

Ellen G. White Publications

INCORPORATED

TRUSTEES

F. M. WILCOX
J. L. McELHANY
S. RASMUSSEN
A. L. WHITE
M. E. KERN

GENERAL CONFERENCE, TAKOMA PARK, D. C.

March 19, 1940

J. V. H. W. F. Z.
QA 40-A

140 Steiner Ave.
Bradley Beach, N. J.

Dear Brother

It has been several weeks since I received your letter written January 26. I must apologize for the long delay in replying. Not being a student of the Greek, I asked one of my co-laborers in regard to the third question which you raised, and because of pressure of other work, there was some delay in getting a reply to me. Had I known there was to be such a long delay in this matter, I should have dealt with the first two questions much earlier.

I am sorry to learn that your friend seems somewhat confused in regard to the Spirit of prophecy. For one to find his confidence in the Spirit of prophecy jeopardized because there may be some things that are difficult to understand or to explain, is very unfortunate. There are some things in Scripture which are difficult of explanation, and yet we do not cast aside our confidence in the Bible because we are unable to harmonize every text. When a gift, as the Spirit of prophecy, which has manifested its influence among Seventh-day Adventists for seventy years while the instrument was alive, and for twenty-five years more following her death, and that during the time of the greatest development in the work of Seventh-day Adventists; and when the fruit of that gift is so apparent and in every case good, one is hardly justified in abandoning confidence in the gift because of a few statements which to his mind seem unexplainable or contradictory.

We sincerely hope that the brother whom you mention may find his way clearly through the problems which concern him.

A { Your first question relates to the statements in "Patriarchs and Prophets," page 354 and "Great Controversy," page 418, pertaining to the transferring of sin from the sinner to the sanctuary in the case of the ancient sanctuary service. Both statements are very much alike, and the criticism is based on an understanding of the terms "individuals" and "repentant sinner" in "Patriarchs and Prophets" and "sinner" in "Great Controversy." It is assumed by the questioner that these two terms as used in these two books, refer only to one of the common people. However, the statement is not so made.

It is a fact that the Scriptures bring to view two methods of transferring sin from the sinner to the sanctuary. In the case of the priest or the congregation, the blood was carried into the sanctuary. In the case of the ruler, or one of the common people, the flesh was eaten and thus transferred

to the priest and through him to the sanctuary. Let me ask whether the priest, the ruler, or one of the common people who has sinned may not be the "individual" and "repentant sinner" of "Patriarchs and Prophets" and the "sinner" of "Great Controversy."

Sister White in these two books does not deal with the minutae of the various phases of the sacrificial system, drawing the fine line of differentiation between various classes of sinners. In the paragraphs under question, she makes a general statement bringing to view the two methods of transferring sin to the sanctuary, without specifying who the sinner is or what his office or position may be. If in "Great Controversy" or "Patriarchs and Prophets" the procedure for the priest or for the whole congregation was elsewhere taken up, one might feel that there was justification for the conclusion that the "individual" and "repentant sinner" of the quotations in question excluded the priest and the entire congregation. The question of the transfer of sin is dealt with as a whole rather than in particular detail.

In this connection I will quote a statement made on this point by Elder M. L. Andreasen, one of the teachers in the Theological Seminary. He has given much earnest study to the question of the sanctuary. You will observe that he in turn quotes a statement made by Sister White, published in the Signs of the Times of March 14, 1878, which is of particular interest, as it relates to the sin of the people being transferred vicariously to the sanctuary through the blood of the priest's offering, which in this case was carried into the holy place.

The blood of the sin offering was carried into the sanctuary in the case of the priest or the whole congregation sinning. Lev. 4:6,17. In the case of a ruler or one of the common people, the blood was not carried into the sanctuary. Lev. 4:25,30. In the latter two cases the blood was put on the horns of the altar of burnt offering, and the rest poured out at the foot of the altar. In such cases the flesh was eaten by the priest who thus carried sin. Lev. 10:17,18.

In these two cases the sin was therefore transferred from the sinner to the priest, who was thus made to carry sin. Sin being thus laid upon him, he became a sinner, and it was necessary for him to offer. He might have officiated for several persons during the day, and thus have an accumulation of sin which he bore vicariously. He therefore offered a lamb or whatever other sacrifice was necessary. But in case of a priest the blood was carried into the sanctuary, as before noted. When the blood was thus carried in, the sin which the priest bore--mostly those of common people, was through the blood transferred to the sanctuary. Of this Sister White says:

"The sins of the people were transferred in figure to the officiating priest, who was a mediator for the people. The priest could not himself become an offering for sin, and make atonement with his life, for he was also a sinner. Therefore, instead of suffering death himself, he killed a lamb without blemish; the penalty of sin was transferred to the innocent beast, which thus became his immediate substitute, and typified the perfect offering of Jesus Christ. Through the blood of this victim, man looked forward by faith to the blood of Christ which would atone for the sins of the world."

Another question relates to the reference to Armageddon in "Great Controversy," in the Index, and also to Armageddon as referred to in the general "Index to the Writings of Mrs. E. G. White."

The term "Armageddon" is not used in the book "Great Controversy," and the reference to the conflict at the close of the thousand years, under the topic of Armageddon as listed in the Index to that book is plainly an interpretation of the indexer. Mrs. White was in no way responsible for this, and in all new editions the reference to Armageddon in the Index has been deleted. Just how this matter slipped into the Index of the book I cannot say; but we recognize that it so clearly represents an individual interpretation that we are not justified in keeping the reference in the Index.

For a statement regarding the alleged discrepancy between John 20:19 and "Desire of Ages," I enclose a statement prepared by Elder D. E. Robinson, who has checked the Greek with some of our best Greek students, as well as standard lexicons.

Sincerely your brother,

Arthur L. White, Secretary
ELLEN G. WHITE PUBLICATIONS