the lie to Satan's claims. In his thinking, the eventuation of the parousia was dependent upon the completion of this final phase of the atonement (the perfecting of the saints), since their use as a final cosmic exhibit of God's power must precede the eschaton.

The difference in temper was due to a perception on his part that these fundamental concerns, which had become part of the warp and woof of his theology, were in danger of compromise.

#### Evaluation and Critique

This evaluation and critique deals first with the salient features of Andreasen's sanctuary theology. Subsequently, it focuses

brief attention on the notion of sinless perfection which, though not an intrinsic part of the doctrine of the sanctuary as such was, nevertheless, seen by Andreasen as a major purpose of the final atonement in the most holy place.

#### "Within the Veil"

If the assumption is correct that Andreasen did feel the force of Ballenger's exposition of Heb 6:19, 20, and therefore found himself at a loss to defend the traditional Adventist view while, however, still clinging to it, then his treatment of the problem in Hebrews was a study in "theological diplomacy". Evidently, he regarded it as the better part of valor simply to avoid engaging the issue rather than attempting to defend an untenable position. In following Andross' lead, however, it is questionable whether he opted for a very convincing theological alternative. No one can deny that the earthly tabernacle services were preceded by a ceremony of dedication and consecration. But it is very difficult to conceptualize the need for such a consecration service in regard to the heavenly sanctuary. The earthly consecration and dedication were conducted as a way of pointing to the intrinsic holiness of that which pertained to the antitypical realities but were not anticipatory of corresponding heavenly activities. Not every aspect of the Old Testament cultus was to find an answer in the heavenly. Thus, the purification of the priests in preparation for ministry was not to be repeated antitypically, but was done only as a way of pointing to Him who is "holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners," "who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth" (Heb 7:26; 1 Pet 1:22).

Besides, Heb 6:19, 20 and Heb 9:23, 24 do not envision an entrance into the most holy place, followed by a hasty retreat into the holy place, let alone an entrance in which Christ does not see God but is seen by Him. As a way of justifying the traditional Adventist view in the wake of Ballenger's exegesis of these passages, such concepts are ingenious but unconvincing.

#### Defilement and Cleansing of the Sanctuary

Andreasen never tried to substantiate a theological connection between Dan 8:14 and Lev 16. Indeed, his use of the former text to validate the notion of a cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary was, at best, sparing.

Might he have been uneasy in regard to the exegetical problems involved? This is difficult to ascertain. But perhaps one should not make too much of this apparent disuse, for Andreasen was in the habit of citing certain texts commonly used by Adventists to defend their positions with very little, if any, exegetical elaboration.<sup>1</sup> Whatever the cause, however, Andreasen did not make any significant contribution to the exegetical problem in regard to the connection between Dan 8:14 and Lev 16.

His extrapolation from the red heifer ceremony, seeing in it the cleansing effected in baptism, seems rather contrived. Nor does his general statement in regard to the defilement of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Thus he used Rev 20:12, 15 and Dan 7:10 to validate the concept of an investigative judgment (*Sanctuary Service*, pp. 192, 305-07), and Acts 3:19 to advocate the blotting out of sin at the end of the anti-typical atonement, just before the parousia (*ibid.*, p. 192).



sanctuary because of unconfessed sin rest on any firmer ground than that of Ballenger, criticized in the preceding chapter.

If Andreasen's emphasis on the cleansing of the soul temple is evaluated apart from his notion of sinless perfection, one would have to recognize it as a legitimate dimension of the concept of the cleansing of the sanctuary. For it is quite evident from the record in Lev 16 that there was an experiential concern on the part of the participating Israelites. They "afflicted" their souls. They faced the occasion with deep solemnity. Certainly, they were concerned with more than the objective cleansing of a structure in their midst. The idea is inescapable that they perceived a vital connection between that objective cleansing and their personal, moral, and spiritual purification. If Adventists take the idea of the anti-typical cleansing seriously, then this emphasis of Andreasen will have to receive appropriate attention.

#### The Investigative Judgment

Andreasen's emphasis on the notion of the vindication of God through the investigative judgment was a valuable one. It was an effort to broaden the common perception of that activity as being concerned only with the sin of individual saints. The idea that God Himself is, in a limited sense, on trial, is attractive, both theologically and philosophically. It shows a God who can afford to be open and candid with the beings He has created, a God who, so to say, has nothing to hide.

It is somewhat surprising, though, that Andreasen should seem to be satisfied with the term "investigative" as a fit

expression to describe this judgment, given his broadening conceptualization of the activities involved. He would have done better to recognize the term as being the best at hand, rather than simply "the best," to describe the judgment in question.

Andreasen's detailed exposition of the post-Advent judgment, such as, for example, that each generation judges members of its own, and that the saints help set the sentence, leaves one wondering how he came into possession of such minute theological intelligence. It is certainly without any explicit scriptural indications, and, indeed, he made no effort to supply any. Clearly, such speculations amount to that which Andreasen himself assumed to be a reasonable procedure, informed by the principles of Western jurisprudence quite foreign to the original Biblical milieu.

Moreover (and this is a problem for Adventists in general), it is not as clear as Andreasen made it appear how the mere fact of participation in the proceedings of an investigative judgment ensures forever that no further question or suspicion will arise. Is it not true in this life that, notwithstanding one's exposure to the most detailed and convincing evidence on a given case, questions might yet arise at some future time? What is it that would make the situation different in the future life? Andreasen did not address himself to this philosophical problem.

The idea of conditional pardon, discussed both in connection with the cleansing of the sanctuary and the investigative judgment, tends to raise questions in regard to Christian security and assurance. It is highly questionable whether passages like Ezek 18:22,

24 and Matt 18:23-25 do indeed support this notion.<sup>1</sup> At any rate, the matter of sin being stored in the sanctuary until blotted out should be handled very delicately, for it is very vulnerable to misunderstanding. Nor is the situation helped by Andreasen's unfortunate reference to post-mortem responsibility. Regardless of his disclaimers and explanations, the idea is exceedingly destructive to the concept of Christian assurance. It is questionable whether this is, in fact, the emphasis of Rev 14:13 on which it seems to rest.

#### The Scapegoat

Much criticism and misunderstanding has arisen because of the loose way in which Adventists have expressed themselves on this question in the past. Andreasen, in the second edition of The Sanctuary Service, states the case in such a way as to forestall any charges of making a savior of the devil. Of the expositions presented by the three figures in this report, Andreasen's is the most attractive in terms of clarity and theological precision.

The question of the scapegoat is an intractable one, however, and, in spite of Andreasen's splendid attempt to solve its enigma, two questions still remain. First, how is it that Satan's part in

---

<sup>1</sup>The simple assertion of the Ezekiel text is that the good deeds, the righteousness of the man who apostatises, will be discounted. There is no mention of a throwing back upon his head previously forgiven sins. Presumably, his destiny is determined by the sins committed in his apostasy. The passage in Matthew was designed to answer a question posed by Peter concerning the nature or dimension of forgiveness (18:21). It is, in other words, a parable dealing specifically with the matter of forgiveness. Whatever is done to the unmerciful servant will happen only to those who fail to forgive their fellowmen (v. 35). To use this passage to suggest a roll-back of the apostate's former sins upon his head is unwarranted.

the sins of the righteous came to lodge in the sanctuary, since, as Andreasen explained it, that is what the high priest, in the typical service, confessed over the head of the scapegoat? If this is truly Satan's sin, then was it actually brought to the sanctuary by the blood of the sacrifice? Second, how, in the light of his explanation, can Lev 16:21 be explained: "And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the people of Israel, and all their transgressions, all their sins. . . ." <sup>1</sup> The passage seems utterly unaware of any obliteration of the sins of the people before this point. Nor is there any explicit or implicit indication that these sins are, in fact, the scapegoat's, or Satan's.

#### The Atonement

Andreasen's novel expostulation of a three-phase atonement is a commendable attempt to come to grips with the meaning of this central truth of the Christian faith. However, it is rather questionable whether such a theory has any basis in Heb 1:3. His use of this passage reveals the unwarranted conclusions to which one is likely to come through a refusal to allow the results of clear scriptural exegesis to stand, even when they fly in the face of one's own theories. For it was because of Andreasen's reluctance to allow for "a complete atonement at the cross" that he was led into an unwarranted exegetical treatment of the passage in question. It is rather strange that Andreasen should appear to be so much opposed to a finished atonement at the cross when that was a

---

<sup>1</sup>Emphasis supplied.

position which he himself had espoused and whose validity he had recognized.

He was correct, however, in criticizing the use of the word "final" to describe the atonement at the cross. Though the article in question did clearly present a concept of the atonement which embraced both the transaction of the cross and Christ's ministry in the heavenly sanctuary after 1844, the use of the word "final" tended to contradict exactly what it had affirmed, namely, a heavenly sanctuary atonement. Andreasen rightly pointed out that the use of that word was untenable.<sup>1</sup>

In calling attention to this problem, however, he tended to give the impression that what happened on the cross was somehow of lesser importance; that it, in a sense, stood in competition with other events in terms of its significance in salvation history. Thus he wrote:

Dreadful as were the sufferings on the cross they did not begin to compare with the sufferings of God from the time sin first entered in heaven. . . . There [on the cross] men saw the Son suffer. But the milleniums [sic] of sufferings which had gone before they did not see. What men saw was a sample of the suffering of God, which had gone on for ages and which constitutes the real cost of sin.<sup>2</sup>

With this said, Andreasen proceeded to offer this startling admonition: "Let not the cross hide from us the deeper aspects of the atonement, which includes the cross as a revelation, but which

---

<sup>1</sup>It is interesting to notice that the word was not used in Questions on Doctrine in connection with the atonement at the cross.

<sup>2</sup>"The Atonement," 15 February 1957, p. 4. Cf. "Atonement IX," p. 10. Here Andreasen contended that "our salvation was not accomplished by a few hours of sufferings, dreadful as they were." See also "Eternal Atonement," pp. 1, 2, and "The Atonement Central," pp. 2, 3, 6.

[sic] roots go back untold ages."<sup>1</sup> Whatever the reason, any attempt to undermine the centrality of the cross does serious theological disservice to the concept of the atonement, indeed to the plan of salvation itself.

Still, it is difficult to conclude that Andreasen's real purpose was to denigrate the cross. It is more likely that he was responding in this way in an effort to highlight Christ's ministry in the most holy place. Even so, his statements are to be regarded as untenable.

Moreover, his apparent inability to consistently hold in balance the notions of a complete atonement at the cross and a final atonement in the heavenly sanctuary is surprising--inasmuch as he relied so heavily on the writings of Ellen G. White for his theology. He was aware that she espoused this dual concept.<sup>2</sup> Yet he referred to her endorsement of an early article by Adventist pioneer O. R. L. Crosier as if to say that she endorsed, in particular, Crosier's view that the atonement was not made on the cross.<sup>3</sup> He professed to be in "full agreement" with L. E. Froom's basic

---

<sup>1</sup>"The Atonement," 15 February 1957, p. 4; cf. "Eternal Atonement," pp. 1, 2. It should be noted, however, that Andreasen had expressed this view long before his crisis with church leaders (see The Sabbath: Which Day? pp. 242-45).

<sup>2</sup>See Letters: "The Atonement," p. 12. He claimed he had found "seven statements that the atonement was made on the cross" and "twenty-two statements that the final atonement was made in heaven." And what lesson did he draw from this phenomenon?: "It is evident . . . that I may not accept one set of statements and reject the other if I wish to arrive at truth." (Ibid.) Yet this seems to have been what Andreasen was doing. (Cf. "The Atonement IX," pp. 1, 2.)

<sup>3</sup>Letters: "Downgrading Mrs. White," pp. 5, 6. Crosier's article appeared in a Millerite periodical, The Day Star, in an Extra dated 7 February 1846.

position vis-à-vis the concept of a dual atonement,<sup>1</sup> yet he used against him an 1874 Seventh-day Adventist position-statement which averred that the "atonement so far from being made on the cross . . . is the very last portion of his [Christ's] work as priest."<sup>2</sup> Such confusing theological signals are unfortunate.

#### The Concept of Sinless Perfection

As already noted, it is difficult to determine with any accuracy whether Andreasen's idea of sinless perfection had its genesis in his anthropology or in his Christology. Although there are some signals that it may have originated in his anthropology, its explicit expression and development were in the context of the atonement, particularly the first and third phases.

The emphasis on personal victory over sin was not an unreasonable one. At least three factors could account for it.

First, in the wake of two world wars, both of which seemed to many to put the world on the brink of Armageddon, it was natural to give serious consideration to the question as to why the parousia was not actualized in connection with either of the two calamities. Although Andreasen himself probably did not entertain such a militaristic conception of Armageddon,<sup>3</sup> it is reasonable that, given a widespread belief of this kind, he should develop a theology

---

<sup>1</sup>Letters: "Downgrading Mrs. White," p. 4; cf. "The Apostasy."

<sup>2</sup>"The Living Witness," p. 1; cf. "Fundamental Principles," ST, 4 June 1874, p. 3. Cf. Letters: "Attempted Tampering," p. 5. Adventists, he claimed in that last reference, had historically repudiated the idea of atonement at the cross.

<sup>3</sup>See Andreasen to McElhany and Branson, 25 December 1942, p. 5.

designed to explain why the end had not yet ensued. His idea of a moral and spiritual exhibition of a perfect Remnant seemed to be the answer.<sup>1</sup>

Second, it seems clear from the book of Revelation that there is something spiritually and morally special about the 144,000, which Andreasen identified with the Remnant. They are "sealed" in their foreheads as God's very own just before the final "winds" begin to blow on the earth (Rev 7:1-3); they stand with Jesus on the antitypical Mount Zion, the "Father's name written on their foreheads"; no one else is able to learn their song; they are described as "chaste," not having "defiled themselves with women," "and in their mouth no lie was found, for they are spotless" (Rev 14:1-5).<sup>2</sup>

Third, Andreasen ministered in a period which saw the rise of several movements as offshoots from Adventism.<sup>3</sup> Some of these,

---

<sup>1</sup>In one place Andreasen recognized the coming of Christ as the "only solution" to the problems of the world. He affirmed that "the time is near when God must intervene." Then he explained the impediment: "However, the Lord will not come till there has been one final demonstration both of the power of God and of the power of Satan. . . . Both God and Satan should present their finished product [their followers] that men may see and judge of the relative merits of the two antagonists. Only such a demonstration will satisfy the onlooking universe." Faith of Jesus, p. 563. Though this work was written in 1939, perhaps even before the start of the Second World War, my suspicion is not thereby invalidated. It only shows that the main impetus for his theology predated that second conflict, but was surely strengthened by it, as may be seen in his works written afterwards--for example, in Hebrews.

Perhaps the original impetus dated back to that 1919 call on the part of Adventist leaders for a return to an emphasis on righteousness by faith. Thus his notion of sinless perfection may be seen also as a response to that call.

<sup>2</sup>If one sees the 144,000 as being equivalent to the great multitude (Rev 7:9, 10) and not a small, distinct group, then much of the steam in Andreasen's argument dissipates.

<sup>3</sup>The Ballenger controversy (see chapter II of this work),



like the Davidian Adventists or Shepherd's Rod, placed strong emphasis on holy living. The Shepherd's Rod, in particular, stressed the importance of understanding "the truth of the 144,000 mentioned in Revelation 7" and the urgency of "a reformation" among Adventists.<sup>1</sup> Andreasen's emphasis on sinless perfection may, therefore, be seen either as a response to or a polemic against these movements, a preemptive attempt to steal their thunder, so to speak. For it would have been difficult to stress a more radical holiness than that which he was emphasizing. It was his way of profiting from the better side of "heresies."<sup>2</sup>

In the end, however, one has to come to terms with the question as to the validity of the concept of sinless perfection which, to a large extent, motivated Andreasen's sanctuary theology, and is so intimately tied to his concept of the atonement.<sup>3</sup>

---

together with the Pantheistic crisis occupied the first decade of this century. In the second, a Mrs. Margaret Rowen of Los Angeles, California, presented her claims to the prophetic office, provoking a good measure of debate in some quarters of Adventism. Then followed the emergence of the German Reform Movement, about 1915. Finally, as the third decade was coming to a close (1928/1929) the Shepherd's Rod Movement, under the leadership of Victor Houteff, was coming to the fore, a movement that was to claim the attention of church leaders for many years and bring considerable confusion into the rank and file. (For descriptions of the rise and teachings of these movements, see SDA Ency., s.v. "Davidian SDA's--Shepherd's Rod"; *ibid.*, s.v. "Reformed Seventh-day Adventists--Rowenite"; Light Bearers, pp. 445-60.)

<sup>1</sup>See Victor T. Houteff, The Shepherd's Rod: The 144,000 of Revelation 7--Call for Reformation, vol. 1 (Los Angeles, CA: Universal Publishing Assn., n.d.), pp. [5], [11].

<sup>2</sup>See Andreasen to McElhany and Branson, p. 4.

<sup>3</sup>Andreasen described the "demonstration" which Christ was to make in His saints on earth as "a work closely connected with that which He was to do in the sanctuary above, and vital to our salvation." He described the perfection of the saints as part of the

Andreasen based the idea of sinless perfection partly on his understanding of the purpose of the incarnation. Though this is not the place to enter into a discussion of that subject, it should be pointed out that there is a danger in seeing the mission of Christ wholly, or even primarily, in terms of a model, in the sense that Andreasen did. This ultimately removes the focus of attention from Christ to us. Given that conception, the human tendency will ever be to compare one's achievement, one's growth, with His perfect life, rather than laying ever stronger claims upon His righteousness. In the biblical understanding of righteousness by faith, the Christian relies ever more completely on the righteousness of Christ. In Andreasen's theology, there seems to be a diminishing need for that righteousness.

One is hard pressed to deny a dangerous emphasis on self-achievement, not to say legalism, in Andreasen's theology. The image of the 144,000, the Remnant, left in the mind of the reader, is one of a group of people who have "made it", somehow; and who, therefore, can claim an experience equal in quality and scope to that of Jesus. They have come to the place of "absolute perfection."<sup>1</sup> They are "overcomer[s] on . . . [their] own account."<sup>2</sup> This, I think, is the fruitage of an unguarded conception of the mission of Christ in terms of the "model man".

---

cleansing of the sanctuary (Hebrews, pp. 58, 60). This is the reason for the space given to this concept here.

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 467.

<sup>2</sup>"Eternal Atonement," p. 4. Cf. Sanctuary Service, p. 305 where Andreasen suggests that the outcome of the investigative judgment hinges on a person's "life and attitude."

Andreasen may also be criticized for having a kind of unilateral concept of sin, which made it easy for him to call on people to "get rid of every sin," "gain the victory over every besetment," "break every chain that binds," and "do that now, today."<sup>1</sup> It is not as though one would limit the power of God, but the suspicion is inescapable that such admonition is based upon a somewhat deficient notion of the chronicity and pervasiveness of sin in the human person. It fails to give due recognition to the fact that man is not a sinner for his sinning, but that his sinning stems from the fact that he is sinful, that, as Rom 7 seems to imply, sin precedes his sinning.

Andreasen's doctrine of sinless perfection must, therefore, be distinguished from the biblical doctrine of perfection which is always expressed in terms of maturity in Christ, rather than absolute sinlessness.<sup>2</sup> However, leaving aside his emphasis on absolute sinlessness, it should be recognized that his basic emphasis on personal victory over sin was sound and ought to be taken with utmost seriousness. In terms of its significance, it rose far above the vacuous speculations about Armageddon, the prophetic role of Hitler, and other aspects of current Adventist interest which he criticized.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Gospel Prophet II, p. 78. Emphasis supplied.

<sup>2</sup>Eph 4:11-14; 1 Cor 2:6; Phil 3:12-15; Col 1:28; 4:12. Cf. Hans K. LaRondelle, Perfection and Perfectionism: A Dogmatic-Ethical Study of Biblical Perfection and Phenomenal Perfectionism, 2nd ed. (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1975), pp. 183-98; cf. pp. 199ff.

<sup>3</sup>Andreasen to McElhany and Branson, p. 5.

Andreasen's approach to the doctrine of the sanctuary may be seen as an attempt to show that the significance of that teaching went beyond a set of theoretical formulations--that it had to do with the day-to-day spiritual experience of contemporary men and women, particularly that of God's eschatological chosen people.

## CHAPTER IV

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Great philosophical or theological issues are seldom resolved to the satisfaction of succeeding generations. Their very greatness, in fact, seems to lie in their ability to generate new ways of interpreting old dilemmas.<sup>1</sup>

#### Summary

The three figures studied in this dissertation exhibit an interesting variation in the basic motivation for their theology of the sanctuary.

In the case of Uriah Smith, there were three primary motivating concerns: (1) an urge to defend the salvation-historical importance of the Advent expectation of 1844; (2) a desire to attest the perpetuity and obligation of the law and the sabbath; and (3) a wish to preserve the belief in an imminent parousia. These three factors constituted the theological passion of his life, and the doctrine of the sanctuary, though possessing for him an importance all its own, was nevertheless called into the task of bolstering these basic planks which he regarded as the theological foundation of Adventism.

In his attempt to defend the theological importance of 1844,

---

<sup>1</sup>David R. Mason, "What Sense Does It Make to Say, 'God Knows Future Contingent Things'?" Journal of Religious Studies (Fall 1978/Spring 1979):27.

Smith sought to reinforce the basic Millerite chronology of Dan 8 and 9, affirming (1) the validity of the 457 B.C. commencement date for the 2300 days, (2) the thematic/theological connection between Dan 8 and 9, and (3) the applicability of the year-day principle to the prophecies of the two chapters. Thus Dan 9:25 (" . . . from the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem . . .") provided the starting point of both prophecies, with the application of the year-day principle placing the terminus of the 2300 days of Dan 8:14 in 1844.

His discussion of qôdesh was designed to identify the sanctuary of Dan 8:14 with the heavenly, thus showing the reasonableness of expecting some event to transpire there in 1844. The concept of a two-part heavenly ministry, derived from the daily/yearly ritual in the Old Testament, was emphasized all the more because it rendered the idea of a change of locus in Christ's heavenly ministry in 1844 theologically viable. His resistance to the concept of an atonement at the cross also sprang from a desire to establish the salvation-historical significance of 1844.

Smith connected the cleansing of the sanctuary in Lev 16 with that mentioned (on the basis of the KJV translation) in Dan 8:14. Thus he saw in the latter text a forecast of the commencement of the cleansing of the sanctuary on the antitypical day of atonement in 1844. This not only gave further theological importance to that date, but provided content in terms of an event to occur. To him, 1844 was the date when the door into the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary opened, according to Rev 11:19, just as that into the holy place closed. This "shut door" did not,

therefore, represent the close of probation, since the daily service in the ancient economy continued unbroken, even on yom kippur.

Smith's emphasis on a literal interpretation of the Biblical reference to the sanctuary was evidently not for its own sake. It was an effort to attest the perpetuity of the decalogue and the sabbath. The basic point he wanted to make was that the heavenly sanctuary was the "great original," and as such was equipped with its corresponding vessels of service. This means that when the apocalypse speaks of the disclosure of "the ark of his testament" in heaven (Rev 11:19), we are to see this as a confirmation of the perpetuity of the decalogue which in olden times was housed in the ark. By extension we are also to see in this disclosure the bindingness of the sabbath, since it was a part of the decalogue.

Smith's historicist approach to the interpretation of prophecy enabled him to place this disclosure of the ark in 1844, the time when the most holy place was opened for the first time. This anchorage of the sabbath idea in the sanctuary-prophetic matrix was seen by Smith as a major factor in the establishment of that doctrine among Adventists.

As an inheritance from the Millerite Movement, in which he participated to some extent as a lad of twelve, Smith cherished a belief in an imminent parousia. When he joined the ranks of early Adventism, he sought to preserve this element of the imminence of the second Advent, and again fell back on the doctrine of the sanctuary for assistance. In this connection, he stressed the notions of a cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary and an investigative judgment.

Taking his cue from the yearly service in the Old Testament, Smith emphasized, chronologically, that the cleansing of the sanctuary constituted the closing activity in Israel's ritual year. In the same way, the antitypical counterpart must comprise the very last portion of Christ's heavenly ministry in behalf of mankind before the parousia. Chronometrically, he pointed to the durational ratio of the daily ritual to the yearly in the ancient economy: three hundred and sixty to one. This suggested that the ministry of Christ in the most holy place, or the cleansing of the sanctuary and investigative judgment, must occupy a proportionately brief period, in comparison to His long 'daily' ministry in the holy place from the cross to 1844.

Thus the sense of urgency which characterized Smith's expositions throughout his life had its foundation not simply in the general Advent prophecies, but, more particularly, in his understanding of the meaning of the cleansing of the sanctuary and the investigative judgment. His position on the law and the sabbath had a similar basis. As he sought to influence his church to spread its message throughout the world, he wanted to affirm its prophetic origin and commission by stressing the salvation-historical importance of 1844.

Albion F. Ballenger, no less staunch in regard to the perpetuity of the law, developed, however, a burden for the doctrine of righteousness by faith. As he saw it, the greatest threat to that concept within Adventism was the doctrine of the sanctuary, as traditionally developed. Accordingly, the task of reformulating the sanctuary teaching in such a way as to conform and contribute



to the concept of salvation by faith in both dispensations became his primary goal. His belief that the outpouring of the latter rain upon the church awaited this correction of the church's cardinal teaching gave urgency to the task. For it was the outpouring of the Spirit in latter-rain power that was to swell the proclamation of the good news and thus usher in the parousia.

In pursuit of his basic theological objectives, i.e., righteousness by faith and Christian assurance, Ballenger sought to establish the notion of a heavenly priestly ministry from the fall to the cross, a ministry contemporaneous with that in the earthly sanctuary from the time of Moses. His point of departure in advocating this concept was Heb 6:19, 20, which he used to show that Christ commenced His ministry in the most holy place at His ascension. This being the case, the ministry in the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary had to occupy the period from the fall to the cross.

This belief suggests a continuous ministry in the heavenly sanctuary from the fall to the present time, making man's salvation ever dependent upon services in that sanctuary rather than on those conducted by earthly priests in the ancient tabernacle. Thus righteousness by faith in both dispensations is assured through a heavenly advocate in both. The purpose of the earthly sanctuary was that men may look through it to the heavenly sanctuary where Melchisedec and angel priests were there and then ministering in their behalf. To look through the earthly sanctuary to the heavenly was righteousness by faith, but to look to the earthly, that is, to depend upon its services for salvation, constituted righteousness by works.

In his discussion of the atonement Ballenger's purpose was to emphasize the concepts of righteousness by faith and Christian assurance through a finished, universal work of Christ on the cross. He regarded it as the essence of legalism to postpone the atonement until 1844, for in this way, it makes the atonement "depend upon what man had done for God instead of what God has done for man"--a reference to the investigative judgment (which, in traditional Adventist theology was equivalent to the atonement) in which man's acts play a vital role. Thus, 1844 marked the commencement, not of the "atonement for iniquity" but of the "atonement of judgment," in which the devil, as the antitypical scapegoat, will be judged.

Not only was the "atonement for iniquity" finished at the cross, it was also universally applicable. All men, and not just the saints, benefit from it. It lifts the entire race to the place where Adam stood before the fall, giving them, like him, an opportunity to choose eternal life.

His concept of the defilement and cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary diverged from that commonly held within Adventism. The sanctuary was defiled not by the sins of the penitent transferred there through the blood of animal victims, but through the mere commission of sin on the part of the entire human race. The blood of the sacrifice never defiled, in fact, but always cleansed. The sins of men were cleansed from the heavenly sanctuary when Christ sprinkled His blood there at His ascension. Man can rejoice, then, for the debt has been fully paid, his sin cancelled.

The idea of an investigative judgment was eventually rejected by Ballenger, evidently because, as he understood it, it

clashed with the notions of righteousness by faith and Christian assurance. He reinterpreted Rev 14:6, 7 to conform to the idea of assurance, seeing in the passage God's response to the oppression of His people by bringing punitive judgment upon their persecutors.

Ballenger genuinely hoped that his reinterpretation of the sanctuary doctrine might be accepted by the Adventist church, which would thereby have freed itself of grievous error which had impeded its progress from the start.

Milian Lauritz Andreasen, his interest in the sanctuary sparked by the 1905 Ballenger trial and his encounters with the defendant, poured his energies into that which he understood to be the center of Ballenger's concern, the atonement. His own primary interest regarding the atonement, however, was the perfection of God's final remnant in preparation for the parousia. This achievement was to be a product of the third or final phase of the atonement, transpiring now in the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary. This realization of absolute perfection on the part of the eschatological remnant, the 144,000, was regarded as crucial to the vindication of God's character and the actualization of the parousia.

Like Uriah Smith and Ballenger before him, Andreasen believed in the profound importance of the sanctuary doctrine, seeing it as crucial to the existence of Adventism. The major facets of the doctrine were developed along generally traditional lines, although he deviated somewhat on a few significant particulars.

For example, on the locus of Christ's ministry upon His ascension, he chose to follow the lead of E. E. Andross, rather than Uriah Smith. With Andross, he conceded that Christ did enter the

most holy place on His ascension, albeit for a ceremony of consecration, dedication and inauguration, and not for the purpose of commencing His priestly ministry there. This interpretation was a tacit admission that "within the veil" in Heb 6:19 did point to the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary.

On the question of the defilement of the sanctuary, Andreasen again seemed to concede Ballenger's position that the sanctuary may be defiled apart from the confession of sin and the transference of that sin to it by means of sacrificial blood. On the cleansing of the sanctuary he emphasized, in addition to the traditional position, the experiential aspect, something to which Smith did not devote a great deal of attention, preferring instead to stress the more objective cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary.

Smith had spoken of the vindication of God only in the context of the earthly life of Christ, a concept which was certainly familiar to Andreasen. But it was Andreasen who developed the notion of the vindication of God through the investigative judgment, thereby adding a new dimension in his treatment of this theme not present in Smith. Also, apart from the idea of a pre-Advent investigation in which the saints are judged, Andreasen pointed to a post-Advent investigation in which the saints participate in judgment of the wicked. Though Smith did hold this belief, it was left for Andreasen to develop in much finer detail.

Running through Andreasen's treatment of the sanctuary theme was his primary theological concern for the sinless perfection of an eschatological Remnant in preparation for the parousia. Traces of

this concern were shown to be present in all the major facets of the sanctuary treated by him, but nowhere was this concern more evident than in his development of the doctrine of the atonement. Of the three phases of the atonement isolated by him, it was the final one in the most holy place since 1844 which effected this condition in God's last-day saints, the 144,000. It was for this reason that Andreasen found it so difficult to live with the idea of a complete atonement at the cross. This he perceived to be a threat to that final, vital activity in the most holy place, indeed a threat to Adventism itself. Moreover, since the perfection of the saints was a condition of the parousia, any negation of the concept of a final antitypical atonement, could further delay the actualization of that event.

#### General Interpretive Assessment

This interpretive assessment deals with the sanctuary theology of all three figures taken together. It centers around three basic questions relative to the finding in this study: (1) the question of theological gain, (2) the question of theological synthesis, and (3) the question of basic theological motivation.

#### Question of Theological Gain

The question of theological gain may be stated as follows: Do the positions of Ballenger and Andreasen on the sanctuary give evidence of significant gains on that of Uriah Smith, either theologically or biblically?

Perhaps the most efficient way of answering this question is to reflect, briefly, on the major areas covered in the preceding

chapters: (1) the locus of Christ's ministry upon His ascension; (2) the literalness of the heavenly sanctuary and ministry; (3) the defilement and cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary; (4) the investigative judgment; (5) the scapegoat; and (6) the atonement.

The locus of Christ's ministry  
upon His ascension

Ballenger's treatment of Heb 6:19, 20 is so strong, exegetically, that it has to be regarded as a significant movement towards a closer affinity to the biblical testimony in regard to the meaning of the phrase "within the veil." His argumentation, based as it was on solid scriptural indications, far surpassed the value of Smith's on the same point. And inasmuch as the two positions were diametrically opposed to each other, Ballenger's is to be preferred.

The theological use to which Ballenger put his finding, however (namely, the notion of a pre-cross heavenly ministry), was clearly unsupported by explicit scriptural evidence, thus betraying an unevenness in the rigor of his exegesis.

Andreasen's position on the question of the locus of Christ's ministry at His ascension, while representing a concession of sorts to the biblicality of Ballenger's interpretation of Heb 6:19, 20, nevertheless presents an unattractive theological alternative. The need for a consecration service in heaven, involving Christ and the heavenly sanctuary accessories, tends too much to humanize the heavenly realities. Also, there seems to be an absence of theological seriousness in the suggestion (implied in Andreasen's position) that Christ only made a brief stay in the most holy place, hastily exiting into the first apartment for

His ministry there. Likewise, Andreasen's contention that Christ in this brief visit to the most holy place was seen by God but did not, necessarily, see God borders on the preposterous.

None of the figures appreciated the full implications of Heb 6:19, 20, but it was Ballenger who came closest to recognizing it.

The literalness of the heavenly sanctuary and ministry

Appropriate theological caution would deter an overly critical approach to the idea of a literal heavenly sanctuary corresponding, in terms of detail, with the earthly sanctuary; for the fact is that none of us has had any access to the reality. If the matter were to be objectively adjudicated, the onus would really fall on the non-literalist to prove his position, given the literalistic tone of the biblical revelation.

Yet there is an inner conviction on the part of many Bible students that the correspondence between the earthly and heavenly sanctuaries could not be in terms of a one-on-one relationship. Smith caught this point, but seemed to use it only when it was convenient to his position. Ballenger recognized it and hurled it against Smith's notion of a mobile heavenly throne. But it was Andreasen who probably gave the clearest expression of it.

While arguing for a "real ministry in heaven,"<sup>1</sup> Andreasen reminds us of the inadequacy of the type to portray heavenly realities in every particular. He called attention to the differences between the wilderness tabernacle and Solomon's temple,

---

<sup>1</sup>Andreasen, Hebrews, p. 273.

though both were constructed from divine stipulations. Commenting on the expression "example and shadow" (Heb 8:5), he asserted that "there are vital differences between the ministration on earth and the one in heaven. . . ." A shadow does not give an exact description of the object casting it.<sup>1</sup>

It is perhaps this awareness which kept him from reiterating Smith's contention in regard to a movable throne, or in regard to the confinement of Christ in the holy place on His ascension in literal conformity to the type. Yet in Andreasen's opposition to an alleged notion of "bloodless atonement," he leaves the strong impression that Jesus does manipulate His literal physical blood in the heavenly sanctuary.

For his part, Ballenger, in emphasizing the need for a "service in progress" in heaven if pardon was to be administered, also betrayed a serious literalism. Especially was this element of his theology evident in his assertion that Christ was barred from the most holy place until the cross, a cordon of angels guarding the way to the Father's throne.

On the basic question of a two-part heavenly ministry, there is no essential difference between Smith and Ballenger--so far as the purely physical aspect is concerned. Both see a literal, physical sanctuary, divided into holy place and most holy place. The difference is that in Smith, the ministry in the holy place begins at the ascension, while in Ballenger, it begins at the fall.

When one leaves the physical consideration, however, there

---

<sup>1</sup> Sanctuary Service, p. 179; Hebrews, pp. 273, 274.



are other significant differences. In Ballenger's system, Christ does not minister in the holy place, and there are alternative mediators--Melchisedec and the angels. His position also tends to relegate the cross to an auxiliary event, rather than afford it the central status given it in the New Testament. Ballenger's scheme, though esthetically neater is, nevertheless, scripturally unsupported.

Andreasen's position on this point did not exhibit any significant difference from that of Smith.

Defilement and cleansing of  
the heavenly sanctuary

Ballenger's explanation sees the cause of the sanctuary's defilement in the universal sinning of mankind, the household of God, rather than in the confession of sin on the part of the penitent. While there is a sense in which this position is true, it fails to give adequate attention to the more particular notion of ritual defilement. One gets the impression that there was a "normal" anticipated defilement of the sanctuary which, far from being condemned by God, was actually provided for in the cultus. On the other hand, the defilements to which Ballenger refers are strongly condemned by God, and there is no explicit indication of any corresponding ritual cleansing.

Based on this misunderstanding of the ritual defilement of the sanctuary, Ballenger proceeds to assert that at the ascension, when Christ sprinkled His blood upon the mercy seat, He cleansed the sanctuary of the sins of men, all men. It is extremely difficult to conceptualize what this can mean, inasmuch as men continue

to sin, and, presumably, continue to defile the sanctuary. Moreover, his idea that the cleansing of the sanctuary, begun in 1844, is directed towards the sins of the devil--a process in progress now for more than one hundred and thirty years--is unconvincing.

Andreasen reiterated Smith's basic emphasis in regard to the defilement and cleansing of the sanctuary. His apparent concession to Ballenger's position on non-confessional defilement of the sanctuary is not considered significant. However, his emphasis on the experiential dimension of that cleansing seems to make theological advancement. As already noted, the idea is not without its potential problems, but considered from a biblical standpoint, it is a valid and important emphasis. Regretably, the value of this gain has been marred precisely by Andreasen's succumbing to the perennial lure for sinless (absolute) perfection, a danger which had already affected Adventism in the middle of the 1890s to the end of the first decade of this century.<sup>1</sup>

#### The investigative judgment

I have argued that Ballenger's eventual rejection of the notion of an investigative judgment was probably due to his own understanding of it while an Adventist minister. His understanding was that a living person is lost whose name happened to come up in judgment while there was unconfessed sin in the heart. (This emphasis, incidentally, was not found in Smith, though it may have been

---

<sup>1</sup> See Bert Haloviak, "Pioneers, Pantheists, and Progressives: A. F. Ballenger and Divergent Paths to the Sanctuary," June 1980, pp. 1-11, passim, G.C. Archives; William H. Grotheer, The Holy Flesh Movement, 1899-1901 (Florence, MS: Adventist Laymen's Foundation of Mississippi, Inc., 1973).

stressed by others apart from Ballenger.) Furthermore, he believed that this notion made salvation dependent on human works.

With this conception of the investigative judgment, it is not surprising that Ballenger eventually rejected that teaching. By the same token, however, his rejection of it can be seen as unilateral and unnecessary. Clearly, the element of judgment involving Israel as God's chosen people was evident in the ceremonies and activities connected with yom kippur. And if, as Ballenger himself believed, the transaction in the heavenly sanctuary since 1844 bears some relationship to the ancient day of atonement, then the idea of a judgment affecting the saints cannot be dismissed as incompatible with the activities of the anti-typical day of atonement. While the particular way in which this notion was expressed may have been far from perfect, it was a mistake to reject the concept completely.

Curiously, the argumentation employed by Ballenger in rejecting the investigative judgment succeeded in placing emphasis on the vindication of the saints, a crucial dimension of a pre-Advent judgment, it would seem, wholly overlooked by Smith and not very clearly elucidated, as such, by Andreasen. The idea of the vindication of the saints, a basic ingredient of the apocalyptic genre,<sup>1</sup> gives a new dimension to the purpose of a pre-Advent judgment. It suggests that God is on the side of His saints, that His primary purpose in the judgment is not their condemnation but their vindication.

---

<sup>1</sup> Kenneth A. Strand, "Apocalyptic Prophecy; A Brief Introduction to its Nature and Interpretation (with Special Attention to Daniel and Revelation), " 20 June 1980, pp. 4, 5, G.C. Archives.

In this respect, then, Ballenger's emphasis was an important step forward, theologically and biblically. The picture of a pre-Advent judgment comes closer to completion, however, when the notion of the vindication of the saints is combined with that of the vindication of God and the assessment (investigation) of individual character, as found in Smith and Andreasen.

### The scapegoat

In their discussion of the scapegoat (Azazel), all three figures endeavored to safeguard the uniqueness of Christ as man's sin-bearer. Each one endeavored, in his own way, to show that the scapegoat does not participate in making atonement. But Smith was not always theologically precise and left himself open to Ballenger's criticism when he spoke of sin meeting its "just deserts in another quarter" following this atonement.

Interestingly, though, it is Ballenger who makes some of the most startling assertions in regard to the antitypical scapegoat, suggesting, in one place, that "satan will be offered as a 'sin-offering'," and that "he must bear the sins of the people until his final destruction."<sup>1</sup>

Andreasen, while seeming to take his cue from Ballenger, endeavored to provide a corrective to both him and Smith, evidently, taking the position that Satan suffers only for sins which are his own, ipso jure. However, the intractableness of the issue of the role of the scapegoat surfaces in the fact that Andreasen's treatment also left a central question, that regarding Satan's relation

---

<sup>1</sup>"Satan and the Cleansing of the Sanctuary," p. 3, emphasis his.

to the sins of the righteous, unanswered.

### The atonement

In his emphasis on a complete atonement at the cross, Ballenger's position was, of the three figures, the one which most nearly reflected the New Testament emphasis. Smith's refusal to admit of an atonement at the cross was both unwarranted and shortsighted. It led him to adopt certain interpretations which were exegetically untenable. Surprisingly, Andreasen, notwithstanding his historical vantage and his awareness of the position of Ellen G. White on whose writings he heavily depended, proceeded to champion Smith's opposition to an atonement at the cross. This was an unfortunate backward step.

Also unfortunate is the fact that Ballenger's position on the atonement itself cannot be accepted in toto, tinged as it is with false theological premises and emphases, such as its (theoretical) universalism, its tendency to confine the atonement to the cross, its emphasis on an atonement of judgment commencing in 1844 and involving the devil only, and its belief in the sacrifice of the devil. So the position of none of the three figures on this central Christian doctrine was satisfactory.

Thus, the positions of Ballenger and Andreasen, while evidencing theological gains in certain areas, represent negative developments in others. Also, the theological gains are not always an unmixed blessing but require a certain degree of eclecticism (as explained below). On the other hand, negative developments, as, for example, Ballenger's rejection of the idea of an investigative judgment, sometimes contain important elements of truth

which should not be overlooked simply because of the context in which they have been developed.

#### Question of Theological Synthesis

The question of theological synthesis is as follows: Is it possible to construct an Adventist theology of the sanctuary based on a synthesis of the contribution of these three figures? Was there sufficient continuity and consistency in their positions to make such a venture feasible?

It should be noted at the outset that there were several lines of agreement among the three figures in regard to the doctrine of the sanctuary. They all regarded the doctrine as important and central in Adventist theology. They all recognized the place of Old Testament typology in the interpretation of the sanctuary doctrine. All three believed in a literal heavenly sanctuary and a two-part heavenly ministry. They were also together on the 2300 days and its 1844 terminus, and each one attributed a salvation-historical significance to 1844.

Even some of the above areas, however, though showing an outward consistency, contained deeper layers of disagreement. On the idea of a two-part heavenly ministry, for example, there was a profound discrepancy between the positions of Smith and Andreasen on the one hand and that of Ballenger on the other. And though they were together as regards the theological importance of 1844, Ballenger would certainly not see eye-to-eye with Smith and Andreasen on the specific issue of what actually transpired then.

By way of illustrating Ballenger's radical reinterpretation

of the sanctuary doctrine, Smith's five-point definitive statement on the doctrine is repeated here:

1. That the sanctuary and priesthood of the Mosaic dispensation represented in shadow the sanctuary and priesthood of the present or Christian dispensation (Heb. 8:5).

2. That this Sanctuary and priesthood are in heaven, resembling the former as nearly as heavenly things may resemble the earthly (Heb. 9:23, 24).

3. That the ministry of Christ, our great high priest, in the heavenly Sanctuary is composed of two great divisions, as in the type; first, in the first apartment, or holy place, and, secondly, in the second apartment, or most holy place.

4. That the beginning of his ministry in the second apartment is marked by the great prophetic period of 2,300 days (Dan. 8:14), and began when those days ended in 1844.

5. That the ministry he is now performing in the second apartment of the heavenly temple, is "the atonement" (Lev. 16:17), the "cleansing of the Sanctuary" (Dan. 8:14), the "investigative Judgment" (Dan. 7:10), the "finishing of the mystery of God" (Rev. 10:7; 11:15, 19), which will complete Christ's work as priest, consummate the plan of salvation, terminate human probation, decide every case for eternity, and bring Christ to his throne of eternal domination.<sup>1</sup>

While Andreasen would readily endorse all five points of this statement with little, if any, qualification, Ballenger would be able to subscribe only to point number two. This makes it impossible to synthesize the positions of all three men into a homogeneous Adventist theology.

There is enough consistency and continuity in the positions of Smith and Andreasen, however, to make a synthesis of their positions into a unified theology possible. Such a synthesis, though, would need to reflect a theology in process of modification and development. For Andreasen's sanctuary theology did evidence

---

<sup>1</sup>"Questions on the Sanctuary," pp. 376, 377.

important nuances either undeveloped or underdeveloped in Uriah Smith. For example, the idea of the vindication of God through the investigative judgment was untouched by Smith, while the existential dimension of the cleansing of the sanctuary remained largely underdeveloped.

Conflicts in the two theologies in terms of minor details would also have to be recognized. For instance, the question of Christ's access to the most holy place upon His ascension and the role of the scapegoat and the idea of a non-confessional defilement of the sanctuary. However, these do not constitute matters of major importance.

But while it would be impossible to synthesize the sanctuary theology of these three figures into a unified whole, it is feasible to build a contemporary Adventist theology of the sanctuary, using their insights, however diverse they are in some points. Such an eclectic approach would need to discard or modify some features while retaining others with profit. Smith's argumentation in regard to the salvation-historical significance of 1844, for instance, might be improved and retained.<sup>1</sup> Ballenger's stress on the atonement

---

<sup>1</sup>It could be improved, for example, by using more up-to-date historical data, such as that employed by Siegfried H. Horn and Lynn H. Wood in their book, The Chronology of Ezra 7 (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1953, 1970). By means of reputable historical and astronomical data they establish the date 457 B.C. as the seventh-year of Artaxerxes Longimanus, and thus also the date of the decree referred to in Ezra 7:7-13; cf. 6:14. If this is the decree specified in Dan 9:25, then the date for it is assured. In another example, Jacques Doukhan has given some credence to the traditional Adventist position by presenting evidence of a linguistic theological connection between Dan 8 and 9. He has also argued in favor of seeing the seventy weeks of Dan 9:24 as part of the longer period mentioned in Dan 8:14. See Doukhan, "The Seventy Weeks of Dan 9: An Exegetical Study," Andrews University Seminary Studies (Spring 1979), pp. 1-22. See



at the cross and on Christ's entry into the most holy place at His ascension may be retained and shown to be compatible with the notion of an antitypical day of atonement commencing in 1844, as Adventists have traditionally taught.<sup>1</sup>

Ballenger's radical departure in the area of the sanctuary was of immense significance to the purpose of this study, for it raises an important question: whether Adventist theology would have been the beneficiary for adopting his position in toto. At this point in the development of the present study, it is possible to say that had Adventists thus adopted his position (with its notion of a precross angelic-Melchisedekian priesthood, its peculiar concept of universal atonement,<sup>2</sup> its idea of a second sin, etc.), it could have made them the theological laughing stock of Protestantism.

Clearly, this does not mean that Adventism may not learn a great deal from the issues Ballenger raised and championed. His many positive contributions to the theology of the sanctuary have already been noted.

---

also William H. Shea, "The Relationship between the Prophecies of Daniel 8 and Daniel 9," revised 2 May 1979, Biblical Research Institute Sanctuary and Atonement Study, 1979, G.C. Archives.

<sup>1</sup>As indicated below, this may be done by taking more seriously certain hints provided in the type and generally ignored by earlier interpreters such as Uriah Smith. The daily-yearly ritual, as well as the ceremonies peculiar to yom kippur, may be perceived in terms of a theological hendiadys, embracing in their application a dual concept of the atonement.

<sup>2</sup>There is no intention here to deny the idea of a universal atonement, as such. Raoul Dederen has shown how the notion of reconciliation as a universally applicable historic event may be expressed without at the same time denying the fact that "until God's offer of reconciliation has been received . . . no sinner is in fact reconciled to God." See Dederen, "Atoning Aspects in Christ's Life and Death (A Survey of the NT Evidence)," pp. 13, 28, Biblical Research Institute Sanctuary and Atonement Study, 1979, G.C. Archives.

## Question of Basic Theological Motivation

What is the value of recognizing that each of the three figures approached the doctrine of the sanctuary from the standpoint of a basic theological motivation other than the sanctuary itself?

The importance of this recognition is that it enables a better grasp of the three positions on the sanctuary. It allows us, in evaluating each one, to place its author's emphasis in correct perspective, by alerting us to the particular bias or biases he brings to the elucidation of the sanctuary theme. Without a knowledge of Smith's underlying motivation, for instance, it would have been difficult to fully understand his emphasis on the literalness of the heavenly sanctuary, and his insistence on a literal two-part heavenly sanctuary ministry. From a more practical standpoint, it might have proved helpful to Smith if someone who understood his basic motivation could have pointed out to him that an emphasis on righteousness by faith need not detract from the importance of the law and the sabbath--that, in fact, the disclosure of the ark (Rev 11:19) points to an emphasis on both justice and mercy, law and grace. For not only was it true that the decatalogue was housed in the ark, it was also true that that same ark was overlaid by the mercy seat. Since it was a conception of the law in the context of the sanctuary/prophetic matrix which produced Smith's adamancy, it might have proved effective if an effort to correct him could have started on the same grounds by pointing to the fact that the disclosure of the ark means also the disclosure of the mercy seat with all that that connotes.

Had there been a better understanding of Ballenger's basic

motivation, he might have been helped to see that his method of ensuring righteousness by faith in both dispensations was unwarranted. Perhaps he could have been led to understand that the Old Testament typical services, established as they were by God, could not be inimical to righteousness by faith, unless God Himself did not understand the concept. Because of a failure to grasp Ballenger's primary concerns, the debate over his position tended to center around the meaning of the veil in Heb 6:19, 20 and the architectural locus of Christ's ministry upon His ascension.

Similarly, Andreasen might have been shown that the concept of a complete atonement at the cross did not in any way threaten the notion of a final atonement in the heavenly sanctuary, nor vitiate the potential accomplishments of the same. Attempts could have been made to correct the notion of sinless perfection on other grounds.

Thus a knowledge of a theologian's fundamental concern(s) makes it possible (1) to understand better his theology, (2) to evaluate that theology more objectively and intelligently, and (3) to select from his emphases that which is theologically and biblically valid and viable, discarding other elements derived from his particular theological or ideological idiosyncrasy. This approach, if consistently followed, can be of immense advantage to any church in meeting theological challenges to its traditional beliefs.

#### Suggestions for Possible Improvement and New Approaches

##### Improvements

The earliest Adventist pioneers set the tone and basic pattern

for the enunciation of the sanctuary doctrine in the Adventist church. Their works became paradigmatic for future attempts at such enunciation.

In the early decades (1840s-1860s) Adventists directed their sanctuary apologetics to their former Millerite brethren. Their message was beamed primarily--one might even say exclusively --to this group, particularly those in the so-called "Advent Herald Party," the largest unit to emerge from the formerly united Millerite Movement.

In taking this approach, these early Adventists have left for posterity at least three important problems--in regard to (1) method, (2) language, and (3) content. These are taken up in turn. and will be followed by some other observations.

#### Method

The problem in regard to method is a legacy which the early Adventists themselves inherited from the Millerite movement. It is clear that from the start that movement was deeply concerned with chronology. The whole 1844 Advent expectation had its foundation in complicated chronological calculations centering around Dan 8:14.

The validity of the results of these calculations is not under question here. What is being suggested, however, is that this way of coming at the text (though legitimate in its own right) has, nevertheless, bequeathed to Seventh-day Adventists, as we have seen in Smith, a largely one-sided, mathematical orientation to the subject of the sanctuary.

Seen within the context of the 1840s-1860s, the method of these early Adventists (to whom Smith belonged) need not be

disparaged, as such. They correctly perceived the issue of chronology as a critical one. The validity of the 1844 prophetic terminus and, thus, the very raison d'être of their movement was at stake. The arguments they used were persuasive for their time.

However, this strong emphasis on chronology has led, in some Adventist circles, to a rigid and simplistic association of the essence of the sanctuary doctrine with the mathematical or chronological accuracy of the pioneers and subsequent Adventist expositors. So the least suggestion of the violability of an 1844 terminus for the 2300 days of Dan 8:14 is perceived immediately as a threat to the integrity of the doctrine of the sanctuary itself. In the eagerness on the part of the pioneers to establish the salvation-historical importance of 1844, the intactness of the doctrine of the sanctuary, quite apart from this historical particularity, did not emerge as it should.

#### Language

In forcefully addressing themselves to their audience, the pioneers (Smith included) used certain "peculiar" expressions, well calculated to find an answering chord in their hearers--words like "seventh month," "midnight cry," "the bridegroom," etc. These expressions, which constituted common currency for them and their listeners, have now been largely discontinued within Adventism, not necessarily because of any inherent theological error, but more likely because of their having outlived their usefulness. In addition, they were perhaps perceived as unnecessary apologetical handicaps.

The precedent set by this discontinuance of terminological usage paves the way for questions regarding the propriety or adequacy of other terms and concepts used in reference to the sanctuary doctrine. One that immediately comes to mind, because of its impediment to a primary figure in this report is the term "investigative judgment." This expression, coined in the 1850s by James White, soon gained wide acceptance among early Adventists. There is among contemporary Adventists, however, a growing discomfort with this expression.

Again, the theological integrity of the activity to which that expression points is not under question at this point. But the widespread misgivings on the part of an appreciable sector of Adventists, however emotionally or culturally oriented, should nudge the church into giving serious consideration to the appropriateness of the expression. Whatever its denotation, the connotation of the word tends to engender a high degree of personal anxiety and apprehension deemed by many to be inimical to the notions of security and assurance taught in the gospel.

Apart from the question of the appropriateness of the term, there is the added problem of its adequacy. It might be profitable for Adventists to assess whether the judgment activity contemplated by scripture in anticipation of the parousia is not much wider than that which the term "investigative" was meant to describe. And if this is so, whether the continued use of the expression does not encourage, and contribute to, a constricted conceptualization of the dimension of that judgment.

To contemplate the expendability of a particular expression

is not, ipso facto, to question the validity of the theological concept which gave rise to it. Terminological changes may result simply from a sense of concern for the reasonable sensibilities of one's perceived audience, whereas any change in the basic idea should be mandated by scripture only.<sup>1</sup>

The term "pre-Advent judgment," an expression which is finding growing acceptance within contemporary Adventism, might be given consideration as a viable replacement term, being much less offensive and, potentially, much more comprehensive in its perception of the possible scope of the present judgment activity. A more neutral term, it also has the added advantage of diverting attention away from itself, focusing rather on the idea of judgment. Under the general notion of a pre-Advent judgment, the idea of an 'investigation' need not be excluded. It only needs to be given its appropriate place as one aspect of a wide-reaching judgment activity.

Another example of the use of language suggests itself here. The position of the Adventist pioneers was that in 1844 Jesus went, for the first time, into the most holy place to commence His closing work in behalf of men. Was this language appropriate? Was it theologically sound?

---

<sup>1</sup> Terminological changes, as well as changes of a more substantial nature, are not unknown in Adventism. For a theological shift regarding the concept of an atonement at the cross, for example, see "Fundamental Principles," art. 2, SI, 4 June 1874, p. 3; "Fundamental Beliefs of Seventh-day Adventists," art 14, 1933 Year Book of the Seventh-day Adventist Denomination (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn.), p. 6; "Session Actions: Fundamental Beliefs of Seventh-day Adventists--Church Manual Revision," art. 9, RH, 1 May 1980, p. 25.

These early Adventists were steeped in Old Testament typology, and in expressing themselves as indicated above, they were merely using typological language. Without question, they conceptualized this change of locus in a literal, physical sense. But that is really not the issue. It is, rather, whether their language was appropriate. On this, one would have to conclude that, from a scriptural standpoint, it was. Moreover, the historical setting in which the doctrine emerged suggests that apologetic effectiveness must have been a primary consideration in its development. The Adventist pioneers were dealing with an audience accustomed to thinking in concrete terms and not much given to abstract, philosophical reasoning or speculation. The pioneers' unstudied approach possessed that element of concrete precision which lent itself well to the mind-set of their audience. Their ideas may not have been accepted with open arms, but no one genuinely misunderstood them.

Having had much more time for reflection, Adventists today may wish to de-emphasize the notion of a physical movement from one compartment of the heavenly sanctuary to the other. They may consider it more appropriate to call attention to the theological implications of 1844 in terms of a change of phase in Christ's heavenly ministry. But this should not be to disparage the "crude" language used to bring this fact to the attention of mid-nineteenth century New Englanders. As Gustaf Aulén has observed:

. . . the historical study of dogma is wasting its time in pure superficiality if it does not endeavour to penetrate to that which lies below the outward dress, and look for the religious values which lie concealed underneath.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Gustaf Aulén, Christus Victor: An Historical Study of the



Paraphrasing Luther, Aulén remarked that "always the doctrine of Divine things is set forth in crude outward images. . . ." <sup>1</sup>

One suspects that it was not so much the language of these Adventist pioneers that was precarious. It was not even their theology. It was, rather, their exegesis--specifically, their thematic connection between Dan 8:14 and Lev 16 based, primarily, on the word "cleansed" in the Authorized Version. That connection has proved difficult to sustain on the basis of the methodology they employed. Here is one of the most sensitive areas of the Adventist doctrine of the sanctuary. It was not their language in this case, it was their exegesis.

#### Content

The third problem, that of content, may be detected in a common Adventist gibe in regard to the sanctuary: "You don't have to know how to compute the two-thousand three hundred days," it is commonly said, with a degree of sarcasm, "so long as you believe in Jesus." It is not necessary to disagree with the intent of that remark in order to see that it says something about a common Adventist misunderstanding of the content of the doctrine of the sanctuary. What that twit reveals is that there is a prevalent tendency to associate the sanctuary with mathematical and chronological computations in the common Adventist mind.

This situation probably has important significance for the global work of Seventh-day Adventists. If the doctrine of the

---

Three Main Types of the Idea of Atonement, trans. A. G. Hebert (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1969), p. 47.

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., p. 109.

sanctuary is an important one, then apart from having theological depth to challenge the keenest mind, it must also be capable of reduction to the level of ordinary, unsophisticated people in the backwoods villages of the world. One suspects that the complicated mathematical and chronological calculations with which the doctrine has been traditionally associated have created, even in the mind of twitters, the idea that that constitutes the foundation of the sanctuary truth. So that the feeling is engendered that everything said about the sanctuary, in any context, can only be said after this mathematical/chronological dimension has been conveyed and mastered.

This seems to be a matter for urgent theological reappraisal. It must be determined what is, indeed, the absolute, fundamental core of the doctrine, that which, in other words, is urgent for every person on earth to grasp, however different in cultural orientation, however lacking in intellectual acumen.

Adventists did not begin to produce their best works on the subject of the sabbath until they were emancipated from the constant need to defend it. In regard to that particular doctrine they now have "come of age," have become sure of themselves, have acquired theological poise. Thus they are able to approach the subject otherwise than in the heat of doctrinal controversy, a factor which has contributed to the in-depth treatment of that particular doctrine. It is an experience which Adventists may want to extend to the doctrine of the sanctuary if this facet of their teaching is to be fully developed and supplied with the kind of content that can meet the needs of people everywhere.

However, up to now, Adventists, traditionally, have tended to be rather nervous and apprehensive in regard to this doctrine. This nervousness may be traced, in part, to an understandable preoccupation with the "distinctive" aspects of it, a preoccupation, which, ironically, has resulted in a lack of assurance in regard to the biblicality of those elementary aspects of the doctrine which are absolutely fundamental to it: (1) that there is a heavenly sanctuary; (2) that Jesus Christ is the minister (High Priest) of that sanctuary; (3) that the Old Testament cultus constitutes a major source for acquiring insights into the theological implications of the heavenly sanctuary;<sup>1</sup> and (4) that something is

---

<sup>1</sup>This does not imply a literalistic transference from the Levitic cultus to the heavenly antitype or archetype. Neither does it contradict the notion of the theological/ideological priority of the heavenly 'cultus'. What it means to recognize is that the Old Testament types provide us with a basic conceptual framework for understanding the meaning of the heavenly sanctuary. The many references to the ancient ceremonies in the book of Hebrews not only instruct us in regard to the superiority of the heavenly reality, but also provide an inspired hermeneutic of the Levitic cultus.

But while the book of Hebrews shows us the true way in which the ancient economy points to the new, it does not claim to have exhausted that way, or to have spoken the last theological word about the meaning of the old cultus. Surely, it leaves room for fresh insights based on its own inspired interpretation, on other biblical data, and on the old cultus itself.

The suggestion, based on the example of Hebrews, that our contemplation of the heavenly sanctuary should start with that sanctuary rather than with the earthly, that "the true nature of the type can only be distinguished by first understanding the archetype, not vice versa" (see A. P. Salom, "Exegesis of Selected Passages of Hebrews 8 and 9," pp. 8, 31, June 1980, G.C. Archives) is an attractive one, especially in view of past hermeneutical abuses. However, what it seems to forget is that the author of Hebrews was no ordinary hermeneut, and thus his admirable precedent is not one that the common interpreter can follow, however desirable that might be. This means that once we admit that Hebrews did not say all that could be said about the heavenly sanctuary, we are back again exactly where we were before that book came upon the scene. And we can say nothing new about the heavenly sanctuary by

transpiring there now that has a vital bearing on human salvation.<sup>1</sup> Such biblically well-attested fundamentals may appear to be, prima facie, quite unimportant, but they seem to lie at the foundation of the sanctuary doctrine. To advocate them in their entirety is already to say vastly more than the typical Protestant or Catholic would venture. Their scriptural validity as well as their theological moment should help create the emotional poise necessary for creative thought. The content of the sanctuary doctrine will thereby stand to gain.

#### Other Observations

A primary contention of this study was that all three Adventist figures examined showed a deep appreciation for the centrality of the doctrine in and of itself; but that, nevertheless, each one proceeded to use it to foster other theological concerns, even more fundamental to him. Furthermore, as it turned out, each one utilized the doctrine to defend apparently widely different theological interests.

This raises at least two questions: (1) Is this use of the doctrine of the sanctuary legitimate? and (2) If so, how can it be brought within reasonable limits and control?

We consider the second question first. Without some

---

beginning with that sanctuary. The Levitic cultus must therefore be regarded as basic. The challenge is to seek to follow, as closely as possible, the example provided by the inspired hermeneutic in Hebrews in our understanding of it. But it is simply impossible to begin initially with the heavenly sanctuary.

<sup>1</sup>For example, see Heb 4:14-16; 8; 9:11-24; 10:11-13, 19-25; Rev 4; 5; 15:5-8; 16:1.

form of control, the doctrine, as evidenced in the theology of the three figures studied, becomes somewhat malleable, its meaning and significance depending, in a sense, on the particular theological slant of the one using it. We have seen, for example, how Smith used it to defend and advocate the law and the sabbath, and how his understanding of the prophetic timeliness of his emphasis prevented him from appreciating the need for a corresponding emphasis on righteousness by faith.

On the other hand, that which Smith failed to derive from the doctrine of the sanctuary was precisely what Ballenger came to emphasize in it, thus betraying a possible subjectivity in the approach.

Andreasen's use of the sanctuary in advocating the sinless perfection of the eschatological remnant also diverged widely from the stress given in Smith and Ballenger.

In spite of its shortcomings, however, the practice of using the sanctuary concept in the elucidation of other biblical themes can hardly be faulted. No biblical subject can be studied in complete isolation from others to which it is related. But perhaps the common problem on the part of all three figures was a failure to allow the doctrine of the sanctuary sufficiently to speak for itself in reasonable isolation before proceeding to make applications and develop relationships to other themes.

Thus, in attending only to the significance of the content of "the ark of his testament" (Rev 11:19), Smith largely seemed to forget the mercy seat which covered it. In giving all his attention to the latter, Ballenger neglected to notice the aspect of individual

accountability (judgment) portended by the content of that ark. In his penchant for sinless perfection, Andreasen tended to confine himself to a largely anthropocentric emphasis in terms of the absolute eradication of sin from the latter-day saints.

Another glaring example of this failure to listen on the part of the three figures studied in this dissertation was in regard to the atonement, a doctrine which lies at the center of the Christian faith, and also, as Adventism believes, at the core of its teaching on the sanctuary. It is remarkable that the position of none of the three figures on this question has proved to be wholly satisfactory, for each one adopted a unilateral approach to it, based on his own particular interests. It is important to observe on this very issue that the continued failure to let the doctrine of the sanctuary sufficiently speak for itself--in its entirety and in isolation--can yet lead to serious and unnecessary theological conflict within Adventism.<sup>1</sup>

This would be unfortunate. For it is noteworthy that the doctrine of the atonement is one of the areas of Christian theology

---

<sup>1</sup>A useful example of the kind of listening that is necessary has been provided by Frank L. Chaney in one section of his "Letters," directed specifically to Andreasen's position on the atonement. Chaney attempts to show how the book of Leviticus validates the notion of an atonement at the cross as well as an atonement in the heavenly sanctuary. ("Letter No. 1: The Atonement," pp. 2, 3, n.d.; and "Letter No. 2: The Atonement in the Sanctuary in Type and Antitype," pp. 1ff., n.d., E. G. W. Research Center, Andrews University.) Chaney's "Letters" are non-technical, but follow a basic approach which appears to be sound. They constitute the kind of listening that can lead away from an "either-or" approach to the question of an atonement at the cross versus one in the heavenly sanctuary commencing in 1844.

in which Adventists can make a unique contribution. Perhaps it is providential that this central tenet of the Christian faith should have been left open-ended. No universally recognized creedal statement constricts its scope, for the Christian church was unable to reach consensus here. The theories of the atonement, like ancient monuments along a well-traveled route, bear witness to the perennial human quest to comprehend the full scope of the saving work of God in Jesus Christ.

In the light of this, it would seem that the Adventist understanding of the atonement in terms of the sanctuary cultus has the potential of incorporating all the valid elements present in the historic theories, as well as opening up new dimensions of this saving, reconciling activity of God in Christ.<sup>1</sup> It would be tragic if this opportunity should be let to slip, either because of a stubborn traditionalism on the one hand or a misguided passion to conform to Protestant orthodoxy on the other.

Finally, it should be observed that the common contribution of all three figures studied in this report was an emphasis on the eschaton. Smith, for his part, seemed to believe that the imminence of the parousia was so strongly fixed in the prophetic mandate that a "delay," as such, however unexpected, was not to be a matter for theological rationalization.

However, by the time we come to Ballenger, frustration over

---

<sup>1</sup> For a good example of how this may be done see Fritz Guy, "The Ultimate Triumph of Love: An Adventist Understanding of Atonement," pp. 9-18, Biblical Research Institute Sanctuary and Atonement Study, 1979, G.C. Archives. This paper presents a challenging interpretation of the atonement.

the "delay" has begun to set in, and what has now become a trend in Adventism begins to show: theological reasons are presented to explain the "delay," and blame for such delay is attributed. Ballenger saw the reason in Adventism's unwillingness to expunge error from its teachings on the sanctuary, an attitude which prevented the vital experience of the latter rain.

Andreasen, with the same concern, turned inward. The parousia was delayed, he felt, pending the perfecting of the saints. When God's people could be presented as a perfect moral and spiritual exhibit before the world, the end would come.

An urgent task of Adventist theologians would seem to be that of helping their church out of this sense of frustration over the "delay" of the parousia, without, at the same time, leading it into a state of lethargy and ennui. While the doctrine of the sanctuary does suggest the element of urgency (cleansing of the sanctuary, investigative judgment), it also seems to indicate that God is ultimately in control, and that the role of man in regard to the actualization of the Advent, though important, is a limited one. This concept must be developed and emphasized.

#### New Approaches

It is perhaps appropriate that this chapter should close with a few brief tentative suggestions for possible new approaches to the study of the sanctuary. These approaches are new, not in the sense that they have never been utilized before, but only in the sense that their use has not hitherto found either official or widespread acceptance in the Adventist church.



Three such approaches are mentioned: a phenomenological approach, a psychotherapeutic approach, and a quasi-typological approach. The purpose for mentioning these here is only that they may serve as pointers, not as models of the particular approaches.

#### A phenomenological approach

Phenomenology, as one definition puts it, is that philosophical discipline which seeks to conduct a descriptive inquiry into the most fundamental structure of human experience, into those essences which are most immediately present to our consciousness. The phenomenology of religion attempts to listen to, and come to grips with, the common religious "language" and experience of mankind--phenomena which often transcend cultural barriers.

Adventists are fortunate to have already an important work in this area dealing with the book of Hebrews.<sup>1</sup> William Johnsson, its author, has made the point that the book of Hebrews will only unlock its deep secrets as we approach it with a methodology adequate to its nature. And the methodology he recommends, and whose adequacy he effectively demonstrates, is the phenomenological.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>The reference is to William Johnsson's "Defilement and Purgation in the Book of Hebrews."

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 97-116. Briefly, what Johnsson has done is to approach the interpretation of Hebrews within its own milieu, against the background of general information gathered from the common religious experience of mankind. This approach avoids a unilateral imposition of Western logic or philosophy on the biblical cult; and seeks, rather, to understand it in the light of those patterns or "'structures' which emerge from the data of [universal] religion." In this context, the 'primitive' language of the cult no longer tends to create embarrassment. Instead it is appreciated for the directness with which it reveals "how man in his existential concerns sees himself in relation to his fellows, to deity, and to cosmos." See *ibid.*, pp. 98-100; note also Aulen's high recommendation of this methodology for the study of the atonement, in Christus Victor, p. 64.

It would be greatly beneficial if a study could be made of some of the cultic books of the Old Testament, in particular, the book of Leviticus, from the standpoint of phenomenology. In his work on Hebrews, Johnsson is concerned to show the "nature and interrelations of the religious terms 'defilement', 'blood', and 'purgation'."<sup>1</sup> These are the very concepts which confront the reader of Leviticus. Only, perhaps due to the greater distance from us, culturally and temporally, they appear rather more pungent, more stark, more vulgar. It is perhaps for this reason that the typical Adventist tends to ignore much of the book, concentrating primarily on the eleventh, sixteenth and twenty-third chapters. He probably finds it uncomfortable, even perhaps contemptible, to deal with the notions of defilement and blood. He reads of unclean women, made so by the blood of menstruation or childbirth (chapter 12); leprous men, even houses! (chapters 13, 14); of unclean men and women rendered thus by discharges from their bodies (chapter 15). It all seems to fly in the face of contemporary Western cultural norms.

Yet it is precisely in the context of such coarse "unscientific" language that we find the basic description of yom kippur (chapter 16), a central concept in Adventism. That description, moreover, appears as a continuation of the general discussion of defilement, blood, and purgation.

How is our twentieth-century world-view to be reconciled to this "primitive" language and outlook? This question can only be

---

<sup>1</sup> "Defilement and Purgation," p. 98.

answered, it would seem, by giving due heed to the phenomenology of religion. The meaning of such language for the ancients must first be determined. It must be ascertained what particular concepts were being communicated by its use.

The phenomenologist, recognizing the fact that the ancient Israelites existed in a particular cultural context, must seek to understand their religious literature, in this case their cultic habits and patterns, within the thought world of the ancient Near East. Kristensen has observed, on the particular notion in question, that the practice of "ritual purification" occurs in "most religions," and that "only on the basis of comparative study of corresponding data is it possible to ascertain" its meaning.<sup>1</sup>

There is need, then, for an overall approach of this kind to the book of Leviticus, among others. In pursuing it, the contribution of people, who, through birth and culture, are closer to the biblical milieu should be actively sought.<sup>2</sup>

This approach perhaps offers one of the best hopes of breaking down prejudice arising from certain cultic statements, practices, or peculiarities found in the biblical record and seen by Westerners as primitive, crude, or vulgar. It also provides a most effective methodology for getting at the root of this ancient 'primitive' wisdom and has the potential of clarifying for us many hitherto

---

<sup>1</sup>W. Brede Kristensen, The Meaning of Religion: Lectures in the Phenomenology of Religion, trans. John B. Carman (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1960), p. 4.

<sup>2</sup>Johnsson indicated that the significant experiences of his life which provided the impetus for his study came to him while a missionary in Southern Asia and in contact with Eastern religions.

unsolved or misunderstood cultic enigmas.

A psychotherapeutic approach

The psychotherapeutic approach ties in with the phenomenological. It has long been observed that the desire for expiation and appeasement is a universal phenomenon in human experience: A prisoner on death-row insists on the carrying out of his sentence; a group of religious devotees indulge in self-flagellation or some form of penance; a primitive tribe sacrifices one of its members to appease an angry god. Perhaps one of the lessons to be learned from these universal occurrences is that deep within man is a consciousness of moral/spiritual alienation, a recognition of his own culpability, and a need for expiation. As Culpepper observed, "the sense of guilt expresses itself in the fear of punishment and even in what the psychiatrists call the need for punishment."<sup>1</sup> Man's crying thirst is for reconciliation--with God, with the cosmos, and with himself.

It is being increasingly recognized today that a large proportion of the physical disorders that people suffer have their ultimate source in the mind, a sense of guilt being one of the primary factors. Typically, psychologists and psychiatrists have adopted a nonreligious, even anti-religious, approach to the solution of these problems, believing, in some cases, that religion itself constitutes a major cause of guilt. In thus using religion as a culprit for the cause of guilt, modern psychology and

---

<sup>1</sup>Robert H. Culpepper, Interpreting the Atonement (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1966), p. 14.

psychiatry seem to be battling against a most fundamental reality of human experience--the universal sense of uncleanness, of moral estrangement, of sin. It is unlikely that any diversionary secular approach to this deep-seated human problem will ultimately succeed.

The psychotherapeutic approach should seek to demonstrate, from a "scientific" viewpoint, how the biblical doctrine of the atonement answers this deep-seated human need. In pursuing this methodology, the relevance and value of those aspects of the atonement (defilement, blood, intercession, purgation, judgment) which do not always comport with the norms of so-called "advanced" cultures, will be recognized and appreciated for what they really are.

Take the concept of judgment, for example. The common tendency within evangelical Protestantism is to create the impression that the idea of a judgment of the saints, particularly the idea of an investigative judgment, is irreconcilable with the gospel and, moreover, inimical to Christian assurance. The value of a psychotherapeutic approach would be to demonstrate, empirically, that the universal desire for appeasement, for penance and the like, points to a deep-seated human need that sin be treated seriously, and that the sinner be held accountable.

This means that an "easy gospel," one which chooses to ignore the more austere elements of the biblical revelation, is more likely to produce a shallow, emotional euphoria, rather than a deep-seated confidence and assurance. It is the undisciplined child, the one who has not been impressed with the need for accountability, which shows the greater tendency towards feelings of

insecurity. The genius of the Christian gospel is not that it arbitrarily releases one from responsibility but that it removes the insecurity by pointing to Jesus as the universal "city of refuge." Perhaps this approach would demonstrate that the universal conception of "sanctuary" as a place of refuge and safety is not accidental but represents the other side of this need for judgment.

The basic task of this approach would not be to create a new natural theology, but to show how the doctrine of the sanctuary, particularly the atonement, answers to the basic psychological orientation of man.<sup>1</sup> If the atonement, in a sense, is God's way of banishing anxiety of every kind and of bringing His universe together again in a state of security, then one suspects that His method of doing so should find an answering chord deep within the human psyche. The task of the psychotherapeutic approach would be to make this fact explicit through a competent utilization of the most up-to-date and reliable scientific information. It would, necessarily, have to be an interdisciplinary venture combining the efforts of medical and social experts in various lines working, of course, in close cooperation (or consultation) with the theologian. In this way, yet one more aspect of the atonement might be brought to light, thus helping to complete the total picture of its enormous scope and significance; and in the process touching, perhaps, a new audience previously unaffected by traditional approaches.

---

<sup>1</sup>See Don S. Browning, Atonement and Psychotherapy (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1966), p. 15.

A quasi-typological approach

The quasi-typological approach would seek to explore the broader implications of certain experiences and occurrences connected with the Old Testament sanctuary and cultus. Unlike the strict typological approach, it would seek to deal with certain questions not specifically related to the theological significance of the immediate sanctuary ritual and paraphernalia and attempt to draw out the possible theological or religious significance of certain incidental aspects of the "sanctuary complex".

Consider, for example, Num 1:50-53:

. . . they [the Levites] are to carry the tabernacle and all its furnishings . . . and shall encamp around the tabernacle. When the tabernacle is to set out, the Levites shall take it down; and when the tabernacle is to be pitched, the Levites shall set it up. And if any one else comes near, he shall be put to death. The people of Israel shall pitch their tents by their companies . . . but the Levites shall encamp around the tabernacle of the testimony, that there may be no wrath upon the congregation of the people of Israel. . . .

Here one gets the picture of the tabernacle in the center, encircled by the Levites, first, and then by the various tribes of Israel. From this arrangement, one may draw the basic inference of the sanctuary as symbol of the divine presence in the midst of His people. Thus the present text becomes a beautiful fulfillment of Ex 25:8: "And let them make me a sanctuary, that I may dwell in their midst."

Broadening out, one may see in the arrangement a proleptic statement regarding the coming One. For, describing the Messiah, Matthew intimated that "his name shall be called Emmanuel (which means, God with us)."<sup>1</sup> And John, in an even clearer allusion to

---

<sup>1</sup>Matt 1:23.

this ancient tabernacle arrangement, declared that "the Word became flesh and dwelt [literally, tabernacled] among us, full of grace and truth. . . ." <sup>1</sup> And, as if to recall the glory of God settling over the Hebrew tabernacle in the sight of Israel, John added: "We have beheld his glory. . . ." <sup>2</sup>

The Levites, according to Num 1:50, 53, were to occupy the area immediately surrounding the tabernacle. The reason for this is expressly stated: the layman who approached unbidden within the sacred precincts was to be killed (vss. 51, 53). Thus, the passage teaches both the immanence and transcendence of God. Though tabernacled in the midst of His people, God was still the transcendent, unapproachable One--the deus absconditus (Luther). There is the implied need for a 'buffer,' a middle man, a mediator.

The earthly, pro tempore mediators could provide only limited access. But the Mediator from heaven could provide unlimited access by means of Himself. In Christ the barrier is broken down, and thus the apostle could write: "Let us then with confidence draw near to the throne of grace. . . ." <sup>3</sup>

Another example may be cited:

And those to encamp before the tabernacle on the east, before the tent of meeting toward the sunrise, were Moses and Aaron and his sons, having charge of the rites within the sanctuary. . . . <sup>4</sup>

Ballenger once made the point that the door of the tabernacle was located on the eastern side so that as the worshipper looked in its direction his back would be turned toward the East.

---

<sup>1</sup> John 1:14.

<sup>2</sup> John 1:14.

<sup>3</sup> Heb 4:16.

<sup>4</sup> Num 3:38.



This, Ballenger felt, was a symbolic repudiation of sun worship widely practiced among ancient peoples.<sup>1</sup> This seems a valid observation; and he could have expanded on it. The tents of Moses, Aaron, and Aaron's sons were pitched permanently on the eastern side of the tabernacle, looking towards the door. This might be seen as a standing polemic against sun worship on the part of the highest spiritual leaders of Israel in their capacity as representatives of God.

This arrangement probably has far-reaching implications for the nature of true worship. A good case might be made to show that in every national spiritual crisis in Israel, the central issue was that of worship.<sup>2</sup> The New Testament picks up the theme. Before the coming of the day of the Lord, says Paul, the "man of lawlessness" is to be revealed, "the son of perdition, who opposes and exalts himself against every so-called God or object of worship, so that he takes his seat in the temple of God, proclaiming himself to be God."<sup>3</sup> The apocalypse, also, refers to a power which blasphemes God's name and God's tabernacle, and which receives universal allegiance and worship.<sup>4</sup> By contrast, an angel from heaven issues a universal call to men to "worship him who made heaven and earth, the sea and the fountains of waters."<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Our Answer: Why Do Seventh-day Adventists Suffer Imprisonment. . ., p. 6.

<sup>2</sup>See Deut 10:12-22; Josh 24:14, 15; 1 Kgs 18:20, 21, 22-40; 2 Chron 28:1-7, 16-25; 36:11-21.

<sup>3</sup>2 Thess 2:3, 4, emphasis supplied.

<sup>4</sup>Rev 13:6, 8.

<sup>5</sup>Rev 14:7.

Judgment is threatened against this power and those in alliance with it, and frequently in the apocalypse that judgment is seen as proceeding from the East, an allusion it would seem to the physical arrangement of the ancient tabernacle. In Rev 7:2 the angel having the seal of the living God, that is to say, the angel which proceeds from His throne, ascends "from the rising of the sun," that is from the East. In Rev 16:12, a passage which comes in the context of a prophetic portrayal of the battle of the day of God, we hear that the river Euphrates dries up "to prepare the way for the kings from the east."

In Rev 15 which depicts the preparation for the outpouring of the seven last plagues (described in chapter 16), John sees "the temple of the tent of witness in heaven . . . opened."<sup>1</sup> It is from this open 'eastern' door that the vial-armed angels come. As these preparations are completed, the temple fills with smoke "from the glory of God and from his power."

In the Old Testament, such special manifestations of the glory of God in the temple were always times of significant moment for the nation of Israel.<sup>2</sup> So here, this manifestation is an omen of the cosmic judgments to follow. The "kings of the east" mentioned under the sixth plague (Rev 16:12) actually ride forth only in Rev 19:11-16. Thus the cosmic denouement of the ages occurs as the Lord rides out from the 'eastern gate' of the heavenly temple.

The value of the quasi-typological approach is that (1) it

---

<sup>1</sup>Rev 15:15.

<sup>2</sup>Ex 40:34, 35; 2 Chron 5:13, 14; 7:1-3; Isa 6:1-4.

allows Adventists to say something theologically significant about the sanctuary independent of (though not unrelated to) those "distinctive" aspects which have tended to dominate the traditional presentation of the subject in the Adventist church; (2) it draws from the sanctuary theme something deeply theological and spiritual, but, at the same time, readily convertible into the intellectual and experiential 'currency' of various cultures and peoples; and (3) it provides a good introduction to the more "distinctive" aspects of the doctrine.

In approaching the biblical text in this way, one needs to be constantly on guard against allegorical speculations, into which this method can easily degenerate. With appropriate caution, however, the possibilities of this approach seem endless. A plethora of passages wait to be developed in this way--for theological, homiletical, and pastoral purposes.

#### A Final Word

The pursuit of new approaches to the study of the sanctuary should not be at the expense of efforts to resolve those questions arising from the historical Adventist approach. For notwithstanding the contribution of the three figures studied in this report, as well as the contribution of other Adventist expositors, serious questions remain unresolved. The most critical would seem to relate to (1) the salvation-historical significance of 1844; (2) the theological relationship between Dan 8:14 and Lev 16; (3) the day-year principle; and (4) the validity of the concept of an investigative judgment.

Though it was beyond the scope of the present study to engage in a constructive development of the doctrine of the sanctuary, it may be remarked in closing that no evidence to which this study had access was considered fatal to any fundamental area of this doctrine as developed by Seventh-day Adventists. As already noted, there are outstanding problems which call for serious theological and biblical study in the light of contemporary questions and issues. But none of these seems impossible of resolution.

The final chapter commenced by observing that "great philosophical or theological issues are seldom resolved to the satisfaction of succeeding generations."<sup>1</sup> The question which Adventism must ask itself, however, is whether it possesses the theological and emotional sangfroid to pursue the resolution of at least some of the more pressing problems of the sanctuary to the satisfaction of the present generation.

---

<sup>1</sup>Emphasis supplied.

## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Uriah Smith

### Primary Sources

#### Books and pamphlets

The Biblical Institute; A Synopsis of Lectures on the Principal Doctrines of Seventh-day Adventists. Oakland, CA: Pacific Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Assn., 1877.

A Brief Sketch of the Life and Labors of Mr. and Mrs. James White, with Testimonials. Battle Creek: Review and Herald, [1879?].

The Four Universal Monarchies of the Prophecy of Daniel and the Kingdom of God. Rochester, New York: Advent Review Office, 1855.

Here and Hereafter; or, Man in Life and Death: The Reward of the Righteous and the Destiny of the Wicked. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1897.

"The Longest Prophetic Period in the Bible--The 2300 Days of Dan VIII, 14.": In Tabernacle Lectures Comprising a Series of Discourses Setting Forth the Doctrines of Seventh-day Adventists Delivered at the SDA Tabernacle, Battle Creek, Mich., and Reported for the Battle Creek Daily Journal, pp. 100-05. Battle Creek: Review and Herald, 1885.

Looking Unto Jesus; or, Christ in Type and Antitype. Battle Creek: Review and Herald Publishing Co., 1897.

Looking Unto Jesus; or, Christ in Type and Antitype. Advertisement Pamphlet. Battle Creek: Review and Herald Publishing Co., [1897?].

The Marvel of Nations. Our Country: Its Past, Present and Future, and What the Scriptures Say of It. Battle Creek: Review and Herald, 1887; Oakland, CA: Pacific Press, 1887.

The Prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation. Revised ed. Nashville, Tennessee: Southern Publishing Assn., 1944. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1944.

Replies to Elder Canright's Attacks on Seventh-day Adventists. Battle Creek: Review and Herald, 1895.

The Sanctuary and the Twenty-Three Hundred Days of Daniel VIII, 14.  
Battle Creek: Steam Press of the Seventh-day Adventist  
Publishing Assn., 1863.

The Sanctuary and the Twenty-Three Hundred Days of Dan. VIII, 14.  
Battle Creek: Steam Press of the Seventh-day Adventist  
Publishing Assn., 1877.

Synopsis of the Present Truth; a Brief Exposition of the Views of  
S. D. Adventists. Battle Creek: Seventh-day Adventist  
Publishing Assn., 1884; Oakland, California, Pacific Press,  
1884.

Thoughts, Critical and Practical, on the Book of Daniel. 2nd ed.,  
revised and enlarged. Battle Creek: Seventh-day Adventist  
Publishing Assn., 1885.

Thoughts, Critical and Practical, on the Books of Daniel and the  
Revelation; Being an Exposition, Text by Text, of these  
Important Portions of the Holy Scriptures. Battle Creek:  
Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1881.

Thoughts, Critical and Practical, on the Book of Revelation. Battle  
Creek: Steam Press of the Seventh-day Adventist Publishing  
Assn., 1865.

Thoughts, Critical and Practical, on the Book of Revelation. 3d ed.,  
revised and enlarged. Battle Creek: Seventh-day Adventist  
Publishing Assn., 1885.

The 2300 Days and the Sanctuary. Advent and Sabbath Tract No. 5.  
Rochester, NY: Advent Review Office, [1854?].

The Visions of Mrs. E. G. White, a Manifestation of Spiritual Gifts  
According to the Scriptures. Battle Creek: Steam Press  
of the Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Assn., 1868.

The Warning Voice of Time and Prophecy. Rochester, New York:  
James White, 1853.

### Articles

"About the Judgment." Review and Herald, 15 October 1901, pp. 672,  
673.

"Another Attack." Review and Herald, 12 March 1889, [p. 168] and  
19 March 1889, p. [182].

"Another Time Set." Review and Herald, 27 January 1891, p. 56.

"Are the Dates Correct?" Review and Herald, 26 January 1897,  
pp. 56, 57.

- "The Atonement. Not Made on the Cross--In Process Now." Review and Herald, 30 Jan. 1894, p. 70.
- "Between the Cherubim." Review and Herald, 6 March 1888, p. 152.
- "Bible Reading on the Sanctuary: What the Sanctuary Is." Review and Herald, 23 July 1889, p. 472.
- "Bible Reading on the Sanctuary, No. 2: Its Furniture and Uses." Review and Herald, 30 July 1889, pp. 488, 489.
- "Bible Readings on the Sanctuary--No. 3: The Service of the Sanctuary and What it Accomplished." Review and Herald, 6 August 1889, pp. 504, 505.
- "Bible Reading on the Sanctuary--No. 4: The Cleansing of the Sanctuary." Review and Herald, 27 August 1889, pp. 536, 537.
- "A Big Parenthesis." Review and Herald, 28 July 1891, p. 472.
- "A Bird's Eye View of the Great Field of Prophecy." Review and Herald, 6 January 1876, pp. 5, 6.
- "The Blood of the Cross." Review and Herald, 30 March 1897, p. 202.
- "Body and Spirit Are His." Review and Herald, 9 August 1898, pp. 509-10.
- "Christ the Theme of the Bible." Review and Herald, 14 September 1897, p. 584.
- "The Chronological Position of the Atonement." Review and Herald, 8 May 1888, p. 296.
- "The Cleansing of the Sanctuary." Review and Herald, 2 October 1855, p. 54.
- "Daniel 9:27." Review and Herald, 11 March 1890, p. 152.
- "A Difficulty Explained." Review and Herald, 15 April 1890, p. 232.
- "Final Fate of the Candlesticks." Review and Herald, 31 December 1901, p. 850.
- "The Great Central Subject." Review and Herald, 22 November 1881, p. 328.
- "How Long?" Review and Herald, 23 February 1897, pp. 120, 121.
- "Is the Silence in Heaven During the Cleansing of the Sanctuary?" Review and Herald, 18 December 1856, p. 52.

- "The Judgment." Review and Herald, 8 June 1897, pp. 360, 361.
- "Justified Without the Law." Signs of the Times, 2 August 1877, p. 236.
- "The Last Warning to the Church." Signs of the Times, 16 December 1880, pp. 563, 564.
- Letter to the Editor. Review and Herald, 9 June 1853, p. 16.
- "Let us Alone." Signs of the Times, 26 July 1877, p. 228.
- "The Mark of the Beast and the Commandments of God." Signs of the Times, 2 December 1880, p. 536; 9 December 1880, pp. 550, 551.
- "The Marriage Supper." Review and Herald, 7 December 1897, pp. 777, 778.
- "The Message from the Sanctuary." Signs of the Times, 25 November 1880, pp. 522, 523.
- "Miller's Mistake." Review and Herald, 16 October 1883, p. 648.
- "The Mind of Christ." Review and Herald, 16 March 1897, p. 168.
- "The New Volume." Review and Herald, 1 January 1889, p. 8.
- "The New Volume." Review and Herald, 6 January 1891, p. 8.
- "A Notable Anniversary." Review and Herald, 29 October 1901, p. 704.
- "O Brother, Be Faithful." Hymn No. 173. The Church Hymnal: Official Hymnal of the SDA Church. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1941.
- "The Origin and History of the Third Angel's Message," Nos. 1-8. Review and Herald, 2 December 1890-27 January 1891.
- "The Present Burden of the Advent Movement." Signs of the Times, 28 June 1877, p. 204.
- "Position of the Advent Herald Party on the Sanctuary Question." Review and Herald, 12 May 1853, p. 204.
- "Queries on the Sanctuary." Review and Herald, 21 January 1890, p. 40.
- "A Question of Dates." Review and Herald, 19 November 1889, p. 728.
- "Questions on the Sanctuary." Review and Herald, 14 June 1887, p. 376.



- "Questions on the Sanctuary." Signs of the Times, 5 August 1875, p. 308.
- "Questions on the Sanctuary." Signs of the Times, 12 August 1875, p. 316.
- "Remarks on Luke XIII, 23-25." Review and Herald, 26 May 1853, p. 4.
- "The Sanctuary." Review and Herald, 27 September 1887, p. 616.
- "The Sanctuary." Review and Herald, 4 April 1854, p. 84.
- "The Sanctuary. Second Paper--Connection with Prophecy." Review and Herald, 13 January 1876, p. 12.
- "The Sanctuary. Third Paper--Exposition of Dan. 8." Review and Herald, 20 January 1876, p. 20.
- "The Sanctuary. Fourth Paper. Daniel 8, Continued." Review and Herald, 27 January 1876, p. 28.
- "The Sanctuary. Fifth Paper--The Year-day Principle." Review and Herald, 3 February 1876, p. 36.
- "The Sanctuary. Sixth Paper--Dan. 8 Explained by Dan. 9." Review and Herald, 10 February 1876, pp. 44, 45.
- "The Sanctuary. Seventh Paper--'Determined', Dan. 9:24, Means 'Cut Off'." Review and Herald, 17 February 1876, p. 52.
- "The Sanctuary. Eighth Paper--The Seventy Weeks." Review and Herald, 24 February 1876, p. 60.
- "The Sanctuary. Ninth Paper--The Commandment to Restore and Build Jerusalem." Review and Herald, 2 March 1876, p. 68.
- "The Sanctuary. Tenth Paper--Date of the 70 Weeks." Review and Herald, 9 March 1876, p. 76.
- "The Sanctuary. Eleventh Paper--Messianic Dates." Review and Herald, 16 March 1876, p. 84.
- "The Sanctuary. Twelfth Paper--Closing Remarks on Time." Review and Herald, 28 March 1876, p. 92.
- "The Sanctuary. Thirteenth Paper--The Original Advent Faith." Review and Herald, 30 March 1876, p. 100.
- "The Sanctuary. Fourteenth Paper--What Is the Sanctuary?" Review and Herald, 6 April 1876, p. 108.
- "The Sanctuary. Fifteenth Paper--What Is the Sanctuary?" Review and Herald, 13 April 1876, p. 116.

- "The Sanctuary. Sixteenth Paper--Points of History." Review and Herald, 20 April 1876, p. 124.
- "The Sanctuary. Seventeenth Paper--Points of History." Review and Herald, 27 April 1876, pp. 132, 133.
- "The Sanctuary. Eighteenth Paper--Points of History." Review and Herald, 4 May 1876, p. 140.
- "The Sanctuary. Nineteenth Paper--The Temple." Review and Herald, 11 May 1876, pp. 148, 149.
- "The Sanctuary. Twentieth Paper--Destruction of the Temple." Review and Herald, 18 May 1876, p. 156.
- "The Sanctuary. Twenty-first Paper--The Sanctuary Offered by Ezekiel." Review and Herald, 25 May 1876, p. 164.
- "The Sanctuary. Twenty-second Paper--The Sanctuary Rebuilt." Review and Herald, 1 June 1876, pp. 172, 173.
- "The Sanctuary. Twenty-third Paper--The New Covenant Sanctuary." Review and Herald, 8 June 1876, p. 180.
- "The Sanctuary. Twenty-fourth Paper--The Earth Not the Sanctuary." Review and Herald, 15 June 1876, p. 188.
- "The Sanctuary. Twenty-fifth Paper--A Sanctuary in Heaven." Review and Herald, 22 June 1876, p. 196.
- "The Sanctuary. Twenty-sixth Paper--Ministration of the Sanctuary." Review and Herald, 29 June 1876, p. 4.
- "The Sanctuary. Twenty-seventh Paper--Cleansing of the Earthly Sanctuary." Review and Herald, 6 July 1876, p. 12.
- "The Sanctuary. Twenty-eighth Paper--The Ministration of the Heavenly Sanctuary." Review and Herald, 13 July 1876, p. 20.
- "The Sanctuary. Twenty-ninth Paper--Within the Vail." Review and Herald, 20 July 1876, p. 28.
- "The Sanctuary. Thirtieth Paper--Between the Cherubim." Review and Herald, 27 July 1876, p. 36.
- "The Sanctuary. Thirty-first Paper--The Priesthood of Christ." Review and Herald, 3 August 1876, p. 44.
- "The Sanctuary. Thirty-second Paper--Cleansing of the Heavenly Sanctuary." Review and Herald, 10 August 1876, p. 52.
- "The Sanctuary. Thirty-third Paper--a Work of Judgment." Review and Herald, 17 August 1876, p. 60.

- "The Sanctuary. Thirty-fourth Paper--The Opening of the Temple." Review and Herald, 24 August 1876, p. 68.
- "The Sanctuary. Thirty-fifth Paper--The Mystery of God Finished." Review and Herald, 31 August 1876, p. 76.
- "The Sanctuary: A Novel Argument." Review and Herald, 9 January 1855, pp. 156, 157.
- "The Sanctuary--An Objection Answered." Review and Herald 1 November 1864, p. 180.
- "Satan as the Scapegoat." Review and Herald, 3 July 1883, p. 424.
- "S.D. Adventists and the Atonement." Review and Herald, 14 July 1891, p. 438.
- "The Sealing of the 144,000." Signs of the Times, 1 May 1870, p. 141; 8 May 1870, p. 149.
- "The Seventh-day Adventists." Review and Herald, 3 November 1874, pp. 148, 149.
- "The Shut Door." Review and Herald, 14 April 1853, pp. 188, 189.
- "The Standing Controversy." Review and Herald, 23 March 1897, p. 186.
- "Suppression and the Shut Door." Review and Herald, 19 July 1887, pp. 456, 457.
- "Synopsis of the Present Truth." Nos. 1-32. Signs of the Times, 8 January 1880-16 September 1880.
- "The Teaching of Hebrews 7." Review and Herald, 11 September 1888, p. [584].
- "Then Shall the Sanctuary Be Cleansed." Review and Herald, 13 March 1888, p. 168.
- "This Generation." Review and Herald, 17 November 1891, p. 712.
- "Thoughts on the Book of Daniel." Signs of the Times, 18 January 1877-10 May 1877; 9 August 1877; 13 September; 4 October; 11 October; 25 October; 1 November; 8 November; 15 November; 23 November.
- "Thy People." Review and Herald, 16 April 1889, p. 248.
- "Times of Refreshing." Review and Herald, 19 April 1870, p. 140.
- "The Vail of Hebrews 6." Review and Herald, 14 January 1890, p. 24.

"The Warning Voice of Time and Prophecy." Weekly Series. Review and Herald, March 17, 1953-August 11, 1953.

"Watchman, What of the Night?" Review and Herald, 28 September 1897, p. 614.

"What Does 'Have' Mean?" Review and Herald, 18 February 1890, p. 104.

"Where is the Promise." Review and Herald, 29 June 1897, p. 406.

"Within the Vail." 4 March 1890, p. 136.

#### Unpublished Materials

Smith, U. to D. M. Canright, 31 July 1883. Heritage Room. James White Library. Andrews University.

Smith, U. to D. M. Canright, 6 April 1883. Heritage Room. James White Library. Andrews University.

Smith, U. to D. M. Canright, 22 March 1883. Heritage Room. James White Library. Andrews University.

Smith, U. to D. M. Canright, 2 October 1883. Heritage Room. James White Library. Andrews University.

Smith, U. to Ellen G. White, 17 February 1890. W. C. White Letter Book "I," pp. 546-52. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.

Smith, U. to the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, n.d. Letter to General Conference Session, held March 27 to April 13, 1903. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.

#### Secondary Sources

Bourdeau, Augustin C. Daniel and Revelation, by Uriah Smith. (n.p., n.d.)

Corliss, John O. "The Message and Its Friends--No. 6: Uriah Smith, the 'Pathfinder'." Review and Herald, 20 September 1923, pp. 6, 7.

Durand, Eugene F. "Yours in the Blessed Hope, Uriah Smith." Ph.D. dissertation, George Washington University, 1978.

Hammond, Richard J. "The Life and Work of Uriah Smith." Master's thesis, Andrews University, August, 1944.

- Holt, Russel. "Uriah." Insight, 22 February 1977, pp. 13-15.
- "In Memoriam: Uriah Smith." Uriah Smith Obituary. Review and Herald, 10 March 1903, pp. 3-7.
- Materials Relating to the 1944 Revision of U. Smith's Daniel and Revelation. Heritage Room. James White Library. Andrews Universtiy.
- Miller, Donald H. "Legalism and Uriah Smith." Term paper, Andrews University, 1971.
- Morris, David Leo. "The Relation of Uriah Smith to the Righteousness by Faith Message." Term paper, Andrews University, 1969.
- Spayd, L. W. The Two Covenants and the Sabbath; Embracing an Exposition of the Two Bible Testaments, a Review of the "Two Covenants," by Eld. Uriah Smith of the Seventh-day Adventists, and of Seventh-day Adventist Teaching in General. Owosso, MI: Owosso Press Publishing Co., 1898.
- Thurber, Merwin R. "New Edition of 'Daniel and the Revelation'." Ministry, April 1945, pp. 13-15.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Revised D & R in Relation to Denominational Doctrine." Ministry, May 1945, pp. 3-4, 30.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Uriah Smith and the Charge of Plagiarism." Ministry, June 1945, pp. 15, 16.
- Waller, John O. "Uriah Smith's Small Epic: The Warning Voice of Time and Prophecy." Adventist Heritage 5 (Summer 1978):53-61.
- White, Arthur L. "The Standing of Elder Uriah Smith." A Statement by Arthur L. White in response to inquiries addressed to the office of the Ellen G. White Estate. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation." Ministry, January 1945, pp. 11-13, 46.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation. Washington, D.C.: Ellen G. White Publications, 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_ to H. G. Stoehr, 14 January 1957. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.
- \_\_\_\_\_ to Mrs. Alice Powers, 11 October 1957. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.
- \_\_\_\_\_ to Pastor S. A. Bartlett, 7 February 1957. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.

White, Ellen G. "Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation." MS 174-1899. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.

\_\_\_\_\_. ["Uriah Smith and the 1888 Conference."] MS 5, 1889. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.

### Albion Fox Ballenger

#### Primary Sources

##### Books and Pamphlets

Before Armageddon. Riverside, California: Gathering Call, 1918.

Cast Out for the Cross of Christ. Riverside, California: The Author, [1911?].

An Examination of Forty Fatal Errors Regarding the Atonement: A Review of a Work which "Fully Explains the Sanctuary Question as understood by the (Seventh-day Adventist) Denomination." Riverside, California: The Author, [1913?].

Is the Second Coming of Christ Secret? Riverside, California: Gathering Call, n.d.

Not under Law, But under Grace. London: International Tract Society, n.d.

Our Answer: Why Do Seventh-day Adventists Suffer Imprisonment Rather than Keep Sunday? Battle Creek: International Liberty Assn., 1893.

Power for Witnessing. Oakland, California: Pacific Press, 1900.

The Proclamation of Liberty and the Unpardonable Sin. Riverside, California: n.p., 1915.

Protestantism, True and False. Battle Creek: International Religious Liberty Assn., 1894.

Serving in Newness of Spirit. Riverside, California: Gathering Call, n.d.

The Spirit of Prophecy and the Gift to Prophecy. 3rd ed. Riverside, California: Gathering Call, n.d.

What About the Testimonies. Riverside, California: Gathering Call, n.d.

Articles

- "The Anchor Holds." Review and Herald, 1 August 1899, pp. 494, 495.
- "The Atonement. A Review of 'Signs of the Times' Articles." Gathering Call, October 1916, pp. 2, 3.
- "The Atonement. A Review of 'Signs of the Times' Articles." Gathering Call, September 1916, pp. 3, 4.
- "Atonement in Type and Antitype: The Two Goats." Gathering Call, December 1916, pp. 2-4.
- "Before Armageddon." Gathering Call, October 1914-January 1917 and continuing, irregularly.
- "But How About the Testimonies." Gathering Call, March 1916, pp. 2-4.
- "The California Camp-Meeting." Review and Herald, 26 July 1898, p. 479.
- "Camp-Meeting Notes." Review and Herald, 27 September 1898, pp. 620, 621.
- "Camp-Meeting Notes." Review and Herald, 4 October 1898, p. 637.
- "Camp-Meeting Notes." Review and Herald, 11 October 1898, p. 653.
- "Camp-Meeting Notes." Review and Herald, 18 October 1898, pp. 670, 671.
- "Camp-Meeting Notes." Review and Herald, 8 November 1898, p. 720.
- "Camp-Meeting Notes." Review and Herald, 15 November 1898, p. 740.
- "The College View Meetings." Review and Herald, 3 May 1898, p. 288.
- "A Correction." Gathering Call, March 1916, pp. 4, 5.
- "The Denver Meeting." Review and Herald, 3 May 1898, p. 288.
- "Extracts from a Letter." Gathering Call, October 1914, pp. 4, 5.
- "Extracts from a Letter." Gathering Call, November 1914, pp. 2-3.
- "First a Holy Church[,] then the Holy Ghost." Signs of the Times, 15 November 1899, p. 738.
- "The Gifts of the Spirit." Signs of the Times, 20 June 1900, p. 390.
- "Gifts of the Spirit." Signs of the Times, 27 June 1900, pp. 2, 3.

- "God is Weighing His People." Review and Herald, 2 April 1901, pp. 217, 218.
- "He Hath Abolished Death." Gathering Call, November 1916, p. 2.
- "Liberty Through Christ." Gathering Call, October 1915, p. 5.
- "Looking to Instead of Through." Gathering Call, October 1915, pp. 2-4.
- "The Loud Cry." [SDA] General Conference Daily Bulletin, 1899, pp. 69, 70.
- "Miracles of Healing." Signs of the Times, 13 June 1900, pp. 370, 371.
- "A Misunderstood Scripture." Gathering Call, May-June 1937, p. 18.
- "Notes by the Way." Gathering Call, January 1914, pp. [1, 2].
- "Notes by the Way." Gathering Call, April 1914, p. [4].
- "Notes by the Way." Gathering Call, May 1914, p. [4].
- "Notes from the Salem, Ore[gon] Camp-meeting." Review and Herald, 12 July 1898, p. 448.
- "Not Under Law but Under Grace: A Parable." Gathering Call, January 1917, pp. 2-4.
- "The Ohio Camp-meeting." Review and Herald, 17 August 1897, p. 523.
- "Notes by the Way." Gathering Call, December 1914, pp. 5-7.
- "The 'Open Door'." Gathering Call, March 1919, pp. 1, 2.
- "The Pennsylvania Camp-meeting." Review and Herald, 29 June 1897, p. 411.
- "Salvation for the Body." Signs of the Times, 25 June 1900, p. 468.
- "Satan and the Cleansing of the Sanctuary." Gathering Call, November 1916, pp. 2, 3.
- "The Spirit of Prophecy." Gathering Call, June 1914, pp. [2, 3].
- "The Spirit of Prophecy and the Gift of Prophecy." Gathering Call, 2 May 1914, pp. [11, 12].
- "The Spirit of Prophecy not the Gift of Prophecy." Gathering Call, August 1914, p. [5].



- "A Spiritual Revival." Gathering Call, August 1914, pp. [1, 2].
- "Truth Triumphant." Gathering Call, September 1919, pp. 2, 3.
- "Universal Atonement and the Catholic Doctrine of Indulgences." Gathering Call, June 1916, pp. 1, 2.
- "Victory." [SDA] General Conference Daily Bulletin, 1899, p. 96.
- "Victory." Review and Herald, 2 January 1900, p. 13.
- "What is the Spirit of Prophecy?" Gathering Call, April 1914, pp. [1, 2].
- "What is Your Authority?" Gathering Call, January 1915, p. [5].
- "Who is on the Lord's Side?" Review and Herald, 5 October 1897, p. 629.
- "Why Salvation is Free." Gathering Call, February 1930, pp. 9, 12, 13.

#### Unpublished Materials

- "The Nine Theses." Stenographer's Report of Statement by AFB "before the ministers attending the General Conference, at Washington, D.C., May 21, 1905, 5:30 A.M." Record Group 11 (Presidential), Documents, Reports, Narrative, 1901-50 Folder, Department of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, D.C.
- Ballenger, A. F. to Ellen G. White, n.d. DF-178, Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.
- Ballenger, A. F. to Sister Perrine, 10 November 1912. Edson File. Heritage Room. James White Library. Andrews University.

#### Secondary Sources

- Andross, E. E. Transcript of "Studies on the Sanctuary," 14 July 1911. Document File 178, Ellen G. White Estate. Washington, D.C.
- Donnell, R. S. to A. F. Ballenger, 27 June 1899. Record Group 21, 1899-D. Department of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists. Washington, D.C.
- "Ballenger Family." From obituaries of Eliza Walker Ballenger and Mrs. William Ward Simpson, Review and Herald, 21 March 1907 and 29 May 1952, respectively. File DF 178, Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.

- Danniells, A. G. to W. C. White, 16 March 1905, Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.
- Delafield, D. A. "A. F. Ballenger Teachings on the Sanctuary." [1979?]. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.
- Dexter, Edgar P. The Whole-Truth of the Sanctuary; The Bible Answer to the Seventh-day Adventist People on the Atonement Embracing also a Complete Refutation of the Ballenger Hypothesis, of Interest to all Evangelical Christians. Battle Creek: by the Author, 1915.
- "Early Life." A. F. Ballenger obituary. Gathering Call, September-October, 1921, p. 2.
- Irwin, G. A. to Ellen G. White, 3 October 1898. Record Group 11, Outgoing Letterbook 19, p. 549. Department of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, D.C.
- Leshner, W. Richard. "Landmark Truth Versus 'Specious Error'." Review and Herald, 6 March 1980, pp. 244-47.
- Letter from Pre-Medical Student to [B. P.] Hoffman, 19 May 1934. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.
- Morrison, J. H. A Straight Talk to Old Brethren. n.p., n.d.
- Prescott, William W. to Elmer E. Andross, 5 December 1911. Prescott Papers. Heritage Room. James White Library. Andrews University.
- Star, G. B. Critique of Ballenger's book, Cast Out for the Cross of Christ, 13 January 1926. Documents, 1920s-1950s, Ballenger, A. F. and E. F. Folder. Department of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, D.C.
- White, Arthur L. "The General Conference of 1905." Portion of a chapter from the forthcoming Arthur L. White biography of Ellen G. White. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.
- White, Ellen G. "A Warning Against False Theories." May 24, 1905. In White Estate, "The Integrity of the Sanctuary Truth: A Group of Ellen G. White Statements Made in 1905, 1906, and 1907 Regarding Elder A. F. Ballenger's Teachings." Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.

Milian Lauritz Andreasen

## Primary Sources

Books and Pamphlets

Isaiah, the Gospel Prophet, A Preacher of Righteousness; Lesson Notes and Helps. 3 vols. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1928.

The Sanctuary Service. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1937.

The Sanctuary Service. 2nd ed. rev. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1947, 1969.

Man--Here and Hereafter: Whence Came We and Whither We Go? Mountain View, California: Pacific Press Publishing Assn., 1937.

A Faith to Live By. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1943.

Following the Master. Nashville, Tennessee: Southern Publishing Assn., 1947.

The Faith of Jesus. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1939, 1949, 1969.

The Book of Hebrews. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1948.

What Can a Man Believe? Mountain View, California: Pacific Press Publishing Assn., 1951.

Saints and Sinners. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1951.

Letters to the Churches, Series A. Baker, Oregon: Hudson Printing Co., [1959].

Articles

"The Book of Hebrews--No. 3: The Message of the Book." Review and Herald, 3 October 1946, pp. 7, 8.

"The Book of Hebrews--No. 5: Christ's Atoning Work." Review and Herald, 24 October 1946, pp. 9, 10.

"The Christian and the Sanctuary: The Message of the Book of Hebrews." Signs of the Times, 12 November 1946, pp. 10-11, 14.

- "The High Priest's Garments." Ministry, February 1939, pp. 23-26.
- "The Importance and Content of Hebrews." Review and Herald,  
19 September 1946, pp. 6, 7.
- "The Intent of the Sacrificial System." Ministry, July 1939,  
pp. 22-23, 27, 45.
- "The Keeping Power of God." Review and Herald, 18 June 1936,  
pp. 298, 299.
- "The Laodicean Message and Righteousness by Faith." Review and Herald, 9 November 1939, pp. 6-8.
- "Meat or Meal Offerings--I." Review and Herald, 5 October 1939,  
pp. 4-6.
- "Meat, or Meal Offerings--II." Review and Herald, 12 October 1939,  
pp. 7, 8.
- "The Ministry of Our High Priest." Review and Herald, 11 October  
1945, pp. 5, 6.
- "The Sanctuary." Review and Herald, 19 October 1944, pp. 10-13,  
66, 67.
- "The Sanctuary--No. 1: Priests and Levites." Review and Herald,  
19 September 1940, pp. 3-5.
- "The Sanctuary--No. 2: Consecration and Dedication." Review and Herald,  
26 September 1940, pp. 4-6.
- "The Sanctuary--No. 3: The Ram of Consecration." Review and Herald,  
3 October 1940, pp. 7-8.
- "The Sanctuary--No. 4: Dedication and Inauguration--Part I." Review and Herald,  
10 October 1940, pp. 4-5.
- "The Sanctuary--No. 5: Dedication and Inauguration--Part II." Review and Herald,  
17 October 1940, pp. 4-6.
- "The Sanctuary--No. 6: The Daily Sacrifice--Part I." Review and Herald,  
24 October 1940, pp. 5-7.
- "The Sanctuary--No. 7: The Daily Sacrifice--Part II." Review and Herald,  
31 October 1940, pp. 4-6.
- "The Sanctuary--No. 8: The Sin Offering." Review and Herald,  
14 November 1940, pp. 6-8.
- "The Sanctuary--No. 9: Defilement and Blood." Review and Herald,  
21 November 1940, pp. 8-10.

- "The Sanctuary--No. 10: The Day of Atonement." Review and Herald, 28 November 1940, pp. 18-19.
- "The Sanctuary--No. 11: The Work of Judgment." Review and Herald, 12 December 1940, pp. 6-8.
- "The Sanctuary--No. 12: The High Priest as Sin Bearer." Review and Herald, 19 December 1940, pp. 5-6.
- "The Sanctuary--I: The Tabernacle in the Wilderness." Review and Herald, 18 October 1945, pp. 6-8.
- "The Sanctuary--Part 2: The Daily Services." Review and Herald, 25 October 1945, pp. 11, 12.
- "The Sanctuary--III: The Burnt Offering." Review and Herald, 1 November 1945, pp. 8-9.
- "The Sanctuary--Part IV: Meat and Peace Offerings." Review and Herald, 8 November 1945, pp. 10, 11.
- "The Sanctuary--Part V: The Lesson of the Sin Offerings." Review and Herald, 15 November 1945, pp. 9, 10.
- "The Sanctuary--Part VI: The Lessons of the Sin Offerings--No. 2." Review and Herald, 22 November 1945, pp. 9, 10.
- "The Sanctuary--Part VII: The Lesson of the Sin Offerings--No. 3." Review and Herald, 29 November 1945, pp. 9, 10.
- "The Sanctuary--Part VIII: The Day of Atonement--No. 1." Review and Herald, 6 December 1945, pp. 9, 10.
- "The Sanctuary--Part IX: The Day of Atonement--No. 2." Review and Herald, 13 December 1945, pp. 9, 10.
- "The Sanctuary--Part X: Concerning the Scapegoat." Review and Herald, 20 December 1945, pp. 12, 20.
- "Why I Believe in the Second Coming of Christ: God's Timetable Will Not Fail." Signs of the Times, 2 January 1951, pp. 5-6, 15.

#### Unpublished Materials

- Andreasen, M. L. to J. L. McElhany and W. H. Branson, 25 December 1942. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.
- Andreasen, M. L. to R. R. Bietz, 6 October 1961. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.
- Andreasen, M. L. to W. R. Beach. 20 December 1961. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.

- "The Apostacy." N.d. In personal files.
- "The Atonement." 15 February 1957. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.
- "The Atonement." 4 November 1957. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.
- "The Atonement Central." N.d. M. L. Andreasen files, Department of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, D.C.
- "Atonement IV." 14 November 1957. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.
- "Atonement VII." 19 January 1958. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.
- "Atonement VIII: Bloodless Atonement." 31 January 1958. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.
- "The Atonement IX." 13 March 1958. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.
- "Eternal Atonement." N.d. File no. 17: M. L. Andreasen/Atonement--Waggoner and General. Department of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, D.C.
- "The Living Witness." N.d. In personal files.
- "The Living Witness: The Last Letter to the Church." Adventist Layworkers' Publications Newsletter, 25 January 1966, pp. 1, 2.
- "Memorial." 4 June 1958. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.
- "A Most Dangerous Heresy." N.d. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.
- "Review I." 15 May 1958. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.
- "The Sabbath School." N.d. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.
- "The Sanctuary in Heaven." N.d. File 17: M. L. Andreasen/Sanctuary. Department of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, D.C.

- "Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine. Then [sic] Truth about Seventh-day Adventists (Martin)." Series C. No. 2, October 1960. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.
- "Shooting the Watchdog." 19 January 1962. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.
- "A Statement of Belief in Regard to the Sanctuary." N.d. File 17: M. L. Andreasen/Ballenger. Department of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, D.C.
- "The Suspension Story I." N.d. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.
- "Testimony of M. L. Andreasen." 15 October 1953. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.

#### Secondary Sources

- Andreasen, Mrs. M. L. to W. G. C. Murdoch, 27 August 1962. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.
- Andreasen, Vesta. Biographical sketches of the life of M. L. Andreasen. N.d. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.
- Chaney, Frank L. "Letter No. 1: The Atonement." N.d. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Letter No. 2: The Atonement in the Sanctuary in Type and Antitype." N.d. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Letter No. 3." N.d. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Letter No. 4." N.d. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Letter No. 5." N.d. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Letter No. 6." N.d. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Letter to a Friend." 16 May 1958. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.
- [Delafield, D.A.?]. Memorandum on Andreasen's Apology to Adventist Church Leaders. N.d. DF961a, Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.

- Deiafield, D. A. to Mr. and Mrs. S. Chowdhry. 19 March 1968. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.
- "Elder M. L. Andreasen." Obituary. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.
- F[room], L[eRoy] E. "Listening in on the Evangelical Conferences." Book chapter, n.d. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.
- G[eneral] C[onference] Officers [SDA] and Union Presidents. "Suspension of Credentials of M. L. Andreasen." 6 April 1961. File DF961, Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.
- Jemison, Mrs. Hedwig to Bruno W. Steinweg, 28 November 1977. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.
- Olson, Albert V. "An examination of M. L. Andreasen's Objections to the Book 'Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine'." 1960. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.
- Perman, Ken. "A Biographical Sketch of M. L. Andreasen (1876-1962)." Term paper. Andrews University, 1974.
- Steinweg, Virginia. Without Fear or Favor: The Life of M. L. Andreasen. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1979.
- White, Arthur L. "The Charge that the E. G. White Writings are Being Changed--'Attempted Tampering'." Memorandum. 6 August 1971. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.

#### General Secondary Sources

- Ahlstrom, Sydney E. A Religious History of the American People. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1972.
- Anderson, Irene B. "The Sanctuary the Central Theme." Ministry, March 1938, pp. 18, 19.
- Anderson, Roy A. "I Believe . . . That God's Judgment is in Session Now." Review and Herald, 20 January 1972, pp. 12-13.
- Andreasen, Niels-Erik. "The Heavenly Sanctuary in the Old Testament." Biblical Research Institute Sanctuary and Atonement Study, 1978. Department of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, D.C.



- Andrews, John N. "The Antitypical Tabernacle." Review and Herald, 7 July 1853, pp. 24-28.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Commandment to Restore and to Rebuild Jerusalem. Battle Creek: Steam Press of the Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Assn., 1865.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Order of Events in the Judgment." Nos. 1-20. Signs of the Times, 3 January 1878-31 October 1878.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Position of the Advent Herald on the Sanctuary Question." Review and Herald, 12 May 1853, pp. 204, 205.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Sanctuary." Review and Herald, 23 December 1852, pp. 121-25; 6 January 1853, pp. 129-33; 20 January 1853, pp. 137-39; 3 February 1853, pp. 145-49.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Sanctuary." Review and Herald, 18 June 1867, p. 12.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Sanctuary." Signs of the Times, 22 October 1874, pp. 57, 58.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Sanctuary and its Cleansing." Review and Herald, 30 October 1855, pp. 68, 69.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Sanctuary and the 2300 Days. Rochester, New York: James White, 1853.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Sanctuary and Twenty-three Hundred Days. 2nd ed. Battle Creek: Steam Press of the Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Assn., 1872.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Sanctuary of the Bible." Review and Herald, 30 December 1873, p. 21.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Sanctuary of the Bible. Oakland, California: Pacific Press Publishing Co., 1889.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Sanctuary of the Bible." Signs of the Times, 11 May 1876, p. 170; 18 May 1876, pp. 178, 179.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Sanctuary Question." Review and Herald, 7 July 1853, pp. 25-28.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Thoughts on Revelation XIII and XIV." Review and Herald, 19 May 1851, pp. 81-86.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Watchman, What of the Night?" Review and Herald, 27 May 1852, pp. 14-16.
- Andross, Elmer E. A More Excellent Ministry. Mountain View, California: Pacific Press Publishing Assn., 1912.

- Arnold, David. "The Shut Door Explained." The Present Truth, no. 6, (December 1849), pp. 41-46.
- Arthur, David T. "Millerism." In The Rise of Adventism: Religion and Society in Mid-Nineteenth-Century America, pp. 154-72. Edited by Edwin S. Gaustad. New York, Evanston, San Francisco and London: Harper and Row, 1974.
- Aulén, Gustaf. Christus Victor: An Historical Study of the Three Main Types of the Idea of Atonement. Translated by A. G. Hebert. New York: The Macmillan Publishing Co., 1969.
- Bacchiocchi, Samuele. An Analysis of Robert Brinsmead's Teaching regarding the Cleansing of the Sanctuary. New York: Faith for Today, 1963.
- Ballenger, Edward S. to W. W. Fletcher. 3 April 1931. W. W. Fletcher Correspondence 1930-1946. Heritage Room. James White Library. Andrews University.
- Barnes, Albert. The Atonement and its Relations to Law and Moral Government. Philadelphia: Parry and McMillan, 1859.
- Bates, Joseph. An Explanation of the Typical and Anti-Typical Sanctuary by the Scriptures--With a Chart. New Bedford: Benjamin Lindsey, 1850.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Laodicean Church." Review and Herald, November 1850, pp. 7, 8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Midnight Cry in the Past." Review and Herald, December 1850, pp. 21-24.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Second Advent Waymarks and High Heaps, or a Connected View, of the Fulfillment of Prophecy, by God's Peculiar People, from the Year 1840 to 1847. New Bedford: Press of Benjamin Lindsey, 1847.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Thoughts on the Past Work of William Miller and His Adherents, Respecting the True Starting Point of Dan. VIII, 14; IX, 24, 25." Review and Herald, 17 February 1853, pp. 156, 157.
- The Bible Reading Gazette: Containing Bible-Readings on a Great Variety of Subjects, Doctrinal, Practical, and Prophetical; Adapted to All Classes of Society. Battle Creek: Review and Herald, 1886.
- [Bliss, Sylvester]. "The Advent Question." Advent Herald and Signs of the Times Reporter, 27 November 1847, p. 133.

- \_\_\_\_\_. The Chronology of the Bible, Showing from the Scriptures and Undisputed Authorities That We Are Now Near the End of Six Thousand Years from Creation. Second Advent Library, no. 38. Boston: Joshua V. Himes, 1843.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Cleansing of the Sanctuary." Advent Herald, and Signs of the Times Reporter, 16 April 1853, p. 125.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Memoirs of William Miller, Generally Known as a Lecturer on the Prophecies, and the Second Coming of Christ. Boston: Joshua V. Himes, 1853.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Rise and Progress of Adventism." The Advent Shield, and Review, May 1844, pp. 46-93.
- Bollman, C. P. "Antiochus or Rome--Which?" Review and Herald, 20 October 1932, pp. 987-89.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Cleansing of the Sanctuary." Review and Herald, 21 November 1935, pp. 12, 13.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Judgment." Review and Herald, 3 September 1936, pp. 5, 6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Sanctuary Service in Heaven." Review and Herald, 16 April 1936, pp. 6, 7.
- Branson, W. H. The Atonement in the Light of God's Sanctuaries. Mountain View, California: Pacific Press Publishing Assn., 1935.
- \_\_\_\_\_. In Defense of the Faith. The truth about Seventh-day Adventists. A Reply to Canright. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1933.
- Brinsmead, Bernard H. "The Sanctuary in Adventist Theology from Approximately 1840-1850." Term paper, Andrews University, 1975.
- B[rinsmead], R[obert] D. 1844 ReExamined: Syllabus. Fallbrook, California: I.H.I., 1979.
- Brown, H. F. "Relics of the Sanctuary." Letter to the editor. Ministry, August 1941, p. 26.
- Brown, M. H. Christ Our Advocate: His Ministry in the True Tabernacle. Mountain View, California: Pacific Press Publishing Co., 1894.
- Burton, R. G. "The Sanctuary and the Blotting Out of Sins." Ministry, March 1972, pp. 35-37.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Sanctuary and the Blotting Out of Sins." Ministry, April 1972, pp. 31-33.
- Butler, George I. "At the Time Appointed the End Shall Be." Review and Herald, 12 November 1908, pp. 8, 9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "At the Time Appointed the End Shall Be--No. 2." Review and Herald, 3 December 1908, pp. 9, 10.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Many Voices--No. 1: Early Beginnings." Review and Herald, 17 August 1911, pp. 3, 4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Many Voices--No. 2: Earlier and Later Movements." Review and Herald, 24 August 1911, pp. 4, 5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Many Voices--No. 3: The Sanctuary Service." Review and Herald, 31 August 1911, p. 4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Many Voices--No. 4: Positive Evidence that Christ Did Minister in the First Apartment of the Heavenly Sanctuary After His Ascension." Review and Herald, 7 September 1911, pp. 3, 4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Many Voices--No. 5: Further Proof of Christ's Ministry in the First Apartment of the Heavenly Sanctuary After His Ascension." Review and Herald, 14 September 1911, pp. 5, 6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Many Voices--No. 6: The Judgment and the Judgment Message; the Cleansing of the Sanctuary, or the Work of Judgment at the End of the 2300 Days." Review and Herald, 21 September 1911, pp. 4, 5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Certainty and the Triumph of the Advent People." Review and Herald, 19 November 1908, pp. 7, 8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Disappointment and its Explanation." Review and Herald, 17 December 1908, pp. 10, 11.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Disappointment and its Explanation--No. 2: The Sanctuary and its Cleansing." Review and Herald, 24 December 1908, pp. 10, 11.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Events at the Close of the 2300 Year-Days." Review and Herald, 10 December 1908, pp. 9, 10.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Judgment." Review and Herald, 31 December 1908, pp. 9-10.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Judgment Message." Review and Herald, 5 November 1908, pp. 8, 9.

- Butler, Jonathan M. "Adventism and the American Experience." In The Rise of Adventism: Religion and Society in Mid-Nineteenth-Century America, pp. 173-206. Edited by Edwin S. Gaustad. New York, Evanston, San Francisco, and London: Harper and Row, 1974.
- Carson, W. "Mysteries of the Sanctuary." Insight, 20 July 1976, pp. 17, 18.
- Christiansen, Albert C. The Typical Sanctuary. Bible Students' Library, No. 191. Mountain View, California: Pacific Press Publishing Assn., 1905.
- Christensen, H. C. "Two Judgment Scenes." Review and Herald, 13 March 1930, p. 18.
- Christensen, W. W. "The Importance of Daniel." Ministry, May 1953, pp. 20-22.
- Clark, Jerome L. 1844: Religious Movements. Nashville, Tennessee: Southern Publishing Assn., 1968.
- Committee on Defence Literature [General Conference of SDA] to Conference Workers in North America, 19 July 1948. "Re: Charges Made by E. S. Ballenger." A. F. Ballenger documents. Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.
- Conklin, Dorothy W. "The Two Sanctuaries." Ministry, September 1948, p. 15.
- Corlis, J. O. "The Atonement--No. 1: Its Nature and Object." Review and Herald, 22 June 1916, pp. 7, 8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Atonement--No. 2: The Motive Behind It." Review and Herald, 29 June 1916, pp. 7, 8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Atonement--No. 3: The Agency Involved." Review and Herald, 6 July 1916, p. 9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Atonement--No. 4: The Manifestation of Divine Love." Review and Herald, 13 July 1916, p. 7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Atonement--No. 5: Its Heavenly Mediation." Review and Herald, 20 July 1916, pp. 8, 19.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Atonement--No. 6: Recognized by Patriarchs." Review and Herald, 27 July 1916, pp. 5-6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Atonement--No. 9: Some Steps Toward its Accomplishment." Review and Herald, 24 August 1916, pp. 8, 9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Atonement--No. 10: Its Significance to the Work at Large." Review and Herald, 31 August 1916, pp. 6, 7.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Atonement--No. 11: The Weighing of Character." Review and Herald, 7 September 1916, pp. 9, 10.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "History of the Jewish Priesthood--No. 1: Its Early Significance." Review and Herald, 1 December 1910, pp. 4, 5.
- Cottrell, Raymond F. "The Antitypical Day of Atonement." Editorials. Review and Herald, 25 February 1965, p. 13; 4 March 1965, p. 15; and 11 March 1965, pp. 12, 13.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Hermeneutic for Daniel 8:14." [1978?]. Department of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, D.C.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The High Priestly Ministry of Christ." Review and Herald, 1 February 1962, p. 11.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Judgment of the Living." Review and Herald, 8 August 1963, p. 13.
- Cottrell, Roswell F. "Should S.D. Adventists Exist?" Nos. 1-4. Signs of the Times, 23 March 1876, p. 125; 30 March 1876, p. 133; 13 April 1876, pp. 140, 141; 20 April 1876, p. 148.
- Crosier, Owen R. L. "The Law of Moses." Day Star Extra, 7 February 1846, pp. 37-44.
- [\_\_\_\_\_]. "The Priesthood of Christ." Review and Herald, 16 September 1852, pp. 76-77; 30 September 1852, pp. 84-85; 14 October 1852, pp. 90-91.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Sanctuary. Copied from Advent Review, vol. 1, nos. 3 and 4, 1850. St. Helena, California: Elmshaven Office, 1931.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Sanctuary." Reprint of an article from Day Dawn. Review and Herald, 5 May 1851, pp. 78-80.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Sanctuary." Review and Herald, 2 September 1852, pp. 68-69.
- Damsteegt, P. Gerard. Foundations of the Seventh-day Adventist Message and Mission. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1977.
- Daniells, Arthur G. Christ Our Righteousness: A Study of the Principles of Righteousness by Faith in the Word of God and the Writings of the Spirit of Prophecy. Washington, D.C.: Ministerial Association of Seventh-day Adventists, 1941.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Shut Door and the Close of Probation. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., n.d.

- Dederen, Raoul. "Atoning Aspects in Christ's Life and Death (a Survey of the NT Evidence)." Biblical Research Institute Sanctuary and Atonement Study, 1979. Department of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, D.C.
- Douglass, Herbert E. "Importance of the Sanctuary Truth." Editorials. Review and Herald, 4 September 1975, p. 13; 18 September, pp. 13, 14; 2 October, pp. 12, 13; 23 October, pp. 10, 11; 30 October, pp. 12, 13; 6 November, pp. 10, 11.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. Perfection: The Impossible Possibility. Nashville, TN: Southern Publishing Assn., 1975.
- Doukhan, Jacques. "The Seventy Weeks of Daniel 9: An Exegetical Study." Andrews University Seminary Studies 17 (Spring 1979):1-22.
- Dryer, E. J. "God's Dwelling Place." Review and Herald, 27 July 1897, p. 467.
- Duffie, David. "Toward Understanding the Atonement: Some 19th and 20th Century Developments in non-Liberal Theology of the Atonement." Biblical Research Institute Sanctuary and Atonement Study, 1979.
- Dykes, E. G. "Christ in the Sanctuary." Message Magazine, January-February 1969, p. 21.
- Edson, Hiram. Manuscript telling of the [Advent] believers' experiences immediately following the Disappointment of 1844. N.p., n.d. Heritage Room. James White Library. Andrews University.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Sixty-nine Weeks and 2300 Days." Review and Herald, March 1851, pp. 49, 50.
- Edwardson, C. Bible Facts Concerning the Sanctuary and the Judgment. Hutchinson, Minnesota: The Maplewood Press, n.d.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Judgment." Review and Herald, 10 July 1930, pp. 13-15.
- Evans, J. Ernest. A Firm Foundation, Being a Series of Scripture Studies Concerning the Sanctuary Question. Together with Experiences Relating to this Movement. Tujunga, California, n.d.
- Ferch, Arthur J. "The Judgment Scene in Daniel 7." Biblical Research Institute Sanctuary and Atonement Study, 1979. Department of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, D.C.

Festinger, Leon; Riecken, Henry W.; and Schachter, Stanley. When Prophecy Fails. A Social and Psychological Study of a Modern Group that Predicted the Destruction of the World. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1956.

Ford, Desmond. "The Creator in Court." Review and Herald, 18 October 1962, pp. 2-4.

\_\_\_\_\_. רניאל. Nashville, Tennessee: Southern Publishing Assn., 1978.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Daniel 8:14 and the Latter Days." M.A. thesis, Potomac University, Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, 1959.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Daniel 8:14, the Day of Atonement, and the Investigative Judgment." Prepared for the Sanctuary Review Committee, 1980. Department of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, D.C.

Frazer, W. D. Ransom and Reunion Through the Sanctuary. Nashville, Tennessee: Southern Publishing Assn., 1977.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Sanctuary. Wildwood, Georgia: Wildwood Sanitarium and Medical Missionary Institute, n.d.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Then Shall the Sanctuary Be Cleansed." Seventh-day Adventist Annual Council Devotional Message, 1974. Review and Herald, 6 March 1975, pp. 4-6.

French, T. M. "The Atonement and the Judgment." Review and Herald, 12 December 1935, pp. 4, 5.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Judgment Hour Message." Review and Herald, 5 December 1935, pp. 7, 8.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Sanctuary in the Original Hebrew and Greek Applied to the Terms Used in the Book of Hebrews. South Lancaster, Massachusetts, n.p., n.d.

Froom, LeRoy E. Movement of Destiny. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1971.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Not a Block to be Moved Nor a Pin Stirred. II: The Inclusiveness of the Fundamentals (Part 1)." Editorial. Ministry, December 1944, pp. 17-20.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers: The Historical Development of Prophetic Interpretation. 4 vols. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1950-1954.

Fulton, J. E. "Corroboration of Sanctuary Positions." Ministry, June 1938, pp. 9, 10.



- "Fundamental Principles." Signs of the Times, 4 June 1874, p. 3.
- "Fundamental Principles of Seventh-day Adventists." Signs of the Times, 28 January 1875, pp. 108, 109.
- Gaustad, Edwin S., ed. The Rise of Adventism: Religion and Society in Mid-Nineteenth-Century America. New York, Evanston, San Francisco, and London: Harper and Row, 1974.
- Geraty, Lawrence T. "The Jerusalem Temple of the Hebrew Bible in Its Ancient Near Eastern Context." First rough draft without notes and bibliography. Biblical Research Institute Sanctuary and Atonement Study, [1979?].
- Gilbert, F. C. "The Anointing of the Anti-typical Most Holy." Ministry, August 1934, pp. 3, 4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Messiah in His Sanctuary. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1937.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Practical Lessons from the Experience of Israel for the Church Today. South Lancaster, Massachusetts: The Author, 1902.
- Grotheer, William H. "The Holy Flesh Movement, 1899-1901." Florence, Mississippi: Adventist Laymen's Foundation of Mississippi, 1973.
- Guy, Fritz. "The Ultimate Triumph of Love: An Adventist Understanding of Atonement." Biblical Research Institute Sanctuary and Atonement Study, 1979. Department of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, D.C.
- Haddock, Robert. "A History of the Doctrine of the Sanctuary in the Advent Movement, 1800-1905." B.D. Thesis, Andrews University, 1970.
- [Hale, Apollos]. "Brother Hale's Article." Reprint from the Advent Herald (1845), Review and Herald, 16 September 1851, pp. 25-28.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Duties and Trials of Our Position." Review and Herald, 25 November 1851, pp. 49, 50.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Editorial Correspondence." Advent Herald and Signs of the Times Reporter, 10 September 1845, p. 40.
- Haloviak, Bert. "Pioneers, Pantheists, and Progressives: A. F. Ballenger and Divergent Paths to the Sanctuary." June 1980. Department of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, D.C.

- Hardinge, Leslie G. Shadows of His Sacrifice: Studies in the Sanctuary. N.p., [1959?].
- Hasel, Gerhard F. "The Sanctuary in Daniel 8." Biblical Research Institute Sanctuary and Atonement Study, 1979. Department of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, D.C.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Studies in Biblical Atonement I: Continual Sacrifice, Defilement//Cleansing and Sactuary." Biblical Research Institute Sanctuary and Atonement Study, 1978. Department of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, D.C.
- Haskell, S. N. "Bible Reading on the Sanctuary." Review and Herald, 1 December 1910, p. 5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Bible Reading on the Sanctuary." Review and Herald, 8 December 1910, pp. 4, 5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Cross and its Shadow. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1949.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Nature of Judgment." Review and Herald, 24 October 1912, pp. 5, 6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Sanctuary Court and its Services." Review and Herald, 19 September 1912, pp. 3, 4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Sanctuary, Work in First Apartment." Review and Herald, 26 September 1912, pp. 4, 5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Wonderful Prophecy." Review and Herald, 3 October 1912, pp. 4-6.
- Haynes, Carlyle B. The Hour of God's Judgment. Mountain View, California: Pacific Press Publishing Assn., 1926.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Sanctuary and its Cleansing." Review and Herald, 17 January 1935, pp. 4-6.
- Heppenstall, E. "Daniel 8:14 in Perspective." Ministry, October 1956, pp. 29-31.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Hour of God's Judgment Is Come." In Doctrinal Discussions: A Compilation of Articles Originally Appearing in "The Ministry", June, 1960-July, 1961, in Answer to Walter R. Martin's Book "The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism," pp. 158-86. Prepared by the Ministerial Association, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., n.d.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Objective and Subjective Aspects of the Atonement." Biblical Research Institute Sanctuary and Atonement Study, 1978. Department of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, D.C.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Our High Priest: Jesus Christ in the Heavenly Sanctuary. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1972.
- Hilgert, Earl. "Paul's Epistle to the Romans--2: A Broader Concept of Law. Also a Glimpse of the Atonement." Review and Herald, 15 October 1964, pp. 2-4.
- Himes, J. V. "Editorial Correspondence." Advent Herald, and Signs of the Times Reporter, 5 February 1845, p. 205.
- [\_\_\_\_\_]. "Letter from Mr. Miller." Advent Herald, and Signs of the Times Reporter, 12 February 1845, p. 4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Low Hampton Conference." Advent Herald, and Signs of the Times Reporter, 15 January 1845, p. 182.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Meetings in New London, CT." Advent Herald, and Signs of the Times Reporter, 5 February 1845, p. 205.
- Holbrook, Frank B. "The Israelite Sanctuary." January 1969. Department of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, D.C.
- Holt, Benjamin R. "A Comparative Study of the Sanctuary and its Implications for Atonement in Seventh-day Adventist Theology from Uriah Smith to the Present." Term paper, Andrews University, 1969.
- Hoopes, L. A. "The Gospel in the Sanctuary." Review and Herald, 6 August 1908, pp. 9, 10; and 13 August 1908, pp. 9, 10.
- Howell, W. E. "The Meaning of the Altar." Ministry, December 1940, pp. 34, 35.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Meaning of 'Holy Place'." Ministry, October 1940, pp. 15-17.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Meaning of the Veil." Ministry, November 1940, pp. 13-15.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "I. Terminology of the Tabernacle and Services as seen in Type and Antitype." Ministry, January 1942, pp. 11-13.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "II. What Constitutes the Atonement? Distinction between the Sacrifice and the Atonement." Ministry, February 1942, pp. 10-12.

\_\_\_\_\_. "III. Incarnation and Ministry of Christ: What do they Comprehend in Type and Antitype?" Ministry, March 1942, pp. 35, 36; April 1942, pp. 16-18.

\_\_\_\_\_. "IV. Faith before and after the Cross." Ministry, May 1942, pp. 35-37.

\_\_\_\_\_. "V. Forgiveness in the Light of Sanctuary." Ministry, June 1942, pp. 35, 36.

\_\_\_\_\_. "VI. Why God Waits to Finalize on Sin." Ministry, July 1942, pp. 35, 36.

\_\_\_\_\_. "VII. In the Time of Patient Waiting." Ministry, August 1942, pp. 35-37.

Hudson, A. L. to [Adventist] General Conference Executive Committee Members, 28 April 1958. Department of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, D.C.

\_\_\_\_\_ to General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 28 February 1958. Department of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, D.C.

\_\_\_\_\_ to Responsible Brethren and Sisters of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, 2 April 1958. Department of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, D.C.

Huffman, M. G. "The Judgment." Review and Herald, 2 April 1914, pp. 4, 5.

Hyde, G. M. "The Sanctuary Doctrine." Series. Review and Herald, 10 June 1971, pp. 4-6; 17 June, pp. 9-11; 24 June, pp. 8-9; 1 July, pp. 6-8.

Hyde, William T. "The Role and Function of the Sanctuary Services." [1977]. Department of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, D.C.

Johns, Varnes J. "The Hour of His Judgment is Come." Review and Herald, 9 July 1964, pp. 8, 9.

Johnson, A. E. What is Truth on Sanctuary in the Light of Daniel and the Revelation. Monteagle, Tennessee: n.p., n.d.

Johnson, O. A. "Hebrew and Greek Words for the Sanctuary and the Veil." Review and Herald, 5 October 1916, p. 8.

Johnsson, William G. "Defilement and Purgation in the Book of Hebrews." Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1973.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Interpretation of the Cultic Language of Hebrews." Biblical Research Institute Sanctuary and Atonement Study, 1979. Department of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, D.C.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Significance of the Day of Atonement Allusions in the Book of Hebrews." A preliminary study prepared for the meeting of BRICOM at Loma Linda, January 17-21, 1979. Department of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, D.C.
- Jones, Alonzo T. The Consecrated Way to Christian Perfection. Baker, Oregon: Hudson Printing Co., 1905.
- Kelley, H. M. "The Spirit of 1844." Review and Herald, 23 June 1921, pp. 4, 5.
- Kern, Milton E. Bible Reasons Why You Should be a Seventh-day Adventist; an Answer to the False Charges and Unscriptural Teachings of E. B. Jones. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1945.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Ministry of Christ in Heavenly Sanctuary." Ministry, August 1946, pp. 32-34.
- Keslake, C. H. "The Heavenly Pattern." Review and Herald, 31 July 1900, p. 485.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Place of Christ's Ministry." Review and Herald, 17 July 1900, p. 453.
- Kuiper, R. B. For Whom Did Christ Die? A Study of the Divine Design of the Atonement. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1959.
- LaRondelle, Hans K. Perfection and Perfectionism: A Dogmatic Ethical Study of Biblical Perfection and Phenomenal Perfectionism. 2nd ed. Berrien Springs, Michigan: Andrews University Press, 1975.
- Lindén, Ingemar. The Last Trump: A Historico-Genetical Study of Some Important Chapters in the Making and Development of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Frankfurt am Main, Bern and Las Vegas: Peter Lang, 1978.
- Litch, Josiah. Dissertation on the Fall of the Ottoman Empire, The 11th of August 1840. Second Advent Tracts, no. 11. [Boston: Joshua V. Himes], [1840?].
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Letter from Br. J. Litch." Advent Herald, and Signs of the Times Messenger, 27 November 1844, pp. 122, 123.

- \_\_\_\_\_. The Possibility of the Second Coming of Christ About 1843. Boston: David H. Ela, 1838.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Rise and Progress of Adventism." The Advent Shield and Review, May 1844, p. 90.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Ten Virgins." Advent Herald and Signs of the Times Messenger, 21 May 1845, p. 120.
- Littlejohn, W. H. "The Temple in Heaven: An Imaginary Conversation on a Very Important Theme." Series. Review and Herald, 19 August 1884, pp. 530-31; 26 August, pp. 546, 547; 2 September, pp. 562, 563; 9 September, pp. 578, 579; 16 September, pp. 594-95; 23 September, pp. 610, 611; 7 October, pp. 626, 627; 14 October, pp. 642-43; 21 October, pp. 659-60; 28 October, pp. 675-76; 4 November, pp. 690-91; 11 November, pp. 706, 707; 18 November, pp. 722, 723.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Temple in Heaven: Miller's Mistake Discussed." Review and Herald, 2 December 1884, pp. 753, 754.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Temple in Heaven: Miller's Mistake Explained." Review and Herald, 9 December 1884, pp. 771, 772.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Temple in Heaven: The Seven Thunders, The Little Book, The Last Day Scoffers, and the Ten Virgins." Review and Herald, 16 December 1884, pp. 787, 788.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Temple in Heaven: The Talk about Ascension Robes." Review and Herald, 25 November 1884, pp. 738-40.
- Loughborough, John N. "The Atonement." Review and Herald, 17 August 1922, pp. 3, 4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Great Second Advent Movement: Its Rise and Progress. Nashville, Tennessee: Southern Publishing Assn., 1905.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Letter. Review and Herald, 19 August 1852, p. 62.
- Lowe, Harry W. "The Sanctuary and Related Discussions." Series. Review and Herald, 2 April 1864, pp. 2, 3; 9 April, pp. 6, 7; 23 April, pp. 5-7; 30 April, pp. 4-6; 7 May, pp. 4-6; 14 May, pp. 2-4.
- Maxwell, A. S. Great Prophecies for Our Time. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1943.
- Maxwell, C. Mervyn. Tell It to the World: The Story of Seventh-day Adventists. Mountain View, California: Pacific Press Publishing Assn., 1976.
- Miller, William. "The Albany Conference." Advent Herald, and Signs of the Times Reporter, 4 June 1845, p. 129.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Letter from Bro. Miller." Advent Herald, and Signs of the Times Reporter, 11 December 1844, p. 142.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Letter from Bro. Miller." Advent Herald, and Signs of the Times Reporter, 18 December 1844, p. 147.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Letter from Bro. Miller." Advent Herald, and Signs of the Times Reporter, 26 March 1845, p. 49.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Letter from Bro. Miller--the 'Shut-Door' Doctrine Repudiated." Advent Herald, 13 November 1847, p. 119.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Letter to Joshua V. Himes, On the Cleansing of the Sanctuary. Boston: J. V. Himes, 1842.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Mr. Miller's Apology and Defence." Advent Herald, and Morning Watch, 13 August 1845, pp. 1-6.
- \_\_\_\_\_ to I. E. Jones. Letter. Advent Herald, and Signs of the Times Reporter, 25 November 1844, p. 154.
- \_\_\_\_\_ to Sylvester Bliss, 29 November 1844. Advent Herald, and Signs of the Times Reporter, December 1844. Reprinted in Review and Herald, 19 August 1851, p. 14.
- [\_\_\_\_\_]. William Miller's Apology and Defence. Boston: J. V. Himes, 1845.
- Montgomery, Oliver. "The Judgment-Hour Message." Review and Herald, 8 November 1928, pp. 5-7.
- Morse, Washington. "The Judgment Hour." Review and Herald, 3 January 1907, p. 11.
- Murdoch, W. G. C. "The Atonement of Our Lord." Review and Herald, 11 October 1962, pp. 5, 6.
- Maden, L. C. "Christ's Atoning Ministry: What Does it Do for Us in the Judgment?--1." Review and Herald, 10 September 1964, pp. 2-4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Christ's Atoning Ministry--2. Christian Perfection: How Do We Attain it?" Review and Herald, 17 September 1964, pp. 2-4.
- Neilsen, N. P. "The Judgment Message." Review and Herald, 26 April 1928, p. 8.
- Neufeld, Don F., ed. Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia. Revised Edition. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1976.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Was the Atonement Finished on the Cross?" Review and Herald, 22 April 1976, pp. 11, 12.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Thy Way . . . is in the Sanctuary." Review and Herald, 6 November 1969, pp. 13, 14.
- Nichol, F. D. Answers to Objections: An Examination of the Major Objections Raised Against the Teachings of Seventh-day Adventists. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1932.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Critics and their Criticism." Nos. 6, 7, and 8. Review and Herald, 29 March 1962, pp. 12, 13; 5 April, pp. 16, 17; 12 April, pp. 12, 13.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "From the Editor's Mailbag." Review and Herald, 27 October 1960, pp. 4, 5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Midnight Cry: A Defense of William Miller and the Millerites. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1944.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Origin and Prophetic Connections of Seventh-day Adventists." Ministry Extra, September 1844, pp. 2-8.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary. 7 vols. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1953-1957.
- Odom, Robert L. "The Heavenly Sanctuary." Israelite, October 1975, pp. 16-19.
- Olsen, Mahlon E. The History of the Origin and Progress of Seventh-day Adventists. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1925.
- Olsen, V. Norskov. "The Atonement: The Ascended Lord in Heaven: A Study in 16th Century Theology." [1978?]. Department of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, D.C.
- Olson, A. V. "The Judgment in Heaven." Ministry, November 1962, pp. 18-21.
- Olson, Robert W. "An Historical Survey of Seventh-day Adventist Statements on the Doctrine of the Cleansing of the Heavenly Sanctuary." Prepared for the Sanctuary Review Committee, 1980. Ellen G. White Estate, Washington, D.C.
- Our Firm Foundation: A Report of the Seventh-day Adventist Bible Conference Held September 1-13, 1952, in the Sligo SDA Church, Takoma Park, Maryland. 2 vols. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1953.



- Owen, R. S. "The Sanctuary and its Cleansing." Review and Herald, 26 March 1925, pp. 11-20.
- Parmele, R. W. "The Priesthood of Christ." Review and Herald, 3 August 1916, pp. 10-12.
- Pease, Norval F. "With Christ in the Heavenly Sanctuary." Review and Herald, 30 September 1965, pp. 8-10.
- Peck, Sarah E. "Spiritual Significance of the Sanctuary." A paper presented to the Bible Research Fellowship, Angwin, California. N.d.
- Pierson, Robert H. "The Judgment." Review and Herald, 17 March 1938, p. 3.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Message of Judgment." Review and Herald, 15 October 1959, pp. 4, 5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. We Still Believe. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1975.
- Prenier, H. S. Doctrine in Christ. The Fundamentals; the Controversy; Final Things. N.p., 1926.
- Prescott, W. W. "The Atoning Cross." Review and Herald, 22 August 1929, pp. 5, 6.
- Price, George M. "Before the Veil." A paper presented to the Bible Research Fellowship, Angwin, California, 1950. Heritage Room. James White Library. Andrews University.
- Problems in Bible Translation: A Study of Certain Principles of Bible Translation and Interpretation, together with an Examination of Several Bible Texts in the Light of these Principles. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1954.
- The Prophecy of Daniel. The Four Kingdoms, the Sanctuary, and the 2300 Days. Battle Creek: Review and Herald Office, 1859.
- Quimby, Paul E. "How Long Shall Be the Vision." A paper presented to the Bible Research Fellowship, Angwin, California, 1951. Heritage Room. James White Library. Andrews University.
- Read, W. E. "Studies on the Sanctuary--No. 1: God's Plan and Purpose." Review and Herald, 25 August 1932, pp. 795-97.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Studies on the Sanctuary--No. 2: The Earthly and Heavenly Sanctuary." Review and Herald, 8 September 1932, pp. 846-48.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Studies on the Sanctuary--No. 3: Christ Our Great High Priest." Review and Herald, 15 September 1932, pp. 871-73.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Studies on the Sanctuary--No. 4: Order of Service in the Heavenly Sanctuary." Review and Herald, 22 September 1932, pp. 895-97.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Studies on the Sanctuary--No. 5: Christ Ministers in Both Apartments of the Heavenly Sanctuary." Review and Herald, 29 September 1932, pp. 918-19.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Studies on the Sanctuary--No. 6: What the Daily Service Accomplished." Review and Herald, 6 October 1932, pp. 944-46.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Studies on the Sanctuary--No. 7: The Cleansing of the Sanctuary." Review and Herald, 13 October 1932, pp. 969-71.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Studies on the Sanctuary--No. 8: The Final Disposal of Sin." Review and Herald, 20 October 1932, pp. 992-93.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Studies in the Sanctuary--No. 9: The Hour of Judgment." Review and Herald, 27 October 1932, pp. 1017-18.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Studies on the Sanctuary--No. 10: The Time of the Third Angel's Message." Review and Herald, 3 November 1932, pp. 1040-41.
- Reiner, Edwin W. The Atonement. Nashville, Tennessee: Southern Publishing Assn., 1971.
- Rice, M. Leslie. From Disappointment to Victory. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1949.
- Richards, H. M. S. "The Holy Cross in the Desert." Sermon. Voice of Prophecy News, April 1975, pp. 9, 10.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Shadows of the Cross. Los Angeles: Voice of Prophecy, n.d.
- Risley, Ellen. Christ With Us, as Presented in the Sanctuary Service. Battle Creek: n.p., 1914.
- Robinson, A. T. "The Sanctuary and its Service." Series. Review and Herald, 8 August to 5 September, 1918.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Sanctuary Service." Review and Herald, 28 August 1930, pp. 8-10.

Rodriguez, Angel M. "Sacrificial Substitution and the OT Sacrifices." Biblical Research Institute Sanctuary and Atonement Study, 1979. Department of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, D.C.

Sabbath-School Lessons on the Sanctuary for 1901. Reprint edition. Denver, Colorado: International Health Institute, 1969.

Salom, A. P. "Exegesis of Selected Passages of Hebrews 8 and 9." June 1980. Department of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, D.C.

"The Sanctuary in Heaven." N.p., n.d. File no. 17: M. L. Andreasen/Sanctuary, Department of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, D.C.

Schwarz, Richard W. Light Bearers to the Remnant: Denominational History Textbook for Seventh-day Adventist College Classes. Mountain View, California: Pacific Press Publishing Assn., 1979.

Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine: An Explanation of certain Major Aspects of Seventh-day Adventist Belief. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1957.

Seventh-day Adventists, General Conference Department of Education. Principles of Life from the Word of God; a Systematic Study of the Major Doctrines of the Bible. Mountain View, California: Pacific Press Publishing Assn., 1952.

Seventh-day Adventists, General Conference Biblical Research Committee. The Brimsmead Agitation: Its Background, Attitudes, and Some of Its Teachings. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1969.

"The Seventh Month." Reprint from the Advent Herald. Review and Herald, 16 September 1851, p. 30.

Shea, William H. "Daniel and the Judgment." Prepared for the Sanctuary Review Committee, 1980. Department of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, D.C.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Investigative Judgment of Judah: Ezekiel 1-10." Biblical Research Institute Sanctuary and Atonement Study, 1978. Department of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, D.C.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Relationship between the Prophecies of Daniel 8 and Daniel 9." Revised May 2, 1979. Biblical Research Institute Sanctuary and Atonement Study, 1979. Department of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, D.C.

- Short, D. K. A Study of the Cleansing of the Sanctuary in Relation to Current Denominational History. M.A. thesis, Potomac University, Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, 1958.
- Shuler, John L. The Great Judgment Day in the Light of the Sanctuary Service. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1943, 1952.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Judgment." Review and Herald, 7 November 1935, pp. 14, 15.
- Smith, Preston. "How Shall We Stand." Review and Herald, 6 March 1969, pp. 9, 10.
- Spalding, Arthur W. Footprints of the Pioneers. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1947.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Origin and History of Seventh-day Adventists. 4 vols. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1961.
- Spicer, William A. Certainties of the Advent Movement. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1929.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Pioneer Days of the Second Advent Movement, with Notes on Pioneer Workers and Early Experiences. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1941.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Prophecy of Daniel 8--No. 2: 'Then Shall the Sanctuary be Cleansed'." Review and Herald, 6 January 1916, pp. 5, 6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Prophecy of Daniel 8--No. 3: Beginning of the 2300 Days." Review and Herald, 13 January 1916, pp. 3, 4.
- \_\_\_\_\_ to A. F. Ballenger, 14 June 1905. Record Group 21, Outgoing Letters, Book 41, 2 June-21 August 1905, p. 118. Department of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, D.C.
- Specht, Walter F. "Christ's Session, Enthronement and Mediatorial and Intercessory Ministry." A paper presented to the Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists. December 1977.
- Stephenson, J. M. "The Atonement." Series. Review and Herald, 22 August 1854, pp. 9-11; 26 September, pp. 49-51; 3 October, pp. 57-60; 17 October, pp. 73-77; 31 October, pp. 69-91; 7 November, pp. 97-100; 14 November, pp. 105-07; 21 November, pp. 113-16; 5 December, pp. 121-24.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Atonement. Rochester, New York: The Advent Review Office, 1854.

- Stevens, J. C. "Our Judgment." Review and Herald, 21 April 1938, pp. 7, 8.
- Stevenson, G. S. "The Heavenly Sanctuary." A paper presented to the Bible Research Fellowship, Angwin, California, 1952. Heritage Room. James White Library. Andrews University.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Jesus and the Judgment." Review and Herald, 28 August 1952, pp. 5, 6.
- Strand, Kenneth A. "Apocalyptic Prophecy: A Brief Introduction (with Special Attention to Daniel and Revelation)." Prepared for members of Sanctuary Review Committee, 1980. Department of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, D.C.
- Tabernacle Lecture Course: Comprising a Series of Discourses Setting Forth the Doctrines of Seventh-day Adventists. Delivered at the S.D.A. Tabernacle, Battle Creek, Mich. and reported for the Battle Creek Daily Journal. Battle Creek: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1885.
- Thiele, Edwin R. "Gabriel's Testimony Concerning 1844." Review and Herald, 3 July 1980, pp. 4-6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Gabriel's Testimony Concerning 1844--2: What Took Place in 1844." Review and Herald, 10 July 1880, pp. 9, 11.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Outline Studies in Daniel." Revised and enlarged. Emmanuel Missionary College, 1959. Heritage Room. James White Library. Andrews University.
- Thurber, Merwin R. "Discovered: A Manuscript Letter from William Miller--2: The Atonement in Type and Antitype." Review and Herald, 22 April 1976, pp. 8, 9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Symbols of Salvation: How Men are Saved, as Revealed in the Ancient Sanctuary. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1961.
- Trueblood, Elton. A Place to Stand. New York, Evanston and London: Harper and Row, 1969.
- Turner, W. G. to Institutional Managers, Members of Executive Committees, Ministerial Workers, 4 December 1930. W. W. Fletcher correspondence, 1930-1946. Heritage Room. James White Library. Andrews University.
- Veloso, Mario. "The Doctrine of the Sanctuary and the Atonement as Reflected in the Book of Revelation." [Biblical Research Institute Sanctuary and Atonement Study, 1979.] Department of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, D.C.

Waggoner, J. H. "The Atonement." Nos. 1-21. Signs of the Times,  
25 May 1876-26 October 1876.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Atonement; An Examination of a Remedial System in  
the Light of Nature and Revelation. In two parts. 2nd  
edition. Battle Creek: Steam Press of the Seventh-day  
Adventist Publishing Assn., 1872.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Atonement in the Light of Nature and Revelation.  
Mountain View, California: Pacific Press Publishing  
Assn., 1884.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Barnes on the Atonement." Review and Herald,  
10 September 1861, p. 116.

Waldorf, Nels J. The Vicar of Christ and the Daily. N.p., n.d.

Wallenkampe, Arnold V., ed. The Sanctuary and the Atonement, Vol. 1:  
Biblical Studies. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald  
Publishing Assn., 1980.

Waterhouse, Douglas. "Toward an Understanding of the Old Testament  
Sanctuary Services (except for the Day of Atonement)."  
Biblical Research Institute Sanctuary and Atonement Study,  
1978. Department of Archives and Statistics, General  
Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, D.C.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Understanding the Sanctuary." Syllabus. Andrews  
University, 1974.

Watson, C. H. The Atoning Work of Christ, His Sacrifice and Priestly  
Ministry. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing  
Assn., 1934.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Cleansing of the Sanctuary." Review and Herald,  
14 March 1935, pp. 12-14.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Investigative Judgment." Review and Herald,  
7 March 1935, pp. 3, 4.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Sanctuary in Heaven." Review and Herald,  
21 February 1935, pp. 4, 5.

Wearner, Alonzo J. "Glimpses of Open Gates." Review and Herald,  
30 October 1952, pp. 10, 11.

Wellcome, Isaac C. History of the Second Advent Message and Mission,  
Doctrine and People. Yarmouth, Maine: by the author, 1874.

[White, Arthur L.] "Arthur L. White Comments on the SDA Forum  
Presentation at Pacific Union College October 27, 1979."  
Ellen G. White Research Center. Andrews University.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Charge that the E. G. White Writings Are Being Changed--'Attempted Tampering'." Memorandum. 6 August 1971. Ellen G. White Estate. Washington, D.C.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Prophetic Guidance in Early Days: Influence of the Spirit of Prophecy from 1844 to 1855. III. Relationship to Development of Doctrine." Ministry, April 1941, pp. 11-13.
- White, Ellen G. Counsels to Writers and Editors: A Grouping of Messages of Counsel Addressed to Writers and Editors. Nashville, Tennessee: Southern Publishing Assn., 1946.
- [\_\_\_\_\_]. Evangelism as Set forth in the Writings of Ellen G. White. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1946.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Great Controversy Between Christ and Satan During the Christian Dispensation. Battle Creek: Review and Herald Publishing Co., 1888.
- White, James. "The Angels of Revelation XIV." Review and Herald, 29 November 1853, p. 164.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Ark and the Mercy Seat." Signs of the Times, 22 October 1874, p. 60.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Call at the Harbinger Office." Review and Herald, 17 February 1852, p. 94.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "'Call to Remembrance the Former Days'." Review and Herald, 16 September 1851, p. 25.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Definite Time Hidden." Signs of the Times, 4 June 1874, p. 6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Faith of Jesus." Review and Herald, 28 February 1854, p. 44.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Judgment." Review and Herald, 29 January 1857, p. 100.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Judgment. Oakland, California: Pacific Press Publishing Co., 1891.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Our Present Position." Review and Herald, No. 2, December 1850, pp. 13-15.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Our Present Position." Review and Herald, No. 4, January 1851, pp. 27-30.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Our Present Position: Or, the Waiting, Watching Time." Signs of the Times, 3 December 1874, pp. 73, 74.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Parable, Matthew XXV, 1-12." Review and Herald, 9 June 1851, pp. 97-103.

- \_\_\_\_\_. The Parable: Matthew XXV, 1-12. N.p., 1851.
- [\_\_\_\_\_]. "The Position of the Remnant. Their Duties and Trials Considered." Review and Herald, 12 September 1854, pp. 36, 37.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Sanctuary." Review and Herald, 31 March 1853, p. 181.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Sanctuary and 2300 Days." Review and Herald, 17 March 1853, pp. 172, 173.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Sanctuary, the 2300 Days, and the Shut Door. Oswego, New York: N.p., 1850.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Shut Door." Review and Herald, 14 April 1853, pp. 188, 189.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Sketches of the Christian Life and Public Labors of William Miller, Gathered from His Memoir by the Late Sylvester Bliss, and from other Sources. Battle Creek: Steam Press of the Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Assn., 1875.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Sounding of the Seven Trumpets of Revelation VIII and IX. Battle Creek: Steam Press of the Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Assn., 1859.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "This Generation." Signs of the Times, 4 June 1874, p. 6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The 2300 Days." Review and Herald, 6 December 1853, p. 72.
- \_\_\_\_\_. A Word to the "Little Flock." N.p., n.d.
- \_\_\_\_\_. A Word to the "Little Flock." Facsimile reproduction. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1944.
- Wolfkill, Guy F. "The End of the Great Controversy between Christ and Satan as Described in the Books of Daniel and the Revelation." A paper presented to the Bible Research Fellowship, Angwin, California, 1952. Heritage Room. James White Library. Andrews University.
- Wood, Kenneth H. "120 Years Ago." Editorial. Review and Herald, 22 October 1964, p. 16.