

THE EXTENDED ATONEMENT VIEW IN THE *DAY-DAWN* AND THE EMERGENCE OF SABBATARIAN ADVENTISM

MERLIN D. BURT
Andrews University

To historians of American Christianity, it is well known that the Millerite movement of the 1840s gave rise to several different denominations, of which the Advent Christians, Church of God (Oregon, Illinois), Church of God (Seventh-day), and the Seventh-day Adventists, have endured to the present.¹ Not so well known are the theological issues that split the Millerites into divergent camps by 1846, a process in which the *Day-Dawn* played a key role.

The purpose of this study is to examine briefly the significance of the March 1845 *Day-Dawn* and the historical development of sanctuary-atonement theology as developed by Bridegroom Adventists and particularly by O. R. L. Crosier. This article does not intend to fully cover the various aspects of Crosier's arguments, but rather to give an overview to situate the *Day-Dawn* within the flow of postdisappointment Millerite Adventism and show the importance of the *Day-Dawn* for the emergence of Sabbatarian Adventism and later the Seventh-day Adventist Church.²

Beginning in the early 1830s, William Miller preached the Second Advent of Christ "about the year 1843" on the basis of the prophecies of Daniel and Revelation.³ The most important of these prophecies was Dan 8:14: "Unto two thousand three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." Millerite Adventists understood this text to identify the time of Christ's return. Great revival and excitement accompanied the proclamation of the Second Coming. The movement grew and expanded until it was well known in America and could count its adherents in the tens of thousands.⁴

¹Merlin D. Burt, "Historical Introduction," to the facsimile reprint of *Memoirs of Wm. Miller* by Sylvester Bliss (Boston: J. V. Himes, 1853; reprint, Berrien Springs: Andrews University Press, 2005), vii. Cf. George R. Knight, *Millennial Fever and the End of the World: A Study of Millerite Adventism* (Boise, ID: Pacific Press, 1993), 327.

²For a more complete examination of Bridegroom Adventism and collateral topics see Merlin D. Burt, "The Historical Background, Interconnected Development, and Integration of the Doctrines of the Sanctuary, the Sabbath, and Ellen G. White's Role in Sabbatarian Adventism from 1844 to 1849" (Ph.D. dissertation, Andrews University, 2002).

³William Miller, *Evidence from Scripture and History of the Second Coming of Christ About the Year 1843: Exhibited in a Course of Lectures* (Troy, NY: Kemble & Hooper, 1836).

⁴George R. Knight, *Millennial Fever and the End of the World: A Study of Millerite Adventism* (Boise, ID: Pacific Press, 1993), 213; Whitney R. Cross, *The Burned-Over District: The Social and Intellectual History of Enthusiastic Religion in Western New York, 1800-1850* (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), 287.

In October of 1844, Millerites experienced their greatest anticipation regarding the Second Coming of Jesus, eventually focusing on October 22/23, 1844. Following this date, known as the Great Disappointment, the movement began to fragment over the meaning of Dan 8:14 in light of their collective experiences. By 1845, Miller, J. V. Himes, and other key leaders concluded that they had been mistaken in connecting prophetic chronology to the autumn of 1844 and began looking for a future date. A minority group, known as Bridegroom or Shut-Door⁵ Adventists, continued to maintain the correctness of the 1844 date, but with a modified understanding of the event that occurred then.

By the summer of 1845, Bridegroom Adventism had further split over two major theological points. First, a growing majority of Bridegroom Adventists believed that (1) Jesus had come spiritually in October 1844, and (2) most also believed that he had *in one day*—the Day of Atonement in 1844—completed his high priestly work in the heavenly sanctuary and was now reigning as King. These held to a stricter shut-door view. The minority Bridegroom view was that (1) Jesus had *not* come in October 1844, but (2) had begun *extended* atonement as high priest in the heaven sanctuary and would soon return to earth literally. Sabbatarian Adventism followed the minority Bridegroom view on both points.

Bridegroom Adventism and the Advent Mirror

The baseline publication for Bridegroom Adventists was the January 1845 *Advent Mirror*, written and edited by two prominent Millerite ministers, Apollos Hale and Joseph Turner. Before the October 1844 expectation of the Second Coming of Jesus, Millerite leaders Josiah Litch, Hale, and Miller had laid the foundational ideas for a heavenly-sanctuary ministry of Jesus through the concepts of a special time-of-the-end judgment and a close of human probation, just preceding the Second Coming. Samuel Snow had more directly applied typological arguments on the Day of Atonement to conclude that Jesus would come on or about October 22, 1844. As with Miller, Snow examined the Jewish typical year to find typological connecting points to more specifically identify the ending points for the prophetic periods described in Daniel and Revelation. During the late summer of 1844, his *True Midnight Cry* was widely circulated and studied by Millerites.⁶

These background perspectives prepared the way for Hale and Turner to conclude that the parable of the ten virgins in Matt 25 portrayed the history of

⁵The phrase “shut-door” was initially used by Millerites to describe the close of human probation just before the Second Coming of Jesus. William Miller introduced the term and idea in 1836, using the parable of the ten virgins in Matt 25. After the autumn 1844 disappointment, Bridegroom Adventists continued to use the term, but the definition became more fluid and did not exclusively refer to the final close of probation. See William Miller, *Evidence from Scripture and History of the Second Coming of Christ about the Year 1843: Exhibited in a Course of Lectures* (Troy, NY: Kemble & Hooper, 1836), 97, 99.

⁶Samuel S. Snow, “Behold, the Bridegroom Cometh; Go Ye Out to Meet Him,” *True Midnight Cry*, August 22, 1844; see also Burt, “Historical Background,” 2002, 33-36.

the Advent movement and allegorically explained the meaning of the October 1844 disappointment. Since Christ had not come as king at the expected time, they proposed that he had instead come as a Bridegroom to a heavenly wedding. With Jesus as the Bridegroom, they identified the heavenly New Jerusalem as the bride, the marriage as the act of Christ in receiving his kingdom in heaven, and the Advent believers as the virgins.

The main focus of the *Advent Mirror* was to explore the meaning of the marriage. The paper divided the marriage into two steps: the marriage and the marriage supper. The supper was linked to the Second Coming of Jesus as king (Rev 19:7-9; 11-16). The marriage, it was argued, occurred in heaven and preceded the Second Coming. Turner and Hale presented the coming of the Son of Man (Jesus) to the Ancient of Days (God the Father) in Dan 7:9-10, 13-14 as describing events connected with a heavenly marriage. The Ancient of Days sat in judgment and gave to the Son of Man "dominion, glory and a kingdom." Christ was made a king as he received the New Jerusalem at the marriage. As king, Jesus then went from the wedding to the "marriage supper," which occurred when he gathered his saints at the Second Coming. Thus Hale and Turner linked the autumn 1844 date to the marriage, which they believed confirmed the soon return of Jesus.⁷

O. R. L. Crosier and the Day-Dawn

While the *Advent Mirror* did not explicitly suggest an extended atonement in the Most Holy Place of the heavenly sanctuary beginning in 1844, it did theologially prepare the way for this conclusion. This idea was first proposed in print by Crosier in the first issue of the *Day-Dawn*, published in Canandaigua, New York, during March 1845. This broadside publication is republished for the first time in this issue of *Andrews University Seminary Studies*.⁸

The *Day-Dawn*, though not widely influential among Millerite Adventists, was the first source to propose the idea of an extended atonement by Jesus in the Most Holy Place of the heavenly sanctuary, beginning in 1844. In the *Day-Dawn*, Crosier modified Snow's antitypical Day of Atonement explanation for 1844. Throughout 1845 and continuing into 1846, Crosier continued to develop his typological explanation for the disappointment through the *Day-Dawn* and through correspondence to the *Day-Star* and other papers, culminating in his February 7, 1846, *Day-Star* Extra issue. The *Day-Star* Extra became the seminal publication that combined sanctuary typology with extended atonement. These concepts later combined with Sabbatarian sentiment, launched the movement that would eventually become the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

Enoch Jacobs, editor of the *Day-Star*, gave a brief notice of the March 1845 issue of the *Day-Dawn*, but apparently did not carefully read the paper. His

⁷A. Hale and J. Turner, "Has Not the Savior Come as the Bridegroom?" *Advent Mirror*, January 1845, 1-2.

⁸See previous article, 317-330.

conclusion was that it had a “good spirit—the sentiments differing but a little from those of Bro. Hale—‘The Jubilee Standard,’ and ‘The Hope of Israel.’”⁹ In fact, the paper contained dramatically important new ideas that connected the heavenly sanctuary to the Bridegroom concept. It built on the earlier concepts of the preadvent judgment and close of probation published by Miller, Litch, and Hale,¹⁰ and on the new Bridegroom understanding presented in the *Advent Mirror*. Though Jacobs did some creative modification of the heavenly judgment ideas presented by Litch and Hale in November 1844 by suggesting it would last forty days, he did not connect the heavenly judgment idea to a heavenly-sanctuary atonement ministry of Christ.¹¹ In the *Day-Dawn*, Crosier’s major contribution was publishing the idea that the October 1844 date was the beginning of a new and unique extended heavenly sanctuary atonement by Jesus in the Most Holy Place.¹²

Crosier believed that the parable of the ten virgins in Matt 25 gave a “chronology of four important events, viz: (1) The tarrying time, (2) the midnight cry, (3) the marriage, and (4) shutting of the door.” Of these four, he saw the

⁹[Enoch Jacobs], *Day-Star*, April 15, 1845, 36.

¹⁰Josiah Litch, “The Doctrine of the Millennium: The Order of the Resurrection and Order of the Judgment,” *Second Advent Tracts*, No. 12, June 1841, 11, 12; Apollon Hale, *Herald of the Bridegroom! In Which the Plagues That Await the Enemies of the King Eternal Are Considered; and the Appearing of Our Lord to Gather His Saints*. . . (Boston: Joshua V. Himes, December 1, 1843), 22, 23; William Miller, “Brother Miller’s Letter, on the Seventh Month,” *Midnight Cry*, October 12, 1844, 122. See also P. Gerard Damsteegt, “Historical Background: Early Nineteenth Century,” in *Doctrine of the Sanctuary: A Historical Survey, 1845-1863*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, 1989), 1-16; Haddock, “A History of the Doctrine of the Sanctuary,” 91-94; C. M. Maxwell, “The Investigative Judgment,” 545-581; C. M. Maxwell, *Magnificent Disappointment*,” 71-85.

¹¹[Enoch Jacobs], “The Time,” *Western Midnight Cry!*, November 29, 1844, 3, 4. See also Bert Haloviak, “From Millerism, through the Scattering, to the Third Angel: Ellen White and Light from the Most Holy Place, 1844-1851,” paper read at Andrews Society for Religious Studies, San Francisco, California, December 16-18, 1981, Ellen G. White Estate Branch Office, LLU; C. M. Maxwell, “The Investigative Judgment,” 545-581.

¹²Crosier began his ministry in the Wesleyan Church, but withdrew in 1843 at the age of twenty-three to begin preaching the Advent message. Being an orphan, he developed strong attachments with various associates during his childhood and young adult life. One of these was an Adventist and respected medical doctor, Franklin B. Hahn of Canandaigua, whom Crosier joined together with to publish the *Day-Dawn*. Crosier did the writing and Hahn provided the funding and served as publisher. In fact, Hahn’s home in Canandaigua was always open to Crosier. It also doubled as the Advent meeting place. Crosier often traveled in New York between Port Gibson, Rochester, and Canandaigua. When in Port Gibson, he stayed in the home of Hiram Edson, another Adventist whose home also served as a place of meeting. See O. R. L. Crosier, “Early History of Ontario County Revealed in Story of Late Owen R. L. Crozier,” *Daily Messenger*, November 22, 1923, 17, 22. See also 1850 United States Federal Census for Ontario County, New York; Alberto Ronald Timm, “O. R. L. Crosier: A Biographical Introduction,” Term Paper, AU, 1991; Hiram Edson, Manuscript Fragment, n.d., AU.

marriage as “being the point or nucleus about which all the others cluster.”¹³ Crosier equated the “tarrying time” with the period during the late spring and early summer of 1844, when the “believers” “slumbered and slept.” He saw the Midnight Cry as the October 1844 movement and believed that the shutting of the door occurred “before the marriage proceeds.” His explanation of the marriage was that Jesus had begun a special extended mediatorial work in the Most Holy Place for his saints: “As the anti-type of the jubilee trumpet (Rev 10:7; 11; 15) occupies more than a literal day[,] may not the atonement also occupy more than a literal day?”¹⁴ Later in the article, he continues: “If the jubilee trumpet sounded or began to sound on the tenth day of the seventh month—of which we have not a doubt—on that day our great High Priest made, or began to make, the grand and final atonement: See Lev. 16:33, 34.” Thus Crosier concluded: “So Christ is to receive his kingdom *before, and preparatory to*, the utter desolation of the kingdoms of this earth.”¹⁵

Crosier divided the mediatorial work of Christ into two parts: “The object of the typical institutions was to bring these two offices, that Christ was to perform as the Redeemer of mankind, to our limited comprehension. These were typified by the two apartments or services in the two apartments of the tabernacle.”¹⁶ He proposed that the holy place applied to “intercession for transgressors,” which continued until the beginning of the marriage on the Day of Atonement, or the “tenth day of the seventh month” 1844, at which point Christ began a work in the “holy of holies” “for his saints exclusively.” This work was a “final atonement,” when the “sins of the whole house of Israel” were to be “cast into eternal oblivion.” Quoting Lev 25:9, he wrote: “Then shalt thou cause the trumpet of the jubilee to sound, on the tenth day of the seventh month, in the day of atonement shall ye make the trumpet sound throughout all your land.”¹⁷

The Extended Atonement and the Shut Door

By April 1845, Crosier had progressed further in his understanding:

On that day (Oct. 23 [1844]), Jesus closed the tarrying time by entering upon the office of bridegroom or the final atonement. Our great High Priest is now making the atonement for the whole Israel, while we should be engaged in the most important work of prayer. Some supposed that if Christ entered upon the

¹³O. R. L. Crosier and F. B. Hahn, reprint of early 1845 *Day-Dawn* issue published on last page of *Ontario Messenger*, March 26, 1845. Cf. George Storrs developed the first two of Crosier’s four points previous to the October 1844 disappointment (“Go Ye Out to Meet Him: The Tenth Day of the Seventh Month,” *Bible Examiner*, September 24, 1844, 2).

¹⁴Crosier and Hahn, 321.

¹⁵*Ibid.*, 322.

¹⁶*Ibid.*, 320.

¹⁷*Ibid.*, 321.

work of atonement on the tenth, he has left the mercy seat, and hence that all access by prayer is cut off. But the mercy seat is in the Holiest of all . . . so that he has approached directly to the mercy seat. . . . To encourage us in this crisis he says, let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith.¹⁸

Thus, while the door had been shut for the world, Crosier sought to encourage Bridegroom Adventists to look to Jesus and come to him in prayer with "full assurance." He wished to affirm that Jesus had not left them alone, but instead stood before the mercy seat in the Most Holy Place of the heavenly sanctuary. For Bridegroom Adventists, there was an open door into the Most Holy Place.¹⁹

The most important aspect of Crosier's article was his proposal that the final ministry of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary extended over a period of time. During March and April 1845, two views developed on the heavenly atonement ministry of Jesus in the heavenly sanctuary. The extended-atonement view as presented by Crosier was the minority position. He was joined in his views by Emily Clemons, a prominent editor, poet, and writer in the Millerite movement, and Ellen Harmon (White), who began to receive prophetic visions in December 1844 and became a cofounder of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. It appears that each of these individuals developed their ideas independently. Clemons developed an experiential application of the extended atonement and connected it with the New Covenant and personal holiness.²⁰ But although she went on to edit her own paper during the summer of 1845, titled *Hope Within the Veil*, she soon abandoned her position.²¹ Harmon (White) had a vision in February 1845, where she saw Jesus as a "great High Priest," rather than as a king, as proposed by Snow. Snow limited Christ's high-priestly atonement to a single day, October 22, 1844, after which, in his view Christ had begun to reign as king.

¹⁸O. R. L. Crosier, "From Bro. Crosier," *Hope of Israel*, April 17, 1845, 4. There was some ambiguity among the Millerites whether the close of the prophecy Dan 8:14 would occur on October 22 or 23.

¹⁹Major treatment on the shut door includes: Burt, "Historical Background"; P. Gerard Damsteegt, *Foundations of the Seventh-day Adventist Message and Mission* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1995), 104-124; Herbert E. Douglass, *Messenger of the Lord: The Prophetic Ministry of Ellen G. White* (Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 1998), 500-512, 549-569; Francis D. Nichol, *Ellen G. White and her Critics: An Answer to the Major Charges that Critics have Brought Against Mrs. Ellen G. White* (Washington DC: Review and Herald, 1951), 161-252; Robert W. Olson, "The Shut Door Documents: Statements Relating to the 'Shut Door,' the Door of Mercy, and the Salvation of Souls, by Ellen G. White and Other Early Adventists Arranged in a Chronological Setting from 1844 to 1851," April 11, 1982, Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD; 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, Andrews University, 1978, Berrien Springs.

²⁰For more detail on Clemons, see Merlin D. Burt, "Emily C. Clemons and the Developing Sanctuary Doctrine During 1845," research paper, AU, 1997.

²¹Burt, "Historical Background," 179.

One-Day Atonement View

It is important to understand that during 1845 most Bridegroom Adventists,²² including James White (later an important Sabbatarian Adventist and cofounder of the Seventh-day Adventist Church), believed that the atonement was *completed* on the tenth day of the seventh month 1844.²³ This had been the position of Snow in August 1844 as he promoted the October 1844 Day of Atonement date for the Second Coming of Jesus. Snow argued that on the Day of Atonement the high priest went in and came out of the Most Holy Place of the tabernacle on the “*same day*.” His conclusion was thus:

Now the *important point* of this type is the *completion* of the reconciliation at the *coming* of the high priest *out of* the holy place. The high priest was a type of Jesus our High Priest; the most holy place a type of heaven itself; and the coming out of the high priest a type of the coming of Jesus the second time to bless his waiting people. As this was on the tenth day of the 7th month, so on that day Jesus will certainly come, because not a *single point* of the law is to fail. *All must be fulfilled.*²⁴

Snow further noted that the Day of Atonement was also the time of the blowing of the jubilee trumpet for the redemption of all the land. Since the Feast of Tabernacles began five days after the Day of Atonement, he believed it to be a type of the “marriage supper of the Lamb; which will be celebrated in the New Jerusalem, the tabernacle of God which is to be with men.”²⁵

Snow remained steadfast in his one-day-atonement view during 1845 and became an active and sometimes strident critic of Crosier, Clemons, and others who promoted the idea of an extended atonement. In 1845, he wrote against the extended-atonement view:

The point of time arrived, on the 10th day of the 7th month, when the atonement or reconciling was completed, and of course *no more were to be reconciled*. . . . The message was accompanied by the seal of the Holy Ghost, and was therefore truth. It follows, therefore, that the Bridegroom received the Bride, i.e. New Jerusalem the capitol of his kingdom, the atonement was finished and the Jubilee trumpet was blown, on the 10th day of the 7th month.²⁶

²²Enoch Jacobs, “The Time,” *Western Midnight Cry*, November 29, 1844, 19; “To the Believers Scattered Abroad,” *Day-Star*, April 22, 1845, 21-24 (taken from the *Hope of Israel*); F. G. Brown, “Letter from Bro. Brown,” *Day-Star*, April 15, 1845, 34; G. W. Peavey, “Unto Two Thousand and Three Hundred Days: Then Shall the Sanctuary be Cleansed,” *Jubilee Standard*, August 7, 1845, 166; John Lewis, “Letter from Bro. Lewis,” *Day-Star*, October 25, 1845, 8; Lewis Hersey, “Letter from Bro. Hersey,” *Day-Star*, November 15, 1845, 24.

²³James White, “Watchman What of the Night!,” *Day-Star*, September 20, 1845, 26.

²⁴Samuel S. Snow, “Behold, the Bridegroom Cometh; Go Ye Out to Meet Him,” *True Midnight Cry*, August 22, 1844, 4.

²⁵*Ibid.*

²⁶Samuel S. Snow, “Behold He Cometh!!,” *Day-Star*, April 22, 1845, 41.

Importance of the Extended Atonement View

The significance of the articles by Crosier and Clemons, in laying the foundation for the concept of an extended atonement in the Most Holy Place of the heavenly sanctuary beginning in 1844, cannot be underestimated. These two individuals became the most important published promoters of the extended-atonement view during 1845.²⁷ Crosier, Clemons, and also Harmon (White) presented a position that theologically undermined a strict shut-door view. While Snow and other one-day-atonement advocates who no longer saw Jesus as a high priest after October 1844 would naturally conclude that probation had closed, those who presented an extended-atonement view continued to see Jesus in a mediatorial role. As the more radical spiritualizing branch of Bridegroom Adventism imploded during the first half of 1846, the same group's equally radical view that Jesus was king and no longer a high priest was abandoned. What remained was a literal view of the Second Coming of Jesus, with a clearer understanding of the extended atonement as an explanation for what happened in October 1844. The realization dawned on Sabbatarian Adventists that the 1844 shut-door view needed to give way to the idea that Jesus, as high priest, ministered for all humans—sinners and saints—until probation finally closed just before his Second Coming.

Crosier remained the principal advocate of the extended-atonement view through 1846. During 1845, he continued to write letters that developed and clarified his view.²⁸ His fully developed explanation was published in a lengthy article in the *Day-Star* Extra, February 7, 1846.²⁹ Beginning in 1846, Harmon (White) emphatically supported Crosier's view.³⁰ Thus, by about 1851, the extended-atonement view had set the theological course that caused Sabbatarian Adventists to discard most aspects of the shut-door view

²⁷See Burt, "Historical Background," 103-107, 178-191, 242-250.

²⁸O. R. L. Crosier, "From Bro. Crosier," *Hope of Israel*, April 17, 1845, 4; idem., "Letter from Bro. O. R. L. Crosier," *Day-Star*, October 11, 1845, 50; idem., "The Springwater Affair," *Voice of Truth*, October 29, 1845, 505; idem., "Dear Bro. Jacobs," *Day-Star*, November 15, 1845, 23.

²⁹O. R. L. Crosier, "The Law of Moses," *Day-Star* Extra, February 7, 1846, 38-44. While many aspects of Bridegroom Adventism during 1845 and 1846 have been only lightly studied, the February 7 *Day-Star* Extra has been carefully examined. See R. Haddock, "A History of the Doctrine of the Sanctuary in the Advent Movement," B.D. thesis, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1970, 111-129; P. Gerard Damsteegt, "Among Sabbatarian Adventists: 1845-1850," in *Doctrine of the Sanctuary: A Historical Survey, 1845-1863*, ed. F. B. Holbrook (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, 1989), 29-41; Froom, *The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers*, 4:889-905, 1228-1234; K. Bangert, "A Summary and Appraisal of O. R. L. Crosier's Article in the *Day-Star* Extra" (Term paper, Andrews University, 1974); A. R. Timm, "O. R. L. Crosier: A Biographical Introduction" (Term paper, Andrews University, 1991), 8-17.

³⁰Ellen G. White to Bro. Eli Curtis, April 21, 1847, in [J. White], *A Word to the "Little Flock,"* 12.

that they had inherited from Miller, Snow, and others.

Conclusion

After the 1844 disappointment, Millerite Adventism broke into two parts. The larger mainline group gave up faith in the October 1844 date, while the smaller group, Bridegroom Adventists, continued to hold to the October 1844 date. The Bridegroom view was initially presented by Hale and Turner in their seminal January 1845 publication, the *Advent Mirror*.

During 1845, Bridegroom Adventism divided in at least two major ways. The first concerned the time and meaning of the Second Advent. By 1846, a majority accepted the idea that Jesus had spiritually come the second time in 1844. A minority view, held by those who later became Seventh-day Adventists, rejected the spiritual view and argued for a future, literal Second Coming of Jesus. Both Bridegroom groups continued to argue for the prophetic significance of the 1844 date. A second point of fracture within Bridegroom Adventism was over the meaning of the atonement. The traditional pre-1844 Millerite view inherited from Miller and Snow was that Jesus would complete the Most Holy Place atonement in the heavenly sanctuary on one literal day—the Day of Atonement, after which he would come the second time to reign as king. During 1845, most Bridegroom Adventists, and particularly Snow, believed that Jesus ended his priestly ministry and began to reign as king in October 1844. The minority extended-atonement view presented by Crosier said that Jesus had begun a special end-time high priestly ministry in the Most Holy Place of the heavenly sanctuary in October 1844 and that this ministry would continue until the final close of probation. During 1846, Harmon (White) and Sabbatarian Adventists embraced the extended-atonement view.

The emergence of Sabbatarian Adventism can be directly traced to its earliest roots in the publication of Crosier's March 1845 *Day-Dawn* article in Canandaigua, New York. The new and essential idea in his article was that Jesus had begun an extended atonement in the Most Holy Place of the heavenly sanctuary, beginning on the Day of Atonement in October 1844. This theological view was directly contrary to the view presented by Snow in his influential publication of August 1844, titled the *True Midnight Cry*. Snow continued to argue that Jesus completed his Most Holy Place atonement on one day, October 22, 1844. He further concluded that Jesus no longer functioned as a high priest, but rather as a king. Snow's position theologically tended toward a more strict interpretation of the shut door and promoted the idea that probation had closed for the world. Crosier's view, on the other hand, presented Jesus as remaining in his high priestly role with a mediatorial capacity. With the support of Harmon (White) and other Sabbatarian Adventists, this view would lead to the abandonment of most aspects of the shut door by the early 1850s. It also became the basis for a worldwide proclamation of the Sabbath in the context of the "gospel" and "judgment" messages of Rev 14:6-12.