

*"Watchman,
what of the night?"*

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

Eze. 7:6 (Moffatt)

BEYOND THE BORDERS


EXPANDING THE SANCTUARY TRUTH BEYOND
THE TRADITIONAL BORDERS

(Part Two)

The heart of Adventism is the truth revealed by God in the earthly sanctuary, which He asked ancient Israel to erect, so that He might dwell among them. (Ex. 25:8) God had a special regard for Israel. He sent Moses to them with the message - "I will take you to me for a people, and I will be to you a God." (Ex. 6:7) To Pharaoh, Moses was instructed to declare - "Let my people go." (Ex. 8:1) In explaining to the Israelites why God chose them, Moses said - "The Lord did not set His love upon you, nor choose you, because ye were more in number than any people; for ye were the fewest of all people: but because the Lord loved you." (Deut. 7:7-8) We desire to be near those we love; likewise God. He desired to dwell among His people.

Connected with this sanctuary, Israel was to erect, were services. If they had no significance, the ritual of these services would be a meaningless routine in and of themselves. Each morning and each evening a lamb was offered on the Altar at the door of the sanctuary. (Ex. 29:38-42) Other sacrifices and offerings were defined for the individual worshiper. While the meaning of these services is inferred in the Old Testament, no direct statement is made. The Psalmist recognized that God's way was revealed in the sanctuary (Ps. 77:13) It is the New Testament witness which defines the message of the sanctuary. It opens with the cry of John the Baptist - "Behold the Lamb of God which taken away the sin of the world." (John 1:29) The Gospels tell the Sacrifice offered by Christ; Himself the priest, Himself the Victim, on the Altar of the Cross. It is the book of Hebrews which reveals the meaning and significance of the ministry of the risen Lord in the Sanctuary which the Lord pitched and not man. (Heb. 8:1-2)

How are we to understand that ministry? Paul writes that the earthly priesthood served "unto the example and shadow of heavenly things." (Heb. 8:5) The ministry of the earthly tabernacle was each year divided into two phases, a daily focusing primarily on the Altar in the Court, and a yearly ministry with its focus in the Most Holy Place, while the Holy Place



served in connection with both rituals. If the Word of God is to have any meaning, then the ministry of Jesus as a Priest must likewise consist of a dual ministry as indicated in the type. The message of Adventism is the message - "Behold the High Priest as He ministers the cleansing from sin" - even as John declared - "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." It is the Elijah message! How does this message relate to the prophetic revelation of Daniel 7:9-10? This is the question and on that answer hangs the relevancy of Adventism today.

The first most obvious observation between what is revealed of the Most Holy Place where "the judgment was set and the books were opened" and the most holy place of the earthly type is that a structural comparison is incongruent. In the earthly type, the High Priest entered, on the Day of Atonement, its Most Holy Place which was but a ten cubit cubicle. The vision given to Daniel reveals a judgment set in a vast temple room capable of accomodating the entire angelic host. While the curtains of the tabernacle were embroidered with the symbolism of cherubs, the emphasis on the service of the High Priest on the Day of Atonement was that he should enter alone that sacred enclosure. (See Ex. 26:1; Lev. 16:17) The contrast of the type and antitype is greater than likeness and can only be made congruent if we accept the dictum of Hebrews 8:5 - the priests served "unto the example and shadow of heavenly things."

It should be very apparent to the student of sanctuary type and antitype, that there must be a revised approach to the meaning of the symbolism, and a change of emphasis. Add to this the fact that the type reveals movement on the part of the High Priest on the Day of Atonement from the Most Holy Place to the Altar in the Court where the last act of the services of the Day were performed. Add yet another fact that in the final act of atonement, the blood of the bullock and of the Lord's goat was mingled to accomplish the symbolic cleansing. These added factors demand a rethinking of our sanctuary theology to bring our teaching into harmony with the combined revelation of the typical service (Lev. 16) and the prophetic representations given to Daniel (Chapters 7-9). To do so requires a painful laying aside of some previously held traditional concepts and a devotion to truth and truth alone. Truth loses nothing by honest and forthright investigation but is rather enhanced, as well as the experience of the one willing to do such an investigation.

Where do we begin? Accepting the dictum of Hebrews 8:5, we need to focus, in review, our attention on **the services** performed on the typical Day of Atonement as well as the daily services which provided a provisional atonement. It must be kept in mind that the typical sacrifices in and of themselves could accomplish nothing. They could "never take away sins." (Heb. 10:11) However, they do tell us how God intends to accomplish the fact so that when Christ comes the second time, He comes "without sin unto salvation." (Heb. 9:28)

In considering first the daily services regarding the sin offerings, certain facts need to be reviewed:

1) Sins of Ignorance were used by God to illustrate the atonement which resulted in forgiveness. (Lev. 4:2, 20, 26, 31)

2) Two categories of sins were noted - corporate and individual. (Lev. 4:13, 27)

3) The high priest ministered the atonement for the corporate confession, and the common priest for the individual confession. (Lev. 4:16, 30)

4) In the sacrifice of the individual sin offering, no blood was ever taken into the sanctuary. The record of the confession was placed on the horns of the Altar in the court. (Lev. 4:30) However, the priest did eat a token part of the sin offering. (Lev. 6:25-26)

5) In the corporate confession, the High Priest took some of the blood, sprinkled it before the Lord at the inner veil, and placed a record of the confession on the horns of the Altar of Incense. (Lev. 4:17-18)

These typical acts tell us certain things in regard to the heavenly ministry. First it needs to be recognized that the sin had already been committed. It was on record. When convicted thereof, the sinner found a merciful provision. He could transfer his guilt to a substitute, and be again at one with God. To indicate that this act transferred sin to the sanctuary is to suggest that the way to keep from facing our sins is not to confess them. It must be repeated that the sin had already been recorded, and when one convicted of that sin sought freedom from its guilt, a provision was made. The record of his desire, and the acceptance of the provision is recorded.

Translated into the Reality that can take away sins, it means that I, when convicted of my sins,

accept the redemption provided in Christ Jesus. That acceptance is recorded. I am "accepted in the beloved." (Eph. 1:6) In the figurative language of the Old Testament, my name is engraved on the palm of Jesus' hand. (Isa. 49:16) Even as the common priest partook of the sin offering which stood for the sinner, so Christ partook of my flesh and blood, and with His palm out stretched on Calvary, bore our sins. (Heb. 2:14; II Cor. 5:21)

The services for the Day of Atonements (Lev. 23:27-28, Heb. majestic plural), are detailed in Leviticus 16. Note carefully the following data:

1) The High Priest entered three times on that day into the Most Holy Place; first with incense, secondly with the blood of the bullock, and last with the blood of the Lord's goat. (16:12, 14, 15)

2) The bullock was provided by the High Priest, while the Lord's goat was taken from the congregation. (16:3, 6, 5)

3) The days's ritual was performed because of two things: 1) "the uncleanness of the children of Israel; and 2) "their transgressions in all their sins." (16:16)

4) The ministry was done in three steps: 1) In the most holy place; 2) In the holy place where were registered corporate confessions; and 3) At the Altar of the Court where individual confession had been made. (16:16-18)

5) It should be observed that while the "uncleanness of the children of Israel" is a factor in the cause for atonement, it is not until the final ministry at the Altar in the Court, that it is cleansed. (16:19, 30)

6) While the blood of the Lord's goat is used for the atonement in the most holy place, and the holy place, it is the mingled blood of the bullock and the Lord's goat which accomplished the final cleansing at the Altar in the Court. (16:18-19)

All of this data must be programmed into our understanding of the sanctuary truth. Up until now, we have either centered our focus only on the record of sins in the most holy place - "the transgressions in all [our] sins" - or we have jettisoned the whole truth as "stale, flat and unprofitable." Until we are willing to study the symbolism of the services in the typical sanctuary in all of its aspects, and adjust our thinking to the revelation found in the Word it shall continue to lack appeal and meaning to the new

generation of Adventism. It should be obvious to even a casual reader of Leviticus 16, that we have not even considered certain points of the data noted, and some of those we have, we have given a questionable interpretation.

Consider first the bullock provided by the High Priest. The text states that the bullock was to "make an atonement for himself, and for his house." (16:6, 11) The emphasis is stressed in these verses on "for himself." He is providing an atonement. It is not for "himself" in the sense of confession for no hand is placed upon the bullock in confession of sin. Aaron functioned as typical of Jesus Christ the great High Priest forever after the Order of Melchisedec. It was Jesus Christ who "offered Himself without spot to God." (Heb. 9:14) He did this for His "own house; whose house are we, if we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of our hope firm unto the end." (Heb. 3:6) It was the blood of the bullock, symbolic of Jesus giving Himself, that with the blood of the Lord's goat which figuratively accomplished the final cleansing.

Consider also, that the high priest on the typical Day of Atonement moved from the most holy place to a final ministration at the Altar of the Court. The significance of this movement we have failed to consider with its consequences in the reality of the Heavenly ministration. We have in our perception of the Judgment confined Jesus as continually ministering before the Heavenly Ark of the Covenant in the Most Holy Place until He lays down His censor to don His kingly robes of vengeance to come a second time. The type does not support this thinking. To make the sanctuary truth meaningful for a new generation of Adventists, this must be re-studied carefully.

We have lumped the Judgment together, or eliminated from our consideration, the significance of the fact that the registration of confession of sins in the daily services was recorded differently for corporate and individual confessions. This same distinction marked the Day of Atonement. The registration of blood in the holy place was atoned for prior to the cleansing at the Altar in the Court. We have focused our thinking of the judgment on individual cases, and have not included a concept of judgment on corporate sins. The type does not warrant such an exclusion. Admittedly, to accept the whole of a given truth often times leads to an unwelcomed conclusion which demands a decision we would prefer not to have to face. Because of this we opt for either what we smugly call "historic" Adventism, or we choose

to believe that the sanctuary truth is no longer relevant. Over the issue of the Sanctuary Truth for a new generation in Adventism, we have come to a crossroads where neither option is the present truth.

To Be Continued

LET'S TALK IT OVER

In a recent issue of WWN, we quoted from the publication, The Liberal Illusion, as to what would be the Catholic objective in regard to "the religious observance of Sunday" when they restructure society according their perception of "eternal standards." (8/95, p. 6) When writing the article for that August issue, I did not have a copy of the book before me, but relied on notes from a long ago evangelistic lecture. Besides, I was unable, at the time, to turn the book up in our library, even though I was sure we had a copy.

I wrote to the address of a key Roman Catholic agency in Washington D.C., to see if I could obtain a copy, since it had been translated from the French by the National Catholic Welfare Conference in 1939, and I could not find their address. To this request, I received back a handwritten note from one associated with the National Catholic Educational Association which read:

"Dear Elder Grotheer:

Being unable to locate any information about the book by Louis Veillot, The Liberal Illusion, after extensive consultation with the United States Catholic Conference (successor organization to the National Catholic Welfare Society) and the Archives and Library of the Catholic University of America, I regret to inform you that I have failed in my efforts to respond positively to your request. So sorry!

Sincerely,
Catherine McNamee"

In the meantime, we located the Library copy. Not only does this translated publication contain what Louis Veillot wrote in the French in 1866, but also a brief biographical sketch, and a "Translator's Preface." The translator boldly claims that the Encyclical by Leo XIII in 1888 on Liberalism "placed the seal of papal approval... fully upon the contents of Louis Veillot's The Liberal Illusion." (p. 8) In the brief "Biographical Forward," Ignatius Kelly, S.T.D. of DeSales College, noted that Veillot was

acclaimed by Leo XIII as a "Lay Father of the Church," and Pius X declared him to be "the model of them who fight for sacred causes." Jules Le Maitre gave him the epithet of "le grand catholique." (p. 3)

In the light of how Veillot was perceived by his Papal contemporaries, and that his book was promoted by the National Catholic Welfare Conference in 1939, the stated fact that his book cannot now be located in either the Archives or the Library of the Catholic University of America, is saying something.

What does it mean that Rome never changes? Does this mean that while its objectives never change, its methods for achieving its objective can change? Veillot was a Catholic zealot who did not hesitate to make his pen a sword. His was a confrontational approach to reach the objective. He wrote of force - "Force in the hands of the Church is the force of right, and we have no desire that right should remain without force. Force in its proper place and doing its duty, that is the orderly way." (The Liberal Illusion, pp. 47-48) His position was that in the era in which he lived (the Papacy was suffering under its "wound of death") force was not in its proper place, "that is to say at the disposition of the Church." He contended that "in the normal order, Christian society is maintained and extended by means of two powers that ought to be distinct - not separated, united - not confused, and one above the other - not equal. The one is the head, the other the arm; the one is the supreme and sovereign word of the Pontiff, the other the social power." (ibid., pp. 37-38)

Veillot pictures the union of Church and State as "two swords." The Church, "the first sword, the one that cleaves nothing but darkness, remains in the patient (sic) and infallibly enlightened power of the Pontiff. The other, the material sword, is in the hand of the representative of society, and in order that it may make no mistake, it is in duty bound to obey the commandment of the Pontiff. It is the Pontiff who bids it come forth from the scabbard and who bids it return thereto. Its duty is to repress aggressive error, once it has been defined and condemned, to shackle it, to strike it down; to give protection to the truth, whether the latter is under the necessity of defending itself, or has need, in its turn, to go on the offensive." (ibid.)

All of this is echoed in the Encyclicals of Leo XIII, and one can find this defined division basic

in the concepts of John Paul II as he endeavors to achieve the Roman objective - dominance of the world. Did Veullot, therefore, state too bluntly the Roman Catholic objectives so that his translated book was an embarrassment to Rome and had to be "lost," or unavailable? Is Rome now seeking to cover the same objectives under the terminology of "a well **ordered** society" and "**ordered** liberty"? (See WWN, 4/95, p. 4)

In reading through the latest issue of Christian History, (Vol. XIV, #3) on "Paul and His Times," I noted an early Christian document quoted. The instruction from the Didache, as it is comonly called, is very apropos for this present hour due to the "many voices" sounding in the Community of Adventism. Written in the early part of the 2nd Century (circa. A.D. 120), it counseled:

"Let every apostle that cometh to you be received as the Lord. But he shall not remain except one day; but if there be need, also the next; but if he remain three days, he is a false prophet. And when the apostle goeth away, let him take nothing but bread until he lodgeth; but if he ask money, he is a false prophet." (The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. VII, p. 380; writer's emphasis)

May I suggest that you take time to write down the names of all the "independent" ministries you know, from whom you receive letters and/or publications. (We do not have space to do so) Place a check after each name that solicits money from you. Then follow the advice of this early Christian document, write after that name - "false prophet." If every concernd Adventist, and all who consider themselves, "historic" Adventists would do so, the clouds of confusion which now hang heavy over the Community of Adventism would be rapidly dispelled, as is fog before the morning sun.

The July-August issue of the 1888 Message Newsletter highlighted the "Primacy of the Gospel Committee" meeting at the General Conference headquarters in Silver Spring, Maryland on May 24 of this year. This ad hoc committee was set up by the President of the General Conference to "examine and test whether the concepts proclaimed by the 1888 Message Study Committee can be sustained from Scripture."

The report in the Newsletter stated - "The

nature of Christ [in the incarnation] was **purposefully** not discussed, it being suggested that other topics need to be considered first, especially justification by faith in the light of the Day of Atonement and "corporate repentance." (p. 1; emphasis supplied)

Questions: Would there have been any justification by faith, or a Day of Atonement had there been no incarnation? Would not "corporate repentance" involve a change from the apostasy which prevails in the Church regarding the incarnation? To what lengths of compromise will Wieland go to curry the favor of the apostate leadership of the Church?

whg

The 1995 Annual Fellowship is now past history. Audio tapes of the morning Seminar on the Re-Survey of the End-Time are now available, plus the Sabbath Morning sermon - "Our Christian Heritage" You may obtain these for US\$12.50 postpaid from the Foundation office. For Australians, write to the Belmont address for details.

Videos of the other seminar on the Godhead and historical presentations were made. Information regarding these can be obtained by writing to Gary Patrick, 634 S Van Buren, Mason City, IA 50401.

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

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

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

Editor Elder Wm. H. Grotheer

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

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